



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Joel Osborne: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**October 2021**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	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	14

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Joel Osborne
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1281429
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	11 September 1990
<b>TRA reference:</b>	16507
<b>Date of determination:</b>	1 October 2021
<b>Former employer:</b>	Harwich and Dovercourt High School, Essex

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 1 October 2021 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Joel Osborne.

The panel members were Mrs Marjorie Harris (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Neil Hillman (teacher panellist) and Mr Nigel Shock (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Rebecca Utton 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 Osborne that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Osborne provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Chantelle Browne of Fieldfisher LLP, Mr Osborne or any representative.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting, save for the announcement of the panel’s decision, which was announced in public and recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 13 September 2021

It was alleged that Mr Osborne was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst a teacher at Harwich and Dovercourt High School he:

1. During the academic year of 2016-2017, engaged in a conversation with Pupil A in relation to condoms in circumstances where he knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;
2. During the academic year of 2016-2017, on one or more occasions, engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil B in that he sent Pupil B an inappropriate image of him in his underwear while he was in bed;
3. During the academic year of 2016-2017, on one or more occasions, engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil C in that he sent Pupil C an inappropriate image of him in his underwear;
4. In or around February 2017, whilst on the school Outwards Bound trip, invited Pupil D and one or more pupils into his bedroom when he knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;
5. On or around 7 April 2017, produced and/or kept a post-it note on his desk which contained sexual references in relation to one or more pupils.

Mr Osborne admitted the facts of allegations 1 to 5 and that his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the response to the notice of referral signed by Mr Osborne on 11 October 2020, and the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Osborne on 18 July 2021.

## Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

The panel noted that since the date of the referral to the TRA in this case, new 'Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' were published in May 2020 (the "May 2020 Procedures"). The panel understands that the earlier provisions contained within the 'Teacher misconduct: disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' updated in April 2018 (the "April 2018 Procedures") apply to this case, given that those provisions applied when the referral was made. Although the panel has the power to direct that the May 2020 Procedures should apply in the interests of justice or the public interest, the panel had received no representations that this should be the

case. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the panel confirms that it has applied the April 2018 Procedures in this case.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

- Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 1 to 2
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 3 to 14
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 15 to 19
- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 20 to 130
- Section 5: Relevant correspondence – pages 131 to 134

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting.

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Osborne on 18 July 2021.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Osborne for the allegations 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.

In summary, Mr Osborne was employed as a humanities teacher by Harwich and Dovercourt High School ('the School') from 1 July 2014.

Concerns arose regarding Mr Osborne's alleged inappropriate communication with one or more pupils by way of social media in or around March 2017. Student interviews were

then carried out and the Local Authority Designated Officer ('LADO') was contacted on 27 March 2017.

The first investigatory meeting was held, on 30 March 2017, after which Mr Osborne was suspended.

The police confirmed that they would not be proceeding with their investigation, on 26 April 2017.

The School then held a second investigatory meeting on 5 May 2017. Subsequent meetings with students were held on 9 May and 17 May 2017.

Further concerns were raised by members of staff on 18 May 2017 and a third investigatory meeting took place on 24 May 2017. Additional meetings were then held with students on 25 May 2017.

The police contacted the School, on 9 June 2017, to confirm that the police would investigate the allegations. A disciplinary meeting was then held, during which Mr Osborne was summarily dismissed from the School, on 12 June 2017.

The School referred the matter to the TRA, on 30 June 2017. The police confirmed to the TRA by email that they decided to take no further action due to there being insufficient evidence to meet the Crown Prosecution Service's threshold. The police investigation was closed.

## **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. During the academic year of 2016-2017, engaged in a conversation with Pupil A in relation to condoms in circumstances where you knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Osborne on 18 July 2021, Mr Osborne admitted the facts of allegation 1.

Mr Osborne admitted discussing condoms with Pupil A in a Snapchat message.

Notwithstanding Mr Osborne's admission, the panel made its own determination of the facts of this allegation on all of the evidence before it.

The panel considered the documentary evidence of Pupil A and noted that Pupil A made specific reference to the fact that Mr Osborne would ask if Pupil A wanted condoms.

The panel deemed this wholly inappropriate. The panel further noted that Pupil A expressed how the conduct of Mr Osborne made Pupil A feel uncomfortable.

The panel found the facts of allegation 1 proven.

**2. During the academic year of 2016-2017, on one or more occasions, engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil B in that you sent Pupil B an inappropriate image of you in your underwear while you were in bed;**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Osborne on 18 July 2021, Mr Osborne admitted the facts of allegation 2.

Mr Osborne admitted sending a picture of himself in his underwear whilst in bed, to Pupil B via Snapchat.

Notwithstanding Mr Osborne's admission, the panel made its own determination of the facts of this allegation on all of the evidence before it.

The panel considered there was evidence within the bundle, in particular the statements provided by pupil's and images of the stills taken from Snapchat, which supported Mr Osborne's admission of the facts. The panel took particular note of the documentary evidence from Pupil B, in which Pupil B specifically stated that Mr Osborne sent Pupil B a *"picture of him in his underwear whilst in bed"*.

The panel considered Mr Osborne's explanation provided during the school's disciplinary process (that he had made a mistake in sending the image to a pupil, but it had not been intentional) to be unpersuasive. The panel considered that as a professional Mr Osborne should have exercised a higher standard of care in the use of his device and social media platforms. The panel concluded that on balance Mr Osborne knew what he was doing and that his actions were deliberate.

The panel found the facts of allegation 2 proven.

**3. During the academic year of 2016-2017, on one or more occasions, engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil C in that you sent Pupil C an inappropriate image of you in your underwear;**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Osborne on 18 July 2021, Mr Osborne admitted the facts of allegation 3.

Mr Osborne admitted to sending a picture of himself in his underwear with pubic hair showing, to Pupil C.

Notwithstanding Mr Osborne's admission, the panel made its own determination of the facts of this allegation on all of the evidence before it.

The panel considered there was evidence within the bundle, in particular the statement provided by Pupil C and images of the stills taken from Snapchat, which supported Mr Osborne's admission of the facts.

The panel considered it to be irrelevant whether the image was a posed or a snap shot. Given its content and nature the panel concluded the image to be sexual. The panel deemed it was wholly inappropriate for Mr Osborne to send the image to Pupil C, irrespective of how it was captured.

As with allegation 2, the panel considered that as a professional Mr Osborne should have exercised a higher standard of care in the use of his device and social media platforms. The panel concluded that on balance Mr Osborne knew what he was doing and that his actions were deliberate.

The panel found the facts of allegation 3 proven.

**4. In or around February 2017, whilst on the school Outwards Bound trip, invited Pupil D and one or more pupils into your bedroom when you knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Osborne on 18 July 2021, Mr Osborne admitted the facts of allegation 4.

Mr Osborne, Individual 1 and several pupil's attended a school Outwards Bound trip. Mr Osborne was responsible for one group of pupils whilst Individual 1 was responsible for a second group of pupils. On night 3 of the trip, Individual 1 group of pupils were involved in an overnight expedition. On that evening, Mr Osborne admitted that he invited Pupil D and other pupils into his bedroom.

Notwithstanding Mr Osborne's admission, the panel made its own determination of the facts of this allegation on all of the evidence before it.

The panel considered there was evidence within the bundle, in particular the statement provided by Pupil D, which supported Mr Osborne's admission of the facts.

The panel considered that Mr Osborne operated in a clandestine manner by inviting pupils to his own private room instead of meeting with them in a common room/space, particularly on a night when Individual 1 was not there. Given its nature, the panel viewed the game, Cards Against Humanity, to be inappropriate for Mr Osborne to be playing with pupils in his care.

The panel noted from the documentary evidence that Mr Osborne admitted to having read the School's policies on the safeguarding of children. Mr Osborne therefore should have been aware that inviting children in to his bedroom was not appropriate.



The panel found the facts of allegation 4 proven.

**5. On or around 7 April 2017, produced and/ or kept a post-it note on your desk which contained sexual references in relation to one or more pupils.**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Osborne on 18 July 2021, Mr Osborne admitted the facts of allegation 5.

Mr Osborne admitted that he produced the post-it note and that the handwriting on the post-it note was his.

Notwithstanding Mr Osborne's admission, the panel made its own determination of the facts of this allegation on all of the evidence before it.

The panel considered there was evidence within the bundle, in particular a copy of the post-it note, which supported Mr Osborne's admission of the facts. The panel considered the contents of the post-it note to contain sexual references and identified the pupils concerned.

The panel noted Mr Osborne's explanation for the post-it note; that it was written following overhearing pupils talking in the corridor and he had forgotten about it. Given the nature of the conversation heard, and the safeguarding issues that it raised, the panel concluded that Mr Osborne failed to act appropriately. The panel considered it wholly inappropriate for Mr Osborne to leave the post-it note on his desk where anyone accessing the room could, and did, find it. The panel concluded that Mr Osborne's actions had shown a complete disregard of safeguarding policy by his failure to record properly, store confidentially and report appropriately to a designated safeguarding lead evidence of any concern.

The panel found the facts of allegation 5 proven.

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

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted 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 Osborne in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Osborne 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
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Osborne fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mr Osborne's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the Advice. The panel found that none of these offences was relevant. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is more likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel noted that allegations 1, 2 and 3 took place outside the education setting, in that they took place via a social media platform, Snapchat, and took place outside school hours. The panel considered that the nature of Mr Osborne's misconduct touched upon his profession as a teacher. The panel considered that teachers have a responsibility to all children to maintain professional boundaries and that by his actions Mr Osborne had undeniably failed in this regard.

The panel considered Mr Osborne's conduct in respect of each allegation to be of a very serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. The panel found all the allegations to be of a sexual nature.

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

The panel took into account the way 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 also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Osborne's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. In particular, the panel considered that parents, and the public, would be highly concerned if they became aware of the nature of the messages being sent by Mr Osborne to pupils. Furthermore, it is damaging to the trust placed in the profession if teachers themselves breach safeguarding policies and in addition fail to report safeguarding issues once they are made aware of them.

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

Having found the facts of particulars 1 to 5 proved, the panel further found that Mr Osborne's 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 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 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.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Osborne, which included inappropriate communication with pupils, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

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

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

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 Osborne.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Osborne. The panel took further account of the Advice, which of a teacher have been proved. 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- sexual misconduct, for example, 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;
- 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 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.

There was no evidence that Mr Osborne's actions were not deliberate.

The panel was not presented with any evidence to suggest that Mr Osborne was acting under duress.

The panel did not see any evidence which showed Mr Osborne was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel noted that no mitigation had been submitted by Mr Osborne or any evidence to attest to his ability as a teacher.

The panel considered the contents of an undated letter submitted to the TRA by Mr Osborne. In this letter Mr Osborne stated that he openly acknowledged his wrong doing and lack of judgement with regards to the allegations. The panel however, from the full bundle of documents they had considered, did not concur with Mr Osborne's submission. The panel considered that Mr Osborne had failed to demonstrate any real insight, remorse or understanding of his actions and the potential or actual damage that could have been caused to pupils.

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Osborne 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 Osborne. The fact that each allegation had a sexual connotation together with Mr Osborne's lack of reflection as to the damage he could have caused were significant factors 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. 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 two years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours includes serious sexual misconduct, such as 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 his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel deemed the images taken by Mr Osborne and sent to pupils to be provocative. By their nature and content the panel concluded they were both of a sexual nature and sexually motivated. The panel therefore found Mr Osborne was responsible for sending inappropriate communications to pupils which were sexually motivated.

The panel considered Mr Osborne's actions to be extremely serious. In the absence of any evidence that Mr Osborne fully understood his actions to be wrong, and potentially

dangerous, and the fact he gave no indication that he would change his behaviour the panel decided that a review period would not be appropriate. As such, the panel 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 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 Joel Osborne should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Osborne 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
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Osborne fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as the panel found all the allegations to be of a sexual nature.

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 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 Osborne, and the impact that will have on him, 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, "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Osborne, which included inappropriate communication with pupils, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils." 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 considered that Mr Osborne had failed to demonstrate any real insight, remorse or understanding of his actions and the potential or actual damage that could have been caused to pupils."

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts the future well being of pupils at risk. 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 Osborne were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Osborne was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated." I am particularly mindful that the panel observe, "that each allegation had a sexual connotation", and the impact that 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 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 Osborne together with the panel's consideration of mitigating factors. The panel observed:

- “There was no evidence that Mr Osborne's actions were not deliberate.”
- “The panel was not presented with any evidence to suggest that Mr Osborne was acting under duress.”
- “The panel did not see any evidence which showed Mr Osborne was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel also noted “that no mitigation had been submitted by Mr Osborne or any evidence to attest to his ability as a teacher.”

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

I have also placed considerable weight on the nature of the conduct and less weight in my consideration of sanction, to the contribution that Mr Osborne has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition 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 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 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 deemed the images taken by Mr Osborne and sent to pupils to be provocative. By their nature and content the panel concluded they were both of a sexual nature and sexually motivated. The panel therefore found Mr Osborne was responsible for sending inappropriate communications to pupils which were sexually motivated.”

I have considered whether a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, three factors mean that a review period is not appropriate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These factors are the sexual nature of the conduct, the panel deeming the conduct to be sexually motivated and Mr Osborne's failure to demonstrate any real insight, remorse or understanding of his actions.

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 Joel Osborne 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 Osborne 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 Osborne 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 'John Knowles', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: John Knowles**

**Date: 5 October 2021**

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