



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr David Derrick: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

**Panel decision and reasons on behalf of the
Secretary of State for Education**

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

Teacher: Mr David Derrick

Teacher ref number: 0659191

Teacher date of birth: 20 April 1983

TRA reference: 22985

Date of determination: 27 July 2026

Former employer: The Olympus Trust Academy, Winterbourne

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 27 July 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr David Derrick.

The panel members were Mr John Martin (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Eleanor Wilson (teacher panellist) and Ms Maxine Cole (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Derrick that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Derrick provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Matilda Heselton of Browne Jacobson LLP, Mr Derrick or any representative for Mr Derrick.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 27 July 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Derrick was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 20 January 2025, he was convicted of Rape of Female Aged 16 or Over on 29 November 2022, contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.1

Mr Derrick admitted the facts of allegation 1 and further admitted that those admitted facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Derrick on 13 December 2025.

Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents which included:

Section 1: Chronology – page 4

Section 2: Notice of meeting and response – pages 6 to 12a

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 13 to 16

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 18 to 53

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 55 to 60

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Derrick on 13 December 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 22 December 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Derrick for the allegation to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

On 1 January 2008, Mr Derrick commenced employment at The Olympus Trust Academy ('the School') as a teacher of Geography.

On 1 December 2022 the Local Authority Designated Officer ('LADO') received notification that an allegation of rape had been made to the police against Mr Derrick.

On 30 June 2023 Mr Derrick was suspended pending further investigation into the allegation. Subsequently, on 30 November 2023, Mr Derrick's employment at the School was terminated.

On 20 November 2025, Mr Derrick was allegedly convicted at Bristol Crown Court of the offence of rape, contrary to section 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. Mr Derrick was subsequently sentenced at Bristol Crown Court on 20 January 2025 to a total sentence of 2 years and 9 months imprisonment and was also required to sign the sex offenders register indefinitely.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On 20 January 2025, you were convicted of Rape of Female Aged 16 or Over on 29 November 2022, contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.1**

The panel noted that Mr Derrick admitted allegation 1, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed dated 13 December 2025.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers ('the Advice') which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional

circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of a certificate of conviction from Bristol Crown Court, which set out that Mr Derrick had been convicted on 20 December 2025 at Bristol Crown Court of rape of woman 16 years of age or over, contrary to section 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. The panel took this as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

Mr Derrick was later sentenced at Bristol Crown Court on 20 January 2025 to 2 years and 9 months imprisonment and was also required to sign the sex offenders register indefinitely.

The panel also had a copy of the PNC record in respect of Mr Derrick which also set out his sentence on 20 January 2025, of rape of female aged 16 years or over on 29 November 2022 contrary to s1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003, and confirmed the term of imprisonment as 2 years and 9 months.

The panel also has copy of the Court transcript of the sentencing remarks for Mr Derrick in the Hearing of 20 January 2025 which set out the detail of the offence and the detail of the conviction and sentence.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document the Advice.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Derrick, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Derrick was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, [...] the rule of law [...] liberty and mutual respect

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, [...]
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Derrick's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting insofar as it had found that Mr Derrick had been convicted of the extremely serious criminal offence of rape of a woman aged 16 or over contrary to section 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety of members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Derrick's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Derrick's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed. The panel noted the guidance in the Advice that any offence which results in a term of imprisonment is likely to be a relevant offence.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted Mr Derrick's admission in the statement of fact that the offences constituted relevant offences.

The panel carefully considered Mr Derrick's written statement. The panel also considered the Judge's sentencing remarks from Mr Derrick's criminal trial where Mr Derrick was stated to [REDACTED]. The panel did not though consider that it had any mitigating circumstances which would meaningfully impact upon its views as to the relevant nature of this clearly extremely serious offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Derrick's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and the upholding of proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Derrick, which involved rape of a female aged 16 or over contrary to section 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of other members of the public, as the conviction was for a very serious category of sexual misconduct.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Derrick were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Derrick was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Derrick in the profession. Whilst there was evidence that Mr Derrick had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Derrick in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Derrick.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- abuse of position or trust;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

Noting his conviction for the relevant offence and the facts necessarily implied by that conviction the panel found that there was no relevant evidence that Mr Derrick's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Derrick was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel did not consider that Mr Derrick demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct nor did it consider it evidenced that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel again considered the references in the transcript of the Judge's sentencing remarks from the criminal trial including in respect of Mr Derrick's previous good character and the [REDACTED]. The panel further considered Mr Derrick's written statement in which he expressed some remorse for his actions and acknowledged that he had caused harm.

The panel found some limited evidence of insight on Mr Derrick's part was reflected in the references within the Judge's sentencing remarks in the criminal trial and Mr Derrick's written statement. The panel noted that the Judge was satisfied that Mr Derrick's behaviour was out of character. The panel did not have enough evidence to form an opinion on that matter.

Whilst not in any way seeking to go behind the facts of the conviction, the panel noted Mr Derrick's continued assertion that he had sincerely believed that the individual against whom he committed the offence consented; however, the panel also noted that he had been convicted and that that it had been found that such a belief was unreasonable.

The panel considered it had only limited evidence of Mr Derrick's remorse for the impact of his actions upon the victim, upon others, upon the School and upon the profession. The panel also noted that Mr Derrick continued to describe the actions which led to his conviction for rape as an "*error of judgement*" on his part which the panel considered suggested a lack of substantive genuine insight into his decisions and their impact.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Derrick of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Derrick. His conviction of rape of a woman aged 16 or over contrary to section 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

The case involved serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

None of the listed characteristics was engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel again noted that Mr Derrick's case involved serious sexual misconduct, specifically rape, and that as part of his sentencing, Mr Derrick was to sign the sex offenders' registry indefinitely. The panel considered that the extremely serious criminal conviction was wholly incompatible with him working as a teacher. The panel noted that it had not found sufficient evidence of insight or remorse and that it considered that the mitigation which it had been provided with did not materially lessen the seriousness of Mr Derrick's actions.

The panel considered the risk of repetition by Mr Derrick. The panel, whilst noting the limited evidence of insight or remorse, did not find it had any basis to come to a view on that risk though noted the Judge's findings that the incident was out of character.

Ultimately the panel considered the high level of seriousness of the sexual misconduct and the nature of the offence was such as to be wholly incompatible with Mr Derrick returning to the teaching profession and that it was necessary to protect the public interest, and proportionate in terms of impact on Mr Derrick, that no review period be offered.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr David Derrick should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Derrick is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, [...] the rule of law [...] liberty and mutual respect
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, [...]
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Derrick amounted to a relevant offence as *“...the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Derrick’s ongoing suitability to teach.”*

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a criminal conviction of a serious sexual offence.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Derrick, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect the public and pupils. The panel has observed, *“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Derrick, which involved rape of a female aged 16 or over contrary to section 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of other members of the public, as the conviction was for a very serious category of sexual misconduct.”* A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, *“The panel found some limited evidence of insight on Mr Derrick’s part was reflected in the references within the Judge’s sentencing remarks in the criminal trial and Mr Derrick’s written statement. The panel noted that the Judge was satisfied that Mr Derrick’s behaviour was out of character.”*

The panel has also commented that *“The panel further considered Mr Derrick’s written statement in which he expressed some remorse for his actions and acknowledged that he had caused harm.”*

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this may impact future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe that it *“...considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Derrick were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”*

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for a serious sexual offence in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Derrick himself. The panel comment *“The panel did not consider that Mr Derrick demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct nor did it consider it evidenced that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Derrick from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, *“The panel noted that it had not found sufficient evidence of insight or remorse and that it considered that the mitigation which it had been provided with did not materially lessen the seriousness of Mr Derrick’s actions.”*

In light of the seriousness of the panel’s findings, I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction, to the contribution that Mr Derrick has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the seriousness of the

proven conduct in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments *"The panel again noted that Mr Derrick's case involved serious sexual misconduct, specifically rape, and that as part of his sentencing, Mr Derrick was to sign the sex offenders' registry indefinitely. The panel considered that the extremely serious criminal conviction was wholly incompatible with him working as a teacher."*

I have considered whether allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct and the lack of evidence of full insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr David Derrick is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Derrick shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Derrick has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 29 July 2026

This decision is taken by the decision maker named above on behalf of the Secretary of State.