



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Jordan Risebrow: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

April 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
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

Teacher:	Mr Jordan Risebrow
Teacher ref number:	0249093
Teacher date of birth:	1 March 1972
TRA reference:	19245
Date of determination:	25 April 2023
Former employer:	Hemsby Primary School, Hemsby, Great Yarmouth and Henderson Green Primary Academy, Norwich

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 24 and 25 April 2023 by virtual means, to consider the case of Mr Jordan Risebrow.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist) and Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Graham Miles of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr James Lloyd of Counsel, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Risebrow was not 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 5 February 2023.

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

1. Whilst employed as Headteacher at Hemsby Primary School on 17 June 2019, he used unnecessary physical contact when he lifted Pupil A off the floor under his arms.
2. Whilst employed as Headteacher at Henderson Green Primary Academy School:
 - a) On 8 January 2020, he acted in an inappropriate manner in that he:
 - i. shouted at Colleague A;
 - ii. slapped Colleague A on the back of his hand;
 - b) By reason of his conduct at allegation 2a ii above he caused reddening and/or pain to Colleague A's hand.
 - c) On 24 January 2020, he acted in an inappropriate manner by tipping Pupil B off a chair onto the floor.

Mr Risebrow was not present and did not respond to the allegations in advance of the hearing. The panel treated the allegations as not admitted.

Preliminary applications

As to whether the hearing should proceed in the absence of Mr Risebrow

Mr Risebrow was not present and not represented. After hearing submissions from the presenting officer and receiving legal advice, the panel determined that the hearing should proceed in the absence of Mr Risebrow for the following reasons:

- The panel was satisfied that the notice of proceedings was sent to Mr Risebrow in accordance with paragraph 5.23 of the disciplinary procedures.
- The panel was presented with a copy of an email from Individual D, Regional Official of NASUWT dated 14 February 2023, which said: *'Please note that Mr Risebrow does not wish to engage with or respond to the TRA allegations. We will therefore not be in attendance at a future hearing, neither will he submit a response.'* The panel was satisfied that Mr Risebrow had voluntarily waived his right to participate in the hearing.

- No application for an adjournment was made and no purpose would be served by an adjournment.
- It would be contrary to the public interest and the interests of witnesses for the hearing to be adjourned.

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 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings – pages 7 to 12

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 13 to 46

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 47 to 357

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 358 to 359

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from:

- Witness A, [REDACTED];
- Witness B, [REDACTED];
- Witness C, [REDACTED].

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered this case and reached a decision.

Mr Jordan Risebrow was employed by the HEART Education Trust ('the Trust'), initially as a teacher at Valley Primary Academy. He subsequently worked at 2 other schools that formed part of the Trust. These appointments were as assistant headteacher at Henderson Green Primary Academy between 18 April 2017 and 31 August 2018 and as deputy headteacher at Heartsease Primary Academy between 1 September 2018 and

February 2019. On 25 February 2019, he took up the position of headteacher at Hemsby Primary School ('Hemsby'), a maintained school which was not part of the Trust.

It was alleged that, on 17 June 2019, whilst headteacher at Hemsby, Mr Risebrow engaged in unnecessary physical contact with Pupil A when lifting him from the floor and carrying him to his office. On 26 July 2019, Hemsby made a referral to the Local Authority Designated Officer ('LADO'). Mr Risebrow left his employment at Hemsby in August 2019. Despite leaving that employment, an investigation was undertaken in relation to the incident involving Pupil A. As part of that investigation, Mr Risebrow was interviewed on 10 September 2019. During this interview, he denied having any physical contact with Pupil A.

On 28 October 2019, Mr Risebrow resumed employment with the Trust, taking up the appointment of headteacher at Henderson Green Primary Academy ('Henderson Green'). It was alleged that, whilst employed at Henderson Green he acted inappropriately towards Witness A by shouting at him and slapping him on the back of his hand. It was also alleged that Mr Risebrow had acted in an inappropriate manner towards Pupil B by tipping the pupil off a chair onto the floor. On 27 January 2020, an internal investigation commenced in relation to these 2 allegations and a referral was subsequently made to the LADO.

Mr Risebrow has not attended this hearing, nor provided any written evidence for the panel's consideration. However, the panel has been provided with responses given by Mr Risebrow during investigations conducted by Hemsby and Henderson Green. The panel was able to explore matters raised in Mr Risebrow's responses with witnesses who gave oral evidence at this hearing.

The panel acknowledged that extreme caution was required when considering the memories of witnesses. The panel adopted the approach of testing the evidence of witnesses, in the first instance, by reference to objective facts and, where available, contemporaneous documents.

The panel accepted the legal advice provided.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows

- 1. Whilst employed as Headteacher at Hemsby Primary School on 17 June 2019, you used unnecessary physical contact when you lifted Pupil A off the floor under his arms.**

Witness B, [REDACTED], gave evidence that Pupil A had become disruptive in class on the morning of 17 June 2019. At that point, she spoke to Mr Risebrow about Pupil A's behaviour as the class teacher had been called away. She said that Pupil A was chatting

with Mr Risebrow and went calmly with him to his office at that time. Witness B said that at breaktime on the same day Pupil A's bad behaviour started up again. He punched one pupil in the face and spat at another pupil. Witness B said that she then asked Pupil A to come outside of the classroom into the corridor. Once outside of the classroom, Pupil A put himself on the floor. Witness B said that Pupil A was lying on the floor, but he was not distressed and she was satisfied that he was not a danger to himself nor to anyone else. Her intention was to stay with Pupil A when he was on the floor and talk to him until he was calm, as had happened on previous occasions. However, a few seconds after moving out of the classroom, Mr Risebrow came out of the open plan library area adjoining the corridor and told Pupil A to stand up. When he did not do so immediately, Mr Risebrow lifted Pupil A up with his hands under the pupil's armpits. Witness B said that Mr Risebrow carried Pupil A to his office in that way without the pupil's feet touching the floor. Witness B said that she was shocked by Mr Risebrow's actions and she told Mr Risebrow to stop, but he did not do so. She followed them until she saw Mr Risebrow place Pupil A on the floor outside of his office.

Witness B said that she was concerned that Mr Risebrow had not followed the correct procedure as staff had been trained to use de-escalation techniques. Mr Risebrow had not spoken to her before he intervened. The panel was also referred to Hemsby's Reasonable Force and Touch Policy which described *'physical restraint'* as *'the positive application of force in order to protect/prevent a pupil from causing injury to himself or others or seriously damaging school property, or from causing disorder'*. Witness B said that none of those circumstances applied when Mr Risebrow lifted Pupil A from the floor. The same policy also stated that staff should *'always try to avoid acting in a way that might cause injury'*. Witness B felt that the manner in which Mr Risebrow lifted Pupil A with his hands in the pupil's armpits could have caused injury to the pupil.

Witness B said that she was so concerned that she tried to speak to Mr Risebrow about the way he moved Pupil A on a couple of occasions, but Mr Risebrow had avoided the subject each time.

The panel noted that, when he was interviewed on 10 September 2019, Mr Risebrow was adamant that he had not touched Pupil A at all.

The panel found Witness B to be a credible witness. Her very clear oral evidence was consistent with and supported by contemporaneous documents. The panel was satisfied that Mr Risebrow had lifted Pupil A off the floor with his hands in the pupil's armpits and then carried him in that way to his office door. This was unnecessary physical contact as Pupil A was not at risk of causing injury to himself or others or seriously damaging school property or causing disorder.

The panel found allegation 1 proved.

2. Whilst employed as Headteacher at Henderson Green Primary Academy School:

a) On 8 January 2020, you acted in an inappropriate manner in that you:

- i. shouted at Colleague A;**
- ii. slapped Colleague A on the back of his hand;**

b) By reason of your conduct at allegation 2a ii above you caused reddening and/or pain to Colleague A's hand.

Witness A, [REDACTED], gave evidence that he was [REDACTED]. On 8 January 2020, the door to Mr Risebrow's office was due to be replaced. Witness A had gone to meet the carpenters after school. Although pupils had left school for the day, Mr Risebrow and other members of staff, were in Mr Risebrow's room. Those other members of staff included Individual E, [REDACTED] and Individual F, [REDACTED]. Witness A said that he started to prepare to take the door off. In the process of removing a Harry Potter poster from the door, he tore a corner of the poster. Witness A said that, when Mr Risebrow saw this, he "flipped out". He said that Mr Risebrow screamed like a child and then ran over towards him waving his arms in the air "like a chimp". He said that Mr Risebrow shouted, "Don't you dare touch them", or words to that effect, referring to the posters. Witness A said that Mr Risebrow then smacked the back of his hand hard with force. Mr Risebrow then sat down at the table and folded his arms. Witness A said that Mr Risebrow's slap caused reddening to the back of his left hand and a stinging sensation which lasted for about one and a half minutes.

Witness A said that, on reflection, he now felt that Mr Risebrow's behaviour on that day was his way of demonstrating to Witness A and others present that he had power over Witness A. However, at the time, Mr Risebrow's actions had left him feeling like he was a child who had done something wrong. Witness A said that he left shortly after the incident and that on his way home, he telephoned Mr Risebrow to apologise for ripping the poster. Mr Risebrow told him not to worry about it and that they were all friends. He said that Mr Risebrow did not apologise to him for his actions.

Witness A said that Individual E subsequently spoke to him about the incident and told him that he should put in a complaint, which he then did. The panel considered a written account from Individual E which was contained in an email to [REDACTED] dated 24 January 2020. Individual E said that, on the day in question, she was in Mr Risebrow's office and that Individual F was also present, but at the far end of the office. She said that when she saw Witness A pull back the corner of a photocopied Harry Potter poster on the door, the corner tore. Individual E said that Mr Risebrow then rushed across the room and slapped Witness A on the hand. She said that this was hard enough to be audible. Individual E said that she remained present in the office and that, about 15 minutes after

Witness A left, the phone rang. She said it was clear to her that Witness A was apologising to Mr Risebrow for upsetting him. She heard Mr Risebrow say to Witness A that they were all part of the same team and that had had no problem with Witness A. However, he did not apologise to Witness A.

The panel noted that Individual F was interviewed as part of the investigation. In an email to [REDACTED] dated 10 January 2020, he said that Mr Risebrow, "playfully slapped Witness A". He said, "I caught in the corner of my eye whilst sitting at the back of the office. I was not concerned but again, I was not paying full attention".

When interviewed as part of the investigation, Mr Risebrow denied slapping Witness A's hand and maintained that he had simply brushed his hand away. He denied shouting at Witness A and described his tone of voice as "clear, instructive but not aggressive".

When asked in his oral evidence about the people present in the office at the time of the incident, Witness A said that he thought that Individual E was in a better position than Individual F to see what had happened. He thought that Individual F's view might have been blocked by Mr Risebrow's body as he approached Witness A.

The panel found Witness A to be a credible witness. His oral evidence was supported by more contemporaneous accounts, including the written account of Individual E.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Risebrow's actions were inappropriate and represented a breach of the Trust's Code of Conduct for Staff which required all members of staff to treat everyone with respect and not hurt or abuse others.

The panel found allegations 2. a.i and 2.a.ii and 2.b proved.

c) On 24 January 2020, you acted in an inappropriate manner by tipping Pupil B off a chair onto the floor.

Witness C, [REDACTED], gave evidence that on 24 January 2020, he was doing art work in the garden area with pupils. He thought that their work was great and he wanted to show it off to Mr Risebrow. He said that he hoped to catch Mr Risebrow and it was then that he witnessed the incident involving Pupil B. He said that when he came to stand at his door, he saw Pupil B sat on a soft staff room chair that was located outside the pastoral room. Pupil B was sat on the chair hugging his knees and he appeared to be frustrated and angry. Mr Risebrow was standing in front of him at that point. Witness C said that Mr Risebrow appeared frustrated rather than angry. Pupil B needed to follow his instructions to go to another classroom but he was not doing so. Witness C said that the chair was against the wall of the corridor when he saw Mr Risebrow stand to the side of the chair and place his hands on either corner and then pivot the chair. Mr Risebrow spun the chair away from Witness C at an angle of approximately 45 degrees and then tipped the chair. Witness C said that Mr Risebrow did this at a slow speed to slide Pupil B off the chair rather than fling him off the chair. Witness C said that he did not believe that

Pupil B was hurt by this incident. Pupil B had his back to Witness C so he could not see his face, but Witness C did not hear the pupil scream or cry. Witness C said that he thought that Mr Risebrow's actions were absolutely unnecessary. Although he did not believe that Mr Risebrow had any intention to hurt the child, staff had received a lot of training about de-escalation and Pupil B was sitting on a chair and was not causing any other issues or concerns. Accordingly, there was no reason to move him.

Another teacher, [REDACTED] also provided a written account as part of the investigation. Her account was that she had witnessed Mr Risebrow put his hands on both the front chair legs, pick up the chair into the air and tip Pupil B off the chair.

The panel noted that, when Mr Risebrow was interviewed about this allegation on 27 January 2020, he claimed that the chair on which Pupil B was sitting was blocking the door to the pastoral room. Mr Risebrow said that he had then asked Pupil B to move the chair with him and that Pupil B had then sat back on the chair. In that interview, Mr Risebrow had denied that Pupil B had stumbled or tripped at any point. When interviewed again on 25 February 2020, Mr Risebrow said that he and Pupil B had moved the chair together and that the pupil had fallen off onto his hand and knees as he attempted to sit down again. The panel noted that it was only in this second interview that Mr Risebrow acknowledged that Pupil B had fallen off the chair.

Pupil B was interviewed as part of the investigation when his [REDACTED] was present. Pupil B confirmed that Mr Risebrow had tipped him off the chair causing him to land on his hands and knees. He said that this made him angry and upset.

During his oral evidence, Witness C was questioned about Mr Risebrow's accounts of the incident. Witness C said that he did not believe that the chair had been blocking the door to the pastoral room. Furthermore, he rejected the suggestion that Pupil B and Mr Risebrow had been attempting to move the chair together and that Pupil B had fallen when attempting to sit down. Witness C was clear in his evidence that Pupil B slid off the chair as a consequence of Mr Risebrow's actions in tipping the chair. However, Witness C did not believe that the chair was lifted off the ground as suggested by [REDACTED] written account. Aside from this particular incident, Witness C said that he had not had any concerns about Mr Risebrow. He said he had regarded Mr Risebrow as very professional and that he had learned a lot from him. The panel found Witness C to be a credible witness who gave his evidence in a very measured way. The panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the incident had occurred in the manner described by Witness C.

The panel found allegation 2.c proved.

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 proven 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 Risebrow, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Risebrow 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 also considered whether Mr Risebrow’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that the reference to violence was 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.

In assessing the seriousness of Mr Risebrow’s conduct in allegation 1, the panel had regard to Mr Risebrow’s position as headteacher and role model in breaching the Reasonable Force and Touch Policy, the purpose of which was to safeguard the well-being of pupils. Furthermore, the panel considered that his proven conduct in allegations 2., 2.b and 2.c occurred a short time after he had been the subject to a disciplinary investigation and referral to the LADO in relation to allegation 1. The panel would have expected him to be particularly mindful of the need to exercise care and caution in any physical intervention, having due regard to the relevant school policies relating to the use of reasonable force.

Taking all of these matters into consideration, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Risebrow in relation to each allegation amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Risebrow 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 that they behave.

The panel therefore found that Mr Risebrow's actions constituted 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 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 protection of pupils, given the findings of unnecessary and inappropriate physical interventions with pupils at 2 different schools.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Risebrow 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 Risebrow was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 Risebrow.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Risebrow. 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

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 Risebrow's actions were not deliberate. There was also no evidence to suggest that he was acting under duress

Mr Risebrow did have a previously good history. Although no testimonials or character references were submitted by or on behalf of Mr Risebrow, the panel noted that Mr Risebrow had a previous unblemished career and had previously held the positions of assistant headteacher and deputy headteacher before becoming headteacher at 2 different schools. In his evidence as a witness called by the TRA, Witness C said that, aside from the incident that was the subject of allegation 2.c, he had always regarded Mr Risebrow as very professional and that he had learned a lot from him.

However, the panel also noted the report of the LADO meeting recorded that the view expressed by the [REDACTED] was that Mr Risebrow had been reluctant to take advice and that he had struggled to fit his strong personality into the boundaries of his role as headteacher. Aside from this comment, the panel noted that Mr Risebrow had denied the allegations as part of the internal investigations, suggested that witnesses were not telling the truth and gave inconsistent accounts of events that this panel found to have been false. As Mr Risebrow did not attend this hearing or engage in any way, the panel was not provided with any evidence that he had insight into his failings which might have

given the panel with some reassurance that there is no risk of the conduct being repeated.

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 Risebrow 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 Risebrow.

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 panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review after a period of 2 years.

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 Jordan Risebrow should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Risebrow 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.

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 Risebrow, 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 and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed of Mr Risebrow, "in breaching the Reasonable Force and Touch Policy, the purpose of which was to safeguard the well-being 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 was not provided with any evidence that he had insight into his failings which might have given the panel with some reassurance that there is no risk of the conduct being repeated." In my judgement, the lack of evidence of 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 it, "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 that they behave."

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 Risebrow himself. The panel comment "Mr Risebrow did have a previously good history. Although no testimonials or character references were submitted by or on behalf of Mr Risebrow, the panel noted that Mr Risebrow had a previous unblemished career and had previously held the positions of assistant headteacher and deputy headteacher before becoming headteacher at 2 different schools. In his evidence as a witness called by the TRA, Witness C said that, aside from the incident that was the subject of allegation 2(c), he had always regarded Mr Risebrow as very professional and that he had learned a lot from him."

However, the panel, "also noted the report of the LADO meeting recorded that the view expressed by the [REDACTED] was that Mr Risebrow had been reluctant to take advice and that he had struggled to fit his strong personality into the boundaries of his role as headteacher. Aside from this comment, the panel noted that Mr Risebrow had denied the allegations as part of the internal investigations, suggested that witnesses were not telling the truth and gave inconsistent accounts of events that this panel found to have been false."

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the findings of unnecessary and inappropriate physical interventions with pupils at 2 different schools."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Risebrow 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 evidence of remorse, 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 a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review after a period of 2 years."

I consider therefore that a two year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Jordan Risebrow 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 3 May 2025, 2 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 Jordan Risebrow remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Jordan Risebrow has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 26 April 2023

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