



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Christopher Wright: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**May 2024**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
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	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Christopher Wright
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	9356953
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	5 December 1971
<b>TRA reference:</b>	17646
<b>Date of determination:</b>	14 May 2024
<b>Former employer:</b>	Clawton Primary School, Devon

### Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually via Microsoft Teams on 14 May 2024 to consider the case of Mr Christopher Wright.

The panel members were Ms Jackie Hutchings (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Diana Barry (teacher panellist) and Mr Nigel Shock (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan 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 Wright that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Wright provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Wright or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 7 May 2024 (as amended for the reasons set out in the panel's findings in allegation 1).

It was alleged that Mr Wright was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that, whilst employed as Headteacher at Clawton Primary School he:

1. Failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard pupils in or around the academic year 2017-2018 despite being made aware of educational deficiencies at the School, in that he;
  - (a) failed to put in place reasonable adjustments for students with Special Educational Needs and disabilities (SEN);
  - (b) failed to ensure proper safeguarding practices for all pupils were in place;
  - (c) failed to ensure staff were properly trained;
  - (d) failed to ensure policies were up to date;
  - (e) failed to ensure proper health, safety and security measures for the school;
  - (f) failed to comply with pre-employment checks prior to recruiting staff.
2. During the 2018 academic year, in respect of the Key Stage 2 Statutory Attainment Tests he caused and/or permitted and/or failed to prevent;
  - (a) permitted pupils having extra time to write the exam;
  - (b) permitted teachers to assist pupils beyond what was permitted by examination rules during the exam;
  - (c) he assisted pupils beyond what was permitted by examination rules during the exam;
  - (d) permitted pupils to amend their answers after the exam was finished;
  - (e) kept in his possession overnight exams which should have been returned to the examination body immediately after the exam;
  - (f) replaced one pupil's exam with that of a photocopy of another pupil's exam.
3. His conduct as may be found proven at 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Mr Wright admitted the facts of all the allegations.

Mr Wright also admitted that his actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 6 to 11

Section 3: Presenting Officer representations – pages 13 to 14

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 16 to 92

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 94 to 271

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 273 to 284

Proposed Section 1 to the bundle, the Notice of Meeting, was provided separately.

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

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Wright on 25 December 2023.

## **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 Wright 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.

Mr Wright was employed as headteacher at Clawton Primary School (“the School”) from 28 April 2003.

On 12 June 2018, Ofsted received complaints relating to Mr Wright, which led to an investigation.

On 6 July 2018, Devon County Council (“the Council”) undertook a visit to the School.

This resulted in a report which identified a series of failings, which were communicated to Mr Wright and led to the scheduling of a further visit.

This took place on 13 July 2018, conducted by Education Advisors commissioned by the Council, revealing further education and safeguarding failures at the School.

That same day, a pupil disclosed to a member of staff that Mr Wright had swapped their work with another child for the purposes of external Statutory Attainment Tests (“SATs”).

On 19 July 2018, Mr Wright tendered his resignation and officially left the School on 31 August 2018.

Following Mr Wright’s resignation, an investigation was initiated by the Standards and Testing Agency. This led to the annulment of SATs results.

On 6 November 2018, Mr Wright was referred to the TRA.

Mr Wright admitted all of the allegation as documented in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Wright on 25 December 2023 (“the Agreed Statement”).

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1) Failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard pupils in or around the academic year 2017-2018 despite being made aware of educational deficiencies at the School, in that you;**
  - a) failed to put in place reasonable adjustments for students with Special Educations Needs and disabilities (SEN);**
  - b) failed to ensure proper safeguarding practices for all pupils were in place;**
  - c) failed to ensure staff were properly trained;**
  - d) failed to ensure policies were up to date;**

**e) failed to ensure proper health, safety and security measures for the school;**

**f) failed to comply with pre-employment checks prior to recruiting staff.**

The panel considered allegations 1(a) to (f) together, which were admitted by Mr Wright.

Mr Wright accepted that he failed:

- To ensure policies were up to date. At the visit on 13 July 2018, Mr Wright was unable to provide to the advisors any evidence of a completed School Development Plan ("SDP"), which was meant to address pupil outcomes and raising standards. Mr Wright was informed that the current, incomplete SDP failed to identify all pupil groups, including those with SEN and vulnerabilities. He was also informed the SDP failed to address health, safety and security measures for the School. The SDP additionally lacked a key component referred to as the 'Pupil Premium Strategy Plan', which demonstrates how the School uses pupil funding and the direct outcomes of that funding for disadvantaged pupils. It is also mandatory for such information to be on the Schools website, but it was not. The School's website also failed to display an up to date safeguarding policy rendering it non-compliant with Ofsted.
- To ensure proper safeguarding practices for all pupils were in place.
- To ensure proper health, safety and security measures for the School. In particular:
  - Staff at the School were not required to wear identifying lanyards.
  - There was no secure gate at the school and the entire school and grounds remained accessible to the general public.
  - Although theoretically there was a signing in/out procedure, it was effectively unenforceable due to multiple points of access to the site.
- To put in place reasonable adjustments for SEND students. He demonstrated a lack of management for SEND pupils by failing to provide reasonable adjustments that were recommended by an Educational Psychologist. He also refused to take suggestions from other teachers who, while working with SEND pupils, recommended reasonable adjustments which could be appropriately adopted.
- To ensure staff were properly trained. Despite the School's SENDCO organising the delivery of external SEN training, which was to take place at the School, this eventually stopped. When shortcomings regarding the administering of training were brought to the attention of Mr Wright, on several occasions, he did not follow

up by re-organising any training. Mr Wright also failed to implement strategies or advice from outside agencies and staff at the School.

- Mr Wright admits that he failed to comply with pre-employment checks prior to staff recruiting. During the visit on 13 July 2018, one of the Education Advisors reviewed staff employment files and was unable to locate pre-employment screening documents, namely there was a missing check for '*Right to Work in the UK*' and there were gaps whereby '*disqualification by association*' had not been checked prior to employment. Mr Wright was advised to seek urgent advice from DBS regarding this failure.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Wright's admissions were consistent with the evidence presented.

It therefore found each of particulars 1(a) to (f) proved.

The panel was also satisfied that, by his actions, Mr Wright failed to take appropriate action or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard pupils. That was implicit from the nature of the allegations and the specific failings.

The stem to allegation 1 also included the words "*despite being made aware of the following educational deficiencies at the School*". No such deficiencies were specified.

The panel concluded that the inclusion of the words "*the following*" was, therefore, an error. However, it did not consider this issue was material to the extent that it warranted an adjournment of this meeting. The salient facts were clear and admitted.

Accordingly, and whilst there was no opportunity to seek representations from the parties, the panel accepted the legal advice provided and decided it could, in the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction, amend the allegation to remove these words. There were two further typographical errors in that the word '*of*' was included twice, when it should not have been included at all.

In short, the panel did not consider it would be in the public interest to adjourn this meeting and thereby prolong these proceedings in circumstances where there was no prejudice to Mr Wright. To the contrary, it considered he would be prejudiced by an adjournment. The panel considered this decision was also consistent with the public interest in ensuring allegations are accurately pleaded.

As amended, the panel was satisfied that Mr Wright had been aware of educational deficiencies at the School, as recorded in the papers and documented in the Agreed Statement.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proved in its entirety.

## **2. During the 2018 academic year, in respect of the Key Stage 2 Statutory Attainment Tests you caused and/or permitted and/or failed to prevent;**



- (a) permitted pupils having extra time to write the exam;
- (b) permitted teachers to assist pupils beyond what was permitted by examination rules during the exam;
- (c) you assisted pupils beyond what was permitted by examination rules during the exam;
- (d) permitted pupils to amend their answers after the exam was finished;
- (e) kept in your possession overnight exams which should have been returned to the examination body immediately after the exam;
- (f) replaced one pupil's exam with that of a photocopy of another pupil's exam.

The panel considered allegations 2(a) to (f) together, which were admitted by Mr Wright.

Mr Wright accepted that, with specific reference to this academic year and the SATs undertaken from 14-17 May 2018, he failed to ensure rules and procedures for administering the test were followed and, in particular:

- He permitted pupils to have extra time, in that in one of the locations where four pupils were writing a part of the exam, one of whom qualified for extra time, all four pupils were given extra time as well as extra reading support, which was not approved.
- Mr Wright did not ensure that time limits were strictly followed in other rooms.
- Mr Wright was responsible for administering a Maths paper, which was scheduled to be 40 minutes long. The exam began at 13:30 but was not completed until 14:50. Mr Wright admits that he was not as strict with timing as he ought to have been.
- He permitted teachers to assist pupils beyond what was permitted. For example, one member of staff recalls Mr Wright encouraging staff to assist pupils and suggested that staff encourage the pupils to re-read questions, to which the staff member replied, "*I am not prepared to cheat*". Another member of staff recalls being told to point out to children to read questions again or check their answers. SATs administration guidance states:

*"you must ensure that nothing you say or do during the tests could be interpreted as giving pupils an advantage, for example, indicating that an answer is correct or incorrect, or suggesting the pupil look at the answer again"*

- Mr Wright permitted pupils to amend exam answers after the exam was finished. Mr Wright became aware that some pupils had not completed the front of their exam papers and that they had difficulties with their test papers. Mr Wright called upon two of those pupils to work on their answers after the exams had been completed and sealed. The grades for those two pupils had improved after Mr Wright permitted amendments.
- Mr Wright reviewed exam papers after exams had been completed when they should have been sealed and stored until collection.
- Mr Wright kept in his possession, overnight, maths exams which should have been returned immediately to the exam board.
- Mr Wright included a photocopy of one pupil's work in another pupil's work. The pupil approached a member of staff concerned about the substitution and that it was not their work. The pupil's original work was subsequently identified and a typed piece of work had been inserted that was not authored by the pupil. The pupil's name also appeared in typed lettering on the substituted work in an attempt to identify it as their work.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Wright's admissions were consistent with the evidence presented.

It therefore found each of particulars 2(a) to (f) proved.

### **3. Your conduct as may be found proven at 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.**

Having found the facts of allegation 2 proved, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Wright's conduct lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Mr Wright admitted both elements.

The panel agreed. It was clear that Mr Wright's actions were conscious, deliberate and he knew what he was doing was wrong. This was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel was also satisfied that, by his actions, he failed to adhere to the standards of the profession, noting that his actions occurred in the context of public examinations.

The panel therefore found allegation 3 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 proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Whilst this was admitted by Mr Wright, the panel exercised its own judgement in relation to this issue.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wright in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Wright 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, including by
  - 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 ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was accordingly satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wright fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mr Wright's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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 found that fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant in connection with its findings in allegation 2.

Over and above these matters, in relation to allegation 1, the panel took into account the safeguarding implications of Mr Wright's actions and the potential impact on pupils.

In relation to allegation 2, his conduct occurred in the context of public assessments and ultimately impacted on pupils. He also involved other staff members in his actions. Mr Wright was in a position of responsibility and trust as a headteacher. He was also a role model. The panel considered that he failed to adhere to his obligations in that regard.

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

In relation to whether Mr Wright's conduct may bring the profession into disrepute, 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 the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

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

Having found the facts of the allegations proved, the panel further found that Mr Wright'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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and 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 Wright, which involved safeguarding failings and behaviour that risked impacting negatively on pupils, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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

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

In addition to these public interest considerations, the panel considered whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Wright in the profession.

Mr Wright has an otherwise unblemished record. There was a suggestion within the hearing papers that he continues to teach, though it was not clear in what capacity. His competence had not been called into question and he had reached the position of headteacher. However, there was no evidence before the panel, such as references or testimonials, to suggest Mr Wright had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector. At its highest, the panel therefore concluded there was some public interest in retaining him in the profession, given his experience as a teacher and senior leader, but this was not a strong consideration.

In light of the 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 Wright.

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 Wright.

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 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 safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);

- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:
  - any activity that involves knowingly substantiating another person's statements where they are known to be false;
  - encouraging others to break rules;
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (or deliberate collusion in or deliberate concealment of such action) particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment.

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.

In the light of its findings and having regard to the evidence before it, the panel considered the following mitigating factors were present in this case:

- Mr Wright had not been subject to any previous regulatory or disciplinary proceedings. He had an otherwise unblemished record and had reached the position of headteacher. There appeared to have been no issues during his headship from 2003 prior to these events and there was a suggestion that the School had grown under his leadership and, whilst not formally documented, graded as outstanding by Ofsted.
- Mr Wright had participated in these proceedings and made full admissions.
- Mr Wright alluded to some challenging personal circumstances around the time of these events. The panel carefully considered the submissions made by Mr Wright to the TRA in which those circumstances were set out.
- Mr Wright had shown some regret, for example alluding to the “*shamefulness*” of his actions.
- Since leaving the School in 2018, it had taken a very long time for these proceedings to reach a conclusion, for reasons which were unknown. It follows that the threat of a prohibition order has been hanging over Mr Wright for a prolonged period.

Weighed against these matters, the panel considered there were some aggravating factors present, including:

- Mr Wright's conduct amounted to a breach of the Teachers' Standards and was deliberate. Whilst the panel noted his circumstances, the panel was not satisfied it could be said that he was acting under duress.
- Mr Wright was in a position of trust and responsibility as well as a role model. The panel considered he ought to have known what was expected of him and conducted himself accordingly. Mr Wright also involved and implicated others in his actions.
- Mr Wright acted dishonestly and without integrity in the context of public assessments.
- His actions involved and impacted on pupils.
- The concerns were multi-faceted and included a range of distinct failings.

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 Wright 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 Wright. The range of failings, the impact and potential impact of his actions on pupils and the fact that he acted dishonestly in the context of public assessments were significant factors in forming that opinion.

The panel concluded that the conduct was too serious to recommend that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient.

The panel also considered that, whilst Mr Wright, in his written submissions, had shown some regret, there was a focus upon himself in that he sought to attribute his actions to his personal circumstances. To that extent, in terms of the information available, the panel was not satisfied it could be said that Mr Wright had taken full responsibility for his actions. His insight appeared to be, at best, emerging.

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 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. None of these behaviours were present in this case.

The Advice also lists other factors, which, when present, are likely to mean that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

These include fraud or serious dishonesty, which the panel had determined was applicable in this case.

The panel also took account of the fact that Mr Wright had an otherwise unblemished record and had shown some regret.

Further, these proceedings have been hanging over Mr Wright for a long time in circumstances where there is a suggestion he has been involved in education since leaving the School, though in what precise capacity is unknown.

It is regrettable, in those circumstances, that Mr Wright had not provided further information in that regard, together with evidence about his career prior to 2018.

Nonetheless, having acted as he did and left the School as a consequence, the panel concluded that important lessons will have been learned. On balance, it considered the risk of repetition, of the same or similar behaviour as that found proved, was accordingly reduced.

Further, given he was an experienced teacher, Mr Wright could, potentially, make a positive impact in education should he choose to return to education subject to demonstrating, to a future panel, that he is someone who can be trusted to demonstrate and adhere to the standards of the profession and maintain public confidence in it.

The panel therefore decided that its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate.

As such, the panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period.



In terms of the length of that review period, the panel concluded that a review period of three years was proportionate in this case, given the seriousness of Mr Wright's conduct.

Whilst the presence of serious dishonesty weighed in favour of a longer period before a review is considered, the panel had in mind that these events occurred in 2018.

In those circumstances, the panel considered that a period of three years is both sufficient and necessary to meet the public interest. It would allow Mr Wright to have an opportunity to reflect on the panel's findings, gain insight into the nature and implications of his actions and demonstrate that he is able to adhere to the standards of the profession. The panel considered that a period of less than three years would not satisfy the public interest considerations Mr Wright's conduct gave rise to.

In summary, the panel therefore decided that its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period of three 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 Christopher Wright should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 3 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Wright 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, including by
  - 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 ...
- 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 Wright fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of failing to take appropriate action to safeguard pupils and failing to ensure rules and procedures for administering national curriculum tests were followed. Mr Wright's conduct in respect of the tests was found to be dishonest and lacking in integrity.

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 likely to 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 Wright, 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, "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Wright, which involved safeguarding failings and behaviour that risked impacting negatively on pupils, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing 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 has set out as follows, "The panel also considered that, whilst Mr Wright, in his written submissions, had shown some regret, there was a focus upon himself in that he sought to attribute his actions to his personal circumstances. To that extent, in terms of the information available, the panel was not satisfied it could be said that Mr Wright had taken full responsibility for his actions. His insight appeared to be, at best, emerging." In my judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse 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 has observed, "The findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception." I am particularly mindful of the finding of failing to take actions to safeguard pupils and to administer national curriculum tests properly in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Wright himself. The panel has commented, “Mr Wright has an otherwise unblemished record. There was a suggestion within the hearing papers that he continues to teach, though it was not clear in what capacity. His competence had not been called into question and he had reached the position of headteacher. However, there was no evidence before the panel, such as references or testimonials, to suggest Mr Wright had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector. At its highest, the panel therefore concluded there was some public interest in retaining him in the profession, given his experience as a teacher and senior leader, but this was not a strong consideration.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments that the seriousness of the misconduct had led it to conclude that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Wright. The panel has said, “The range of failings, the impact and potential impact of his actions on pupils and the fact that he acted dishonestly in the context of public assessments were significant factors in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of full insight and remorse.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Wright has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight and 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 3 year review period.

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that serious dishonesty is one of the behaviours that has greater relevance and weighs in favour of a longer review period. The panel has also noted that “Mr Wright could, potentially, make a positive impact in education should he choose to return to education subject to demonstrating, to a future panel, that he is someone who can be trusted to demonstrate and adhere to the standards of the profession and maintain public confidence in it.”

I have considered the panel’s comments, “a period of three years is both sufficient and necessary to meet the public interest. It would allow Mr Wright to have an opportunity to reflect on the panel’s findings, gain insight into the nature and implications of his actions and demonstrate that he is able to adhere to the standards of the profession. The panel considered that a period of less than three years would not satisfy the public interest considerations Mr Wright’s conduct gave rise to.”

I have considered whether a 3 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 this case, factors mean that allowing a 2-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct, the dishonesty and lack of integrity in administering national curriculum tests, and the lack of full insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that a 3 year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Christopher Wright 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 21 May 2027, 3 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 Wright remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Christopher Wright 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 15 May 2024**

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