



National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

# **Mr Dennis Edwards: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**September 2017**

## Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4
D. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

**Teacher:** Mr Dennis Charlestan Edwards

**Teacher ref number:** 0211620

**Teacher date of birth:** 9 December 1957

**NCTL case reference:** 14732

**Date of determination:** 29 September 2017

**Former employer:** Stanborough Secondary School, Hertfordshire

### **A. Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 29 September at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Dennis Charlestan Edwards.

The panel members were Ms Margaret Windsor (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Martin Pilkington (lay panellist) and Ms Esther Maxwell (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan LLP, solicitors.

The presenting officer for the National College was Mr Ben Chapman of Browne Jacobson LLP, solicitors.

Mr Edwards was present and was represented by Mr Peter O'Brien of counsel.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## **B. Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 12 July 2017.

It was alleged that Mr Edwards was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that he:

1. Made one or more indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of a child;
2. Possessed one or more indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of a child;
3. Failed to stop using the file sharing software from which he obtained one or more of the images as at allegation 1 and/or 2 above when they came to his attention.

Mr Edwards admitted the facts of the allegations and the panel had regard to a Statement of agreed and disputed Facts presented at the outset of the hearing.

Mr Edwards also admitted that his conduct in relation to the allegations was such that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **C. Preliminary applications**

### **Application for the hearing to be held in private**

After hearing submissions from the presenting officer and the teacher's representative and receiving legal advice, which the panel accepted, the Chair announced the decision of the panel as follows:

The panel carefully considered a request on behalf of Mr Edwards that the hearing take place in private.

The reason relied upon was the particular nature of the allegations in these proceedings and Mr Edwards' circumstances at the relevant time. Given these concerns, he sought the exclusion of the public from the hearing.

The panel took into account the fact that there is a presumption that these proceedings will take place in public and there is a public interest in the openness and transparency of the disciplinary process.

The panel also noted that the outcome of the hearing will be announced in public.

On balance, the panel determined that the public interest in these proceedings taking place in public outweighs Mr Edwards' concerns.

The panel has accordingly decided that this hearing should take place in public.

However, should matters pertaining to Mr Edwards' health arise at any stage in the proceedings the panel will consider whether the public ought to be excluded and the parties are asked to alert the panel if such issues are likely to be introduced.

### **Application to admit additional evidence**

After hearing submissions from the presenting officer and the teacher's representative and receiving legal advice, which the panel accepted, the Chair announced the decision of the panel as follows:

The panel considered an agreed application to adduce a statement of agreed and disputed facts.

The panel decided to admit the statement of agreed and disputed facts.

First, the panel considered that the document was relevant to the case.

The panel also decided that it was appropriate for the document to be admitted in the interests of a fair hearing given the nature of the document which set out the position agreed between the parties in these proceedings.

## **D. 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 1 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 4 to 11

Section 3: National College documents – pages 12 to 68

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 69 to 73

In addition, the panel was provided with a statement of agreed and disputed facts at the outset of the hearing which was added to the hearing bundle at pages 74 to 76.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents in advance of the hearing.

## Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from Mr Edwards. No witnesses were called by the National College.

## E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel has carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

The panel confirms that it read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing. It carefully considered all of the evidence presented and the parties' submissions.

It also accepted the legal advice provided.

Throughout the relevant time for the purposes of these proceedings, Mr Edwards was employed as a teacher at Stanborough Secondary School in Hertfordshire ("the School").

He commenced employment at the School in January 2000.

On 1 July 2015, a search was conducted by the police of Mr Edwards' home. This followed Mr Edwards having downloaded an image that was detected by the police.

Computer equipment and electronic storage devices belonging to Mr Edwards were seized. Upon examination, it was discovered that they contained a number of indecent images of children.

Mr Edwards was arrested and interviewed by the police under caution. In reply to the caution he stated that "*as soon as I realised it was something that I shouldn't have seen I deleted it straight away*". During the course of the interview, he stated to the police that they may find some relevant images on his computer that he did not know about.

Hertfordshire County Council was notified and on 3 July 2015 a LADO Professional Strategy meeting was held.

The School subsequently commenced a disciplinary process and Mr Edwards attended a disciplinary hearing on 5 August 2015. By letter dated 5 August 2015, he was dismissed from his employment at the School.

The criminal investigation continued thereafter which included the preparation of a Forensic Digital Report. A second police interview with Mr Edwards was conducted on 11 January 2016.

Mr Edwards was subsequently charged with the offence of possessing an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child under section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.

On 11 August 2016, the matter came to trial at St Albans Crown Court. However, on the basis that no evidence was offered by the CPS, the charges were dismissed.

The panel confirms that it did not rely upon any findings made or opinions expressed during the police investigation and the School's disciplinary process. It formed its own view of the allegations based on the evidence presented to it.

## **Findings of fact**

The panel's findings of fact are as follows:

### **1. Made one or more indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of a child;**

This allegation was admitted by Mr Edwards.

Mr Edwards accepted that he used file-sharing software called Shareaza ("the Software") over a period of 3-4 years to download sexually explicit images in bulk. His position was that he was intending to download adult pornography.

However, pursuant to the statement of agreed and disputed facts, Mr Edwards admitted that he:

- a) Downloaded one or more indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of children ("Relevant Images") to his laptops using the Software; and
- b) Copied Relevant Images to an external hard drive.

There was no dispute as to the fact that in so doing he 'made' indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs for the purposes of this allegation.

The panel was referred to The Crown Prosecution Service Guidance in relation to indecent images of children which indicated that, in this context, the word 'make' means "*to cause to exist, to produce by action, to bring about*". On this basis, downloading an image onto a disc involved the 'making' of a photograph in accordance with the decision of *R v Bowden* [2000] 1 Cr. App. R. 438.

In light of Mr Edwards' admission and having considered all of the evidence, the panel therefore found allegation 1 proved.

### **2. Possessed one or more indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of a child;**

This allegation was admitted by Mr Edwards.

As noted above, pursuant to the statement of agreed and disputed facts Mr Edwards accepted that he downloaded Relevant Images.

He also admitted that he opened 5 - 10 of the Relevant Images and that he kept Relevant Images stored on his computer hardware. However, he denied having knowledge of the contents of many of the Relevant Images, having not opened them, and stated that when he came across them he deleted them.

The Relevant Images included pre - teens aged 7+ and were categorised as Category A to C images in accordance with Sentencing Council guidance relating to the categorisation of indecent photographs of children.

A Forensic Digital Report prepared by Individual A included within the papers indicated that Mr Edwards' computer hardware contained 12 Category A images, 12 Category B images and 139 Category A images (32 of which were duplicates). Some were marked 'PTHC' which is said to be an acronym for 'pre-teen hardcore'. Certain images were inaccessible, for example incomplete downloads or 'cached' images.

In light of Mr Edwards' admission and given the evidence before the panel, the panel found allegation 2 proved.

**3. You failed to stop using the file sharing software from which you obtained one or more of the images as at allegation 1 and/or 2 above when they came to your attention.**

This allegation was admitted by Mr Edwards.

Pursuant to the statement of agreed and disputed facts Mr Edwards accepted that, over a period of 3-4 years, he used the Software to download sexually explicit images in bulk and he accepted that he continued to use the Software after Relevant Images came to his attention.

The panel accordingly found allegation 3 proved.

**Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute**

Having found allegations 1 to 3 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Edwards in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part Two, Mr Edwards 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.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mr Edwards' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo-photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents is relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Edwards in relation to the facts found proved in allegations 1, 2 and 3 amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Mr Edwards admitted that his actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct. Whilst he denied that he had knowledge of the contents of many of the Relevant Images having not opened them, and stated that when he came across them he deleted them, he recognised that these are matters for mitigation. He accepted that he had been reckless and had left himself vulnerable to allegations.

Whilst Mr Edwards' possession of the offending material may have been inadvertent and not deliberate, there were a large number of Relevant Images in his possession which was a matter of concern.

His failure to take no action after Relevant Images came to his attention was also unacceptable. The panel considered that, having been aware of the Relevant Images, Mr Edwards ought to have immediately ceased using the Software.

Mindful of the nature of the material, he ought also to have reported the matter to the police. The panel was informed that Mr Edwards had been trained in Basic Child Protection Awareness and recognised that the Relevant Images depicted child abuse.

The panel accordingly considered that he failed to act appropriately, particularly in continuing to use the Software. That was a grave error on his part.

The panel noted that the allegations concern conduct which took place outside of the education setting. However, Mr Edwards held a position of trust as a teacher and it was incumbent on him to set an example at all times in relation to both his personal and professional conduct. Further, given that the allegations concern indecent images of children there are serious safeguarding considerations.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Edwards is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Edwards' conduct had brought the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

Mr Edwards admitted that his actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel agreed. The findings of misconduct are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

The panel therefore found that Mr Edwards' actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In conclusion, having found the facts of allegations 1, 2 and 3 proved, the panel further found that Mr Edwards' conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, 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 is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it was 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 a punitive effect.

The panel considered 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
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel found that Mr Edwards had failed to take any action having viewed Relevant Images. There were clear safeguarding implications which he failed to recognise. Having heard from Mr Edwards in oral evidence, the panel was not satisfied that he truly understood the implications of his conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Edwards, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Edwards was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

Further, the panel considered that there is a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession. Mr Edwards' continued use of the Software, after having had sight of Relevant Images, was a particularly serious breach of the Teachers' Standards. The conduct found against Mr Edwards was outside that which could reasonably be expected.

Notwithstanding 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 Edwards.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Edwards. 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 proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo-photograph or image of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case.

The panel considered that there were the following mitigating circumstances:

- Mr Edwards' actions in downloading Relevant Images were not deliberate.

- He has a previously good record.
- He admitted the facts of the allegations at the outset of the hearing and admitted that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. He engaged with the National College during the course of these proceedings.
- Mr Edwards gave evidence as to difficulties in his personal life at the relevant time, particularly following the death of his mother and his divorce. His evidence was that he was depressed and he sought counselling.
- Mr Edwards showed regret and remorse.

In terms of aggravating factors, the panel noted that:

- Mr Edwards was an experienced and senior teacher who had received safeguarding training.
- There had been a clear and serious breach of the Teachers' Standards.
- Mr Edwards continued to use the Software, despite being aware that it had resulted in him downloading Relevant Images.
- Mr Edwards had demonstrated insufficient insight into the impact of his behaviour. The Relevant Images raised serious safeguarding concerns and the panel was not satisfied that Mr Edwards had shown that he fully appreciated this.

The panel was not provided with any references attesting to Mr Edwards' practice as a teacher.

The panel's view was that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Edwards. The insufficient insight shown by Mr Edwards was a significant factor in forming that opinion. When questioned by the panel in his oral evidence, Mr Edwards' focus was on himself and not the safeguarding implications for the children in the Relevant Images. He accepted that his behaviour was not a good reflection on teachers and that parents would not be happy if they knew about it.

Accordingly, the panel makes 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 to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was mindful that the Advice advises 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 behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. One of these behaviours is activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo-photograph or image of a child.

That behaviour was present in this case. Mr Edwards was not only in possession of Relevant Images but continued to use the Software, despite knowing that it had led to those images being downloaded. By his own admission, he was reckless. He also failed to report the matter, which he accepts now he should have done.

The panel had also found that Mr Edwards had shown insufficient insight into his actions.

However, on balance, the panel felt the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate. The panel took into account in particular the fact that the Relevant Images were downloaded inadvertently. He had not deliberately sought them out. Mr Edwards had also shown regret and remorse and the panel considered that, whilst he had shown insufficient insight, given time this could be remedied.

The panel therefore decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period of 5 years. It was the panel's view that a review period of 5 years would enable Mr Edwards to demonstrate that he had truly learnt from his mistakes.

## **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 is published by the Secretary of State 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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Dennis Edwards should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Edwards 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.

- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mr Edwards' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo-photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents is relevant.

The panel found that the conduct of Mr Edwards fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 or not a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Edwards, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate.

In this case I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed "given that the allegations concern indecent images of children there are serious safeguarding considerations." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a serious risk from being present. I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse which the panel sets out as follows, "Mr Edwards had shown insufficient insight into his actions," and "Mr Edwards had also shown regret and remorse." The panel also report that it, "was not satisfied that he truly understood the implications of his conduct."

The panel has also commented, "whilst he had shown insufficient insight, given time this could be remedied". In my judgement, the current lack of insight means that there is some considerable risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this risks the well-being and safeguarding 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, "Mr Edwards' continued use of the Software, after having had sight of Relevant Images, was a particularly serious breach of the Teachers' Standards. The conduct found against Mr Edwards was outside that which could reasonably be expected."

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that failure to impose a prohibition order might be regarded by the public 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 unacceptable professional conduct, 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 Edwards. The panel comment in Mr Edwards’ favour that he “has a previously good record.” However the panel also point out that it, “was not provided with any references attesting to Mr Edwards’ practice as a teacher.”

A prohibition order would clearly prevent Mr Edwards from continuing to work as a teacher and would 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.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Edwards continued to use the software even when he had realised that it was resulting in him downloading Relevant Images.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Edwards has made and is making 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 that is not backed up by sufficient insight does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

This case involved the following facts:

“He also admitted that he opened 5 - 10 of the Relevant Images and that he kept Relevant Images stored on his computer hardware.”

“The Relevant Images included pre - teens aged 7+ and were categorised as Category A to C images in accordance with Sentencing Council guidance relating to the categorisation of indecent photographs of children.”

“Mr Edwards’ computer hardware contained 12 Category A images, 12 Category B images and 139 Category A images (32 of which were duplicates).”

I have considered the guidance published by the Secretary of State that clearly states that “it is likely that a teacher’s behaviour will be considered to be incompatible with being a teacher, if there is evidence of one or more of the factors below....” Those factors include possession of indecent images of children as found in this case.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case the panel has recommended a 5 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments on this. The panel considered that there were the following mitigating circumstances:

- Mr Edwards' actions in downloading Relevant Images were not deliberate.
- He has a previously good record.
- He admitted the facts of the allegations at the outset of the hearing and admitted that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. He engaged with the National College during the course of these proceedings.
- Mr Edwards gave evidence as to difficulties in his personal life at the relevant time, particularly following the death of his mother and his divorce. His evidence was that he was depressed and he sought counselling.
- Mr Edwards showed regret and remorse.

In terms of aggravating factors, the panel noted that:

- Mr Edwards was an experienced and senior teacher who had received safeguarding training.
- There had been a clear and serious breach of the Teachers' Standards.
- Mr Edwards continued to use the Software, despite being aware that it had resulted in him downloading Relevant Images.
- Mr Edwards had demonstrated insufficient insight into the impact of his behaviour. The Relevant Images raised serious safeguarding concerns and the panel was not satisfied that Mr Edwards had shown that he fully appreciated this.



The panel was not provided with any references attesting to Mr Edwards' practice as a teacher.

In my judgement the panel has given too much weight to the mitigating circumstances. In my view the continued use of the software and the lack of insight are significant factors. The panel go on to say that it considers that “the Relevant Images were downloaded inadvertently. He had not deliberately sought them out. Mr Edwards had also shown regret and remorse and the panel considered that, whilst he had shown insufficient insight, given time this could be remedied.”

In my judgement this fails to attribute sufficient weight to the continued use of the software, knowing that it was leading to the downloading of the images.

I have also put considerable weight on the advice given by the Secretary of State which sets out, “a panel should consider recommending to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order is imposed with no provision for the teacher to apply for it to be set aside after any period of time where the case involved:

Any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child,”

This case involves the making and possessing of a significant number of images including at Category A.

I have considered therefore whether a 5 year 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 my view it does not.

In this case, there are three significant factors that in my view mean that a five year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the continuing use of the software, the number and seriousness of the images found and the lack of insight.

I consider therefore that there should be no provision for review in this case. For the reasons set out. In my view that is proportionate and required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Dennis Edwards 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 allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Dennis Edwards 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 Dennis Edwards has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alan Meyrick', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 5 October 2017**

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