



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Mark Robinson: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

September 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

Teacher: Mr Mark Robinson

Teacher ref number: 1074273

Teacher date of birth: 17 May 1987

TRA reference: 24645

Date of determination: 17 September 2026

Former employer: The Challenge Academy Trust, Warrington

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 17 September 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Mark Robinson.

The panel members were Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Anderson (teacher panellist) and Ms Cathryn Tillman (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Mark Millin of Kingsley Napley LLP.

Mr Robinson was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 26 June 2026.

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

1. On 15 January 2025, he was convicted at Warrington Magistrates' Court for the offence of:
 - a) assault by beating on 10 September 2024 contrary to Section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988;
 - b) criminal damage to property valued under £5000 on 10 September 2024, contrary to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Damage Act 1971 s 1(1);
 - c) Intentional strangulation on 10 September 2024, contrary to Section 75(A)(1)(a) and (5) of the Serious Crime Act 2015;
 - d) criminal damage to property valued under £5000 on 14 August 2023, contrary to section 1(1) and (4) of the Criminal Damage Act 1971;
 - e) common assault on 14 August 2023, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988; and
2. On 31 March 2025, he was convicted at Liverpool Magistrates' Court for the offence of:
 - a) assault occasioning Actual Bodily Harm on 30 March 2025, contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861;
3. Commission of the offence at allegation 2a occurred during the Operational Period of suspended Sentence Order on 30 March 2025 contrary to the Sentencing Act 2020 sch 16.

Mr Robinson admitted the allegations and that he was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people– pages 3 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 13

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 14 to 86

The panel also received a skeleton argument prepared by the presenting officer. This was not an evidential document and the panel did not have to decide whether to admit it as late evidence.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following submitted by Mr Robinson:

An account provided by Mr Robinson;

A signed character statement provided by [REDACTED];

A character statement provided by Mr Robinson's [REDACTED]

A letter of a [REDACTED] dated 26 February 2025.

These documents were labelled as pages 87 to 93.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

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

Witnesses

No witnesses were called by the presenting officer.

Mr Robinson attended but did not give oral evidence.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Robinson was employed as a teacher and lead teacher of mathematics at The Challenge Academy ("the School") on 15 April 2024. On 10 September 2024, the School was informed by Cheshire Police that Mr Robinson had been arrested. Mr Robinson was subsequently suspended. On 17 June 2025, a disciplinary hearing was held and Mr Robinson's employment was terminated.

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 15 January 2025, he was convicted at Warrington Magistrates' Court for the offence of:**
 - a) assault by beating on 10 September 2024 contrary to Section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988;**
 - b) criminal damage to property valued under £5000 on 10 September 2024, contrary to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Damage Act 1971 s 1(1);**
 - c) Intentional strangulation on 10 September 2024, contrary to Section 75(A)(1)(a) and (5) of the Serious Crime Act 2015;**
 - d) criminal damage to property valued under £5000 on 14 August 2023, contrary to section 1(1) and (4) of the Criminal Damage Act 1971;**
 - e) common assault on 14 August 2023, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988; and**

Mr Robinson admitted the allegations.

The panel was provided with a certificate of conviction which confirmed that Mr Robinson had been convicted of the offences as set out in the allegations above on 15 January 2025, following a guilty plea by Mr Robinson. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. The property referred to in allegation 1b was a mobile phone to the value of £599 belonging to Person A, the victim of the other offences for which Mr Robinson was convicted. The property referred to in allegation 1d was a number of candle jars of unknown value, also belonging to Person A.

Mr Robinson was sentenced on 12 February 2025. He was sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment suspended for 24 months. Further orders were made consisting of an alcohol treatment requirement for alcohol dependency under the direction of the probation service for 12 months; a rehabilitation activity requirement up to a maximum of 35 days, an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours. Mr Robinson was also ordered to pay compensation of £1,099. A restraining order was made preventing contact with Person A [REDACTED] until 11 February 2030.

No sentencing remarks were provided. However, the panel was provided with a Police Report which summarised the allegations made, leading to the prosecution of Mr Robinson. This stated that on 10 September 2024, an emergency call was made by a witness reporting a male attacking a female and pushing her into a bush. When the police arrived, Person A disclosed that, [REDACTED], Mr Robinson had been shoving her into the bushes and pushing her around and that he had thrown her phone out of the upstairs window. She disclosed that they had been arguing inside [REDACTED] and he had been drinking a lot. She reported that he had strangled her during the argument when they were [REDACTED], and that the argument had escalated, and he had been pushing her around outside [REDACTED], causing her bruising to her right leg and right knee from falling to the floor as well as a scrape to her hand.

The panel also noted that during the School's disciplinary proceedings, representations made by Mr Robinson confirmed that he accepted that he had been sentenced for damage to property, assault and strangulation. He provided an overview of the incident on 10 September 2024 that accorded with the description set out in the Police Report.

The police report also referred to Person A having contacted them on 23 September 2024 to report an incident which took place on 14 August 2023 whereby she was assaulted by Mr Robinson and had her property damaged. She referred to Mr Robinson having been [REDACTED]. She stated that, on this occasion, [REDACTED]. He then came into [REDACTED] and smashed up Person A's candles [REDACTED]. He emptied the drawers onto the floor and threw the candles [REDACTED]. After this, he went [REDACTED] and started to smash [REDACTED]. She stated that she had started to film Mr Robinson from a distance and he attempted to take her phone from her. Mr Robinson then grabbed Person A from behind and pushed her [REDACTED]. He then pushed her on top of broken glass which he had smashed [REDACTED]. She stated that he had taken her phone and when she managed to get it back, he grabbed her around the waist and pushed her [REDACTED]. He then grabbed her by her ponytail and "ran" her head [REDACTED].

Based on the certificate of conviction, and in light of Mr Robinson's admissions, the panel found this allegation proven.

2. On 31 March 2025, he was convicted at Liverpool Magistrates' Court for the offence of:

a) assault occasioning Actual Bodily Harm on 30 March 2025, contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861;

3. Commission of the offence at allegation 2a occurred during the Operational Period of suspended Sentence Order on 30 March 20-25. contrary to the Sentencing Act 2020 sch 16

Mr Robinson admitted these allegations.

The panel was provided with a certificate of conviction which confirmed that Mr Robinson had been convicted of the offence as set out in the allegation 2a above on 31 March 2025, following a guilty plea by Mr Robinson. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. It was apparent from the Certificate of Conviction that Mr Robinson was committed to prison because the offence was committed during the operational period of the suspended sentence previously imposed. The total custodial period was therefore 12 months.

The panel was provided with an extract of the police case summary. This stated that the police received an emergency call on 30 March 2025 at 06:40 in which a disturbance could be heard in the background and a male saying "I will kick you in the face", amongst other threats. The caller referred to Mr Robinson "[REDACTED]". A female had swelling and bruising to her forehead and cheek as well as a cut to the head which had been bleeding. The female said that Mr Robinson had come in [REDACTED], and began shouting at her, causing her to push him away. She alleged that Mr Robinson had then punched her twice to the head, and [REDACTED]. A police statement appeared to describe attending this incident, albeit reported this having occurred on 30 April 2025. The panel believed this to be a typographical error given that the statement was dated 30 March 2025. It was apparent from this statement that the female victim was Person B, [REDACTED].

Based on the certificate of conviction, and in light of Mr Robinson's admissions, the panel found these allegations proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel considered that although allegation 3 was proven, it could not be a relevant offence, since no separate offence was committed. Allegation 3 provided the explanation as to why Mr Robinson was imprisoned following the offence he committed in allegation 2a.

With respect to the remainder of the allegations found proven, the panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Robinson in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

With respect to allegations 1d and 1e, the panel had no evidence before it that Mr Robinson was a teacher at the time the offences occurred on 14 August 2023. Mr Robinson commenced his role at the School on 15 April 2024. Whilst it may be likely that he had previously taught, since he was appointed as lead teacher of mathematics, there was no evidence before the panel of his previous employment. The panel therefore could not be sure that, at the time of the offences, he was bound to adhere to the Teachers' Standards.

With respect to allegations 1a, 1b, 1c and 2a, the panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Robinson 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, including ...the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...

The panel noted that the individual's actions in respect of allegations 1 and 2a were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. The offences including those for violence indicated a loss of control, and the panel was concerned as to the transferable risk.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences had an impact on the safety and/or security 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 Robinson's behaviour in committing the offences 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 Robinson's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment (albeit that it was initially suspended) in respect of the matters set out in Allegation 1. With respect to the offence at allegation 2a, Mr Robinson was imprisoned as a result of having committed that offence during the operational period of his suspended sentence. The sentences for imprisonment were indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

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

This was a case concerning offences involving violence and they were serious offences involving alcohol. The Advice states these are likely to be considered relevant offences.

The panel considered these were serious offences given that the level of violence involved, the violence was perpetrated on numerous occasions, and involved more than one victim.

The panel took into account the evidence that Mr Robinson was experiencing [REDACTED] at the time of committing the offences. With respect to allegation 1, the panel noted that the referral to the TRA stated that prior to Mr Robinson's arrest on 10 September 2024, he had previously been [REDACTED]. The panel noted that [REDACTED] had referred to Mr Robinson having [REDACTED]. Within the police records, [REDACTED] had referred to Mr Robinson being abusive towards her "due to [REDACTED]". However, there was no medical evidence before the panel to confirm that Mr Robinson's [REDACTED] caused his behaviour. With respect to the incident at allegations 1 a, 1b and 1c. Mr Robinson stated that he had taken [REDACTED]. The panel considered that in the absence of any medical evidence that Mr Robinson could not control his decision [REDACTED], these were deliberate decisions. The panel noted that Mr Robinson was convicted of the offences, and by pleading guilty, had accepted liability for his actions. He was aware of his [REDACTED], given that he had raised them with the School. Despite this, he accepted in his representations to the school that he had not been addressing [REDACTED] when he started at the School. The panel did not therefore consider that Mr Robinson's [REDACTED] negated his responsibility for his actions in respect of allegation 1.

With respect to allegation 2a, Mr Robinson has stated in the written account he provided to the panel that he had started some [REDACTED]. He stated that he had been keen [REDACTED]. He now has little memory of what happened when he committed the offence and was arrested. The unsigned witness statement from [REDACTED] corroborated that Mr Robinson [REDACTED]. The panel was concerned, however, as to the weight it could place on her statement given that it was unsigned and she did not attend to give oral evidence. The panel noted that Mr Robinson had provided the panel with a letter [REDACTED] of 26 February 2025 in which it referred to Mr Robinson [REDACTED], and the timing of this was consistent with Mr Robinson [REDACTED]. However, there was no medical evidence before the panel that it was [REDACTED] that was responsible for his actions. Furthermore, the panel noted that Mr Robinson had pleaded guilty in the criminal proceedings and thereby accepted liability for his actions. The panel therefore did not consider that there was sufficient evidence that Mr Robinson's [REDACTED] negated his responsibility for his actions in respect of allegation 2a.

The panel also considered whether there was sufficient evidence of Mr Robinson's rehabilitation in order that this could be taken into consideration when determining whether the offences were relevant to Mr Robinson's fitness to be a teacher. The panel was not provided with sufficient independent evidence of the success of the rehabilitation activity requirement or the [REDACTED] requirement imposed by the court. Whilst

[REDACTED] referred to having been surprised at how much prison seemed to help him to recover, and that [REDACTED], the panel could not place significant weight on this given she did not provide oral evidence and her statement was unsigned.

The panel was provided with a character reference from [REDACTED] referring to Mr Robinson as an extremely knowledgeable, patient, caring and supportive teacher, who consistently puts the needs of his students at the heart of everything he does. She referred to Mr Robinson as a “reliable, dedicated and valued member of staff”. However, there was no evidence that the referee was aware of Mr Robinson’s convictions and in light of that, the panel could not be satisfied that the witness would have provided the same reference had she been so aware.

Although the panel had no reason to doubt Mr Robinson’s teaching proficiency, the panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Robinson’s ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions at allegations 1 and 2a were for relevant offences 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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public given the transferable risk as a result of Mr Robinson having been convicted of offences of violence.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Robinson 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 Robinson 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 Robinson in the profession. Whilst no doubt had been cast upon Mr Robinson's abilities as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Robinson in the profession, since his violent conduct was fundamentally incompatible with his position as 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 Robinson.

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;
- actions or behaviours that ...undermine fundamental British values of ...the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect...
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

With respect to the final bullet point, the panel noted that Mr Robinson had been convicted in respect of three separate incidents of violence, and the panel was concerned as to Mr Robinson's propensity to act in a violent manner.

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.

The panel considered that Mr Robinson's actions were deliberate given that he presented [REDACTED]. Mr Robinson was aware of his own [REDACTED], before the incident on 10 September 2024, but as he said during the School's disciplinary process, he had not been addressing those issues prior to the incident, and when he commenced his role at the School. Although the panel recognised there was some correlation in timing between the evidence that [REDACTED] was being considered and the incident referred to in allegation 2a, the panel was not provided with any [REDACTED] that this contributed to or was the cause of his behaviour.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Robinson was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. The panel noted that in respect of allegation 2a, the emergency call to the police did record that it was stated "She punched me", "She punched me, she hit me first" and "[REDACTED] has assaulted me, she is drunk and intoxicated and she's assaulted me." [REDACTED] statement referred to her having drunk alcohol in the early hours of the morning, which "sadly culminated in me and [REDACTED]... engaging in a physical altercation." The panel was not able to place significant weight on this statement, given that it had not heard oral evidence from her, and the statement was unsigned. The panel noted, however, that Mr Robinson had been convicted of assaulting [REDACTED] indicating his culpability.

There was no evidence that Mr Robinson had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that by reason of the offences, Mr Robinson had clearly failed to demonstrate high standards in his personal conduct.

The panel noted from the referral to the TRA that there had been no previous misconduct. The presenting officer confirmed that there had been no previous disciplinary order imposed upon Mr Robinson by the TRA or its predecessor organisations.

Mr Robinson provided one statement from [REDACTED] testifying to his ability as a teacher. She referred to having worked alongside Mr Robinson for around two years while he was teaching mathematics to secondary school students. As referred to above, there was no indication whether the referee knew of Mr Robinson's convictions when she provided the statement. The statement refers to Mr Robinson as an "extremely knowledgeable, patient, caring and supportive teacher, who consistently puts the needs of his students at the heart of everything he does". She referred to Mr Robinson as a "reliable, dedicated and valued member of staff". She also stated that Mr Robinson created an environment where students felt able to succeed academically while also knowing they had someone who would listen to them when they needed support. She also stated that [REDACTED], she had never doubted that she could speak with him

about anything without fear of judgement, knowing that he would genuinely listen and try to understand.

Mr Robinson co-operated with the TRA proceedings, having attended the hearing. The panel noted that he pleaded guilty in the criminal proceedings. He admitted his conduct during the School's disciplinary proceedings. He also admitted all of the allegations being considered by the TRA.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Robinson had expressed genuine regret for his actions.

Mr Robinson recognised that he may never teach again, and to some extent therefore understood the seriousness of his actions. He acknowledged that his actions could cause safeguarding concerns. However, at the same time, he advanced that he would never have been a risk to students and that he would be safe teaching children. The panel was concerned that Mr Robinson had not entirely appreciated the transferable risk that comes with having been convicted of a series of violent offences.

The panel was concerned that despite having told the School that he was starting to address his issues after the incident on 10 September 2024, he went on to commit a further offence of violence. This was despite the court having already imposed an [REDACTED] requirement and a rehabilitation activity requirement. There had therefore been repetition of his conduct, and this gave rise to concerns regarding the risk of repetition in the future.

Mr Robinson recognised his [REDACTED] but did not appear to have understood the risk of the pressures of teaching exacerbating those issues, nor had he demonstrated strategies to manage those pressures and mitigate the risk posed. Although Mr Robinson was ordered to undertake [REDACTED] and rehabilitation activity and Mr Robinson told the panel that he engaged positively, the panel was not presented with any evidence of the success of those programmes. He also referred to having [REDACTED], but again the panel was provided with no evidence of its efficacy.

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 Robinson 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

Robinson given the series of convictions for acts of serious violence. 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.

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

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. These include violence. In this case there were convictions for three incidents involving serious violence, and the panel considered that this weighed in favour of not offering a review period.

Despite Mr Robinson's evident remorse, the panel considered that it could not be comfortable that Mr Robinson would not re-offend, given he had been convicted for repeated acts of violence. The panel considered that this was a situation in which the seriousness of the offences indicated that Mr Robinson was unsuitable to be a member of the teaching profession.

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 provision 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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to relevant convictions, save for allegation 3, which as the panel point out is not a separate offence.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Robinson 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, including ...the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...

The panel has determined that the conduct at allegations 1 and 2a were relevant to Mr Robinson's ongoing suitability to teach and therefore amounted to a relevant offence.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that Mr Robinson had been convicted of three separate instances of violence, against more than one person. I am particularly mindful of the seriousness of the conviction for intentional strangulation.

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 Robinson, 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 children. The panel has observed, *"There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public given the transferable risk as a result of Mr Robinson having been convicted of offences of violence."* 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 was satisfied that Mr Robinson had expressed genuine regret for his actions."

Mr Robinson recognised that he may never teach again, and to some extent therefore understood the seriousness of his actions. He acknowledged that his actions could cause safeguarding concerns. However, at the same time, he advanced that he would never have been a risk to students and that he would be safe teaching children. The panel was concerned that Mr Robinson had not entirely appreciated the transferable risk that comes with having been convicted of a series of violent offences.”

Further to this, the panel notes, “*Mr Robinson recognised his [REDACTED], but did not appear to have understood the risk of the pressures of teaching exacerbating those issues, nor had he demonstrated strategies to manage those pressures and mitigate the risk posed.*”

In my judgement, this amounts to partial or developing insight into his conduct and, in my view, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the 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 public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Robinson were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.*”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of repeated instances of violence between August 2023 and March 2025, 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 Robinson himself. The panel considered a statement from [REDACTED] which provided a positive reflection on Mr Robinson’s ability as a teacher. However, the panel also comment, “*There was no evidence that Mr Robinson had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.*”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Robinson 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 risk of repetition. The panel has said, *"...Mr Robinson had been convicted in respect of three separate incidents of violence, and the panel was concerned as to Mr Robinson's propensity to act in a violent manner."*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that these matters amount to serious violence.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Robinson 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 circumstances 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.

The panel has identified that the Advice indicates that there are certain 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. The factor of violence falls within this category.

I have also considered the panel's comments *"Despite Mr Robinson's evident remorse, the panel considered that it could not be comfortable that Mr Robinson would not re-offend, given he had been convicted for repeated acts of violence."*

The panel has also said that *"...this was a situation in which the seriousness of the offences indicated that Mr Robinson was unsuitable to be a member of the teaching profession."*

I am also mindful of the panel's findings that there was some correlation in relation to the timing of Mr Robinson taking [REDACTED]. Although I also note that was not provided with any medical evidence that this contributed to or caused Mr Robinson's behaviour.

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. Having considered all of the factors in this case, I am of the view that it

is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession by allowing for an extended review period. The panel has found these offences amount to serious violence, which has occurred on several occasions. However, I have balanced this against Mr Robinson's developing insight. As such, in my view it would be proportionate to allow for a review period.

I consider therefore that an eight-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and is in the public interest. This would also allow Mr Robinson sufficient time to fully reflect on his conduct and address the underlying causes.

Should he wish to return to the profession in the future, it will be incumbent on Mr Robinson to demonstrate that he has taken measures to ensure that the risk of repetition is negligible.

This means that Mr Mark Robinson is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 23 September 2034, eight years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Robinson remains prohibited from teaching

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

Mr Robinson 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: 23 September 2026

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