



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Joshua Adusei: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

May 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	19
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	23

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

Teacher: Mr Joshua Adusei

Teacher ref number: 1844557

Teacher date of birth: 04 April 1994

TRA reference: 19990

Date of determination: 15 May 2025

Former employer: Harris Academy Tottenham, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 12 to 15 May 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Joshua Adusei.

The panel members were Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Emma Hendry (lay panellist) and Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Louisa Atkin of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Adusei 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 26 February 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Adusei was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Harris Academy Tottenham ('the Academy'):

1. In or around the week of 4-8 January 2021, he:-
 - a) Did not complete welfare calls to the pupils in his tutor group;
 - b) Did not inform the Head of Year that he had not completed and/or was unable to complete the welfare calls until the evening of 7 January 2021;
2. On one occasion or more in January 2021, he did not teach online lessons as required, namely on or around:-
 - a) 15 January 2021;
 - b) 20 January 2021.
3. In or around April 2021, he encouraged one or more pupils at the Academy to support an online petition seeking the resignation of Colleague A, ('the Petition'), namely by:-
 - a) Speaking to pupils about the Petition during school hours and/or on school premises;
 - b) Engaging with pupils via social media.
4. The Petition made one or more serious allegations against Colleague A;
 - a) Which were untrue and/or misleading;
 - b) In circumstances where he had not raised such concerns, via any appropriate means, with the Academy and/or the Harris Federation;
5. On or around 21 April 2021, he failed to take any, or any adequate, steps to safeguard a pupil, who was subsequently identified as Pupil A, following comments they had posted in response to one or more of his online Twitter posts, as set out in Schedule A.

Schedule A:

a) [REDACTED]

b) [REDACTED]

c) [REDACTED]

Mr Adusei made no admission of fact in respect of the allegations.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 6 to 8

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 15

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 16 to 49

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 50 to 746

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 the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Witness C – [REDACTED]

Witness D – [REDACTED]

Witness E – [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Adusei commenced employment as a teacher at the Harris Academy Tottenham ('the School') on 1 September 2019.

On 4 to 8 January 2021, Mr Adusei allegedly failed to complete welfare calls to pupils in his tutor group, that were implemented in response to the covid-19 pandemic. Mr Adusei also allegedly failed to teach one or more online lessons.

On 19 April 2021, Mr Adusei allegedly told Witness B that he would start a petition to '*get him out*' if Witness B did not resign.

On 20 April 2021, Mr Adusei allegedly posted online a petition purportedly seeking Witness B's resignation and the cessation of a redundancy process, and was seen in discussion with pupils in Year 10 during the school day after he had done so.

On 21 April 2021, concerns were raised about messages posted by pupils on Mr Adusei's Twitter page, referencing the petition.

Allegedly Mr Adusei did not take any steps to safeguard Pupil A, who had shared information relating to their [REDACTED] with Mr Adusei on Twitter.

On 25 August 2021, a referral was made to the TRA.

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. In or around the week of 4-8 January 2021, you:-

- a) Did not complete welfare calls to the pupils in your tutor group;**
- b) Did not inform the Head of Year that you had not completed and/or were unable to complete the welfare calls until the evening of 7 January 2021;**

2. On one occasion or more in January 2021, you did not teach online lessons as required, namely on or around:-

- a) 15 January 2021;**

b) 20 January 2021.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, who stated that on 5 January 2021 schools in England were forced to close due to the covid-19 restrictions. As part of the Harris Federation's covid-19 action plan all teachers were required to provide online lessons, support vulnerable and key worker pupils in school, attend meetings and do CPD sessions online.

Witness A stated that as part of the above plan, Mr Adusei was expected to teach three lessons a week, deliver a daily tutor session, make 26 phone calls a week and attend all meetings and CPD training. He stated that Mr Adusei was also asked to support physically in school on three occasions across a three week period in early 2021.

Witness A submitted that Mr Adusei should have been conducting welfare calls to Year 8 pupils in the week of 4 January 2021. He stated that Mr Adusei had been assigned a school phone but in the investigation Mr Adusei revealed he had misplaced his phone. Witness A stated that Mr Adusei did not communicate this to anyone at the time.

Witness A stated that on the morning of 8 January 2021, Individual A emailed Mr Adusei to ask how he was going with his welfare calls to Year 8 pupils. The panel later established that this actually occurred on the evening of 7 January 2021.

The panel carefully considered the email correspondence between Individual A and Mr Adusei in which Mr Adusei acknowledged that he had not made the telephone calls and disclosed that he remained in Ghana citing [REDACTED] as the basis upon which he had remained.

The panel noted that Individual A's contact with Mr Adusei was prompted by his concern that no record had been logged of Mr Adusei having made the calls to the pupils and that there remained a very limited time until the deadline set for doing so.

The panel noted that there was no evidence that Mr Adusei had notified the School either of the fact that he remained in Ghana or of the fact that he would not be making these calls in advance of Individual A contacting him on the fourth day after the Christmas holidays.

The panel also noted the email correspondence between Mr Adusei and Witness B of 5 January 2021 which made clear that Mr Adusei was aware that he was required to work in the week commencing 4 January 2021 and he was receiving and responding to emails.

The panel was conscious that Mr Adusei had not attended to present his response to the allegations and carefully scrutinized the documents and statements which he had provided within the investigatory and appeals processes of the School including written documents and the minutes of relevant meetings.

The panel noted that, in his letter of 28 April 2021, Mr Adusei asserted that he had made “*alternative arrangements with colleagues to cover for [him]*” “*in relation to welfare checks*” and that “*Individual B said he would do the phone calls for [him]*”. The panel noted that Mr Adusei asserted that he had asked the School to cover calls “*around 4th January*” and that he had messaged Individual A to this effect. Other than Mr Adusei’s statement to that effect though, the panel found no evidence that he had notified the School.

The panel noted that Mr Adusei’s evidence in the investigations was not always consistent and, in particular, it was inconsistent with Individual A’s correspondence with him.

The panel considered that Mr Adusei had made clear from the evidence that he was aware of his obligation to make the calls and that he did not make them.

The panel noted the evidence provided that Individual A in fact made the majority of calls with support from relevant colleagues.

In relation to the second allegation the panel again considered the written and oral evidence of Witness A.

Witness A stated that Mr Adusei was scheduled to teach three live lessons a week, and that on 15 January 2021 an email was sent identifying that Mr Adusei had not taught his lesson that day. He stated that when asked about this, Mr Adusei said that there had been IT difficulties and some students hadn’t been able to access the live lesson. Witness A submitted that if this was the case he would have expected a member of teaching staff to seek advice from the IT service desk.

Witness A stated that Mr Adusei then failed to teach a careers lesson online on 20 January 2021. He stated that there were IT issues that day, but Mr Adusei’s lesson was period 2 and the issues were resolved by period 1. Witness A stated that pupils flagged difficulties in accessing the work Mr Adusei had uploaded but Mr Adusei did not respond to their requests for help during the lesson.

The panel noted Mr Adusei’s assertion that he had emailed his Head of Department in relation to his IT difficulties on 15 January 2021. The panel noted though that Mr Adusei had not provided a copy of that email at any point to Witness A despite Witness A requesting a copy of the same. There was also no evidence of any issue having been raised by Mr Adusei with the IT service desk on either occasion.

The panel noted that it was clear from the evidence that Mr Adusei did not teach these lessons and that he was aware of his obligation to do so.

The panel found that, on the balance of probabilities, the TRA had proven that in or around the week of 4-8 January 2021 Mr Adusei did not complete welfare calls to the

pupils in his tutor group and did not inform the Head of Year that he had not completed and/or was unable to complete the welfare calls until the evening of 7 January 2021 (then in response to Individual A's email to him).

The panel also found that the TRA had proved, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Adusei did not teach online lessons as required on 15 January 2021 or 20 January 2021.

The panel therefore found allegations 1 and 2 proven.

3. In or around April 2021, you encouraged one or more pupils at the Academy to support an online petition seeking the resignation of Colleague A, ('the Petition'), namely by:-

a) Speaking to pupils about the Petition during school hours and/or on school premises;

b) Engaging with pupils via social media.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness D, who stated that on 20 April 2021 he was covering the lunch duty for the Year 10 "pod" (discrete "pods" having been introduced for year groups as a result of the second covid lockdown).

Witness D stated that he noticed Mr Adusei and another member of staff were in the playground with around 10-20 students stood around them. He stated that Mr Adusei was not, to his recollection, part of the Year 10 pod and so he should not have been on duty for their lunch, which led him to believe that he was there of his own accord.

Witness D said in oral evidence that Mr Adusei's presence in the playground outside his pod was unusual and that he had not seen him in the playground during Year 10 lunchbreak previously. He also noted that there were mobile phones taken out by pupils in the group around Mr Adusei and that this was against the School's rules (and carried a risk of confiscation of the phone). He noted that Mr Adusei did not appear to be challenging this use of phones.

Witness D stated that Pupil C, a Year 10 pupil, walked past him with their phone out. He stated that he asked them to give him their phone as they had it out at School, and they responded with *"not gonna lie sir, a member of staff has told me to get it out to sign a petition"*.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B, who stated that on 19 April 2021 on the first day back after the Easter break Mr Adusei came to his office. He stated that Mr Adusei told him that he had something he needed to get off his chest and that he was going to *"be bold"*. Witness B stated that he was aware Mr Adusei had a disciplinary hearing that week and wondered what Mr Adusei had to say. Witness

B said that Mr Adusei informed him that he and others did not think he (Witness B) was doing a good job and that he had come to request Witness B's resignation.

Witness B said he told Mr Adusei that he was sorry he felt that way and Mr Adusei said to him *"you will be"* and *"if you don't resign I am going to start a petition to get you out"*. Witness B felt threatened by Mr Adusei. Witness B asked Mr Adusei to leave and he did so.

Witness B separately informed the panel that the following day Witness D came to see him to say that Mr Adusei was in the playground and appeared to be asking pupils to sign a petition. Witness D informed him that he had seen Pupil C with their phone out, and they had said to him that Mr Adusei had told them to take their phone out so that he could send them a petition. Witness B stated that it was concerning that Mr Adusei was contacting the pupils' personal phones.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness C, who stated that on 20 April 2021, she was made aware that Mr Adusei had started a petition calling for the resignation of Witness B. She stated that she spoke to Witness B in his office and, whilst she was in there, Witness D came in and informed them that Mr Adusei and another teacher were in the Year 10 playground asking Year 10 pupils to sign a petition. Witness C stated that Witness D had seen a Year 10 pupil with their phone out and tried to confiscate it but the pupil had refused and told him that Mr Adusei had asked them to get their phone out to sign a petition.

Witness C stated that when she was later in the Year 10 playground supervising lunch duty she saw Mr Adusei arrive and speak with a group of Year 10 students including Pupil B. She stated that Mr Adusei then left but returned at the time for line up, presenting as agitated and concerned. She stated that she found his behaviour abnormal as he was never usually there for line up. She observed that Mr Adusei attempted to engage the students in conversation as they began to enter the building and that she saw Mr Adusei approach Pupil B to begin a conversation. She intervened as pupils are supposed to remain silent during line up.

Witness C stated that she saw on Twitter that Mr Adusei had been engaging with Pupil A, Pupil J, Pupil K, Pupil H and Pupil C regarding the petition.

The panel noted various witnesses' evidence that it was against the School's policy for pupils to have their phones out during the school day.

The panel was conscious in considering all of the allegations that Mr Adusei was not present to give his responses to the allegations and sought to ensure that the hearing was fair, including in testing the witnesses' evidence in its questioning and in carefully considering his stated position where it was evidenced in the documentation provided.

The panel noted that Mr Adusei denied that he had encouraged pupils, either in person or online, to support the online petition and the panel noted that it had no direct witness evidence of what was said by Mr Adusei to students in the playground on 20 April 2021 and took this into account when considering the evidence.

The panel was satisfied that it had been evidenced that Mr Adusei had created and posted the petition and that Mr Adusei acknowledged in the appeal investigation that it was "*his petition*". The panel was also satisfied that the wording and title of the petition directly called for Witness B's resignation.

The panel scrutinised the TRA's documents including the witness evidence and statements of pupils and staff, gathered as part of the School's investigation, in relation to the events in the playground on 20 April 2021 and matters concerning the petition. The panel noted that a lot of this evidence was hearsay. The panel considered that these documents were relevant and formed part of the official investigations. The panel considered that the documents should be admitted in evidence. The panel noted, however, that the evidence should be considered carefully and cautiously and with less weight placed upon it than witness evidence heard in person.

The panel noted the statements of various students including that:

1. *"at break time (Tuesday 20) was talking about the petition [sp] with Sir.... Sir said to me I think..... I [am] going to leave a I was angry and upset that it might happen so I signed the petition [sp]"*
2. *"Mr Adusei came up to us telling us about the petition and how the school was making him, other staff member and students, feel. We all got the petition sign it and spreaded the word about it" "Many of us was upset that Mr Adusei was suspended for speaking his mind"*
3. *"We saw Mr Adusei in the playground and we hadn't seen him for a while so we called him and had a conversation then he mentioned the petition and what we did was sign it share it and talk about it with other students"*
4. *"Sir came and just spoke to us as usual normal and we just asked him why he was not in school then told us about the petition [sp] and Sir air drops the link to my phone and I saved it that's it"*

The panel noted that Pupil C's evidence was consistent with Witness D's evidence concerning his discussion with that pupil in the playground on 20 April 2021.

The panel found the students' written evidence to be consistent but saw no suggestion that it had been copied or that they had conspired to create the documents. The panel also noted that the evidence was that Mr Adusei was a popular teacher and there seemed no obvious motivation for pupils to have manufactured false accounts. The panel

found that the accounts of the students were likely to be truthful on the balance of probabilities and placed some reliance on them. The panel noted that Mr Adusei had adduced no evidence in support of his position, within the appeal investigation, that he did not engage with students via social media, or in the playground, in relation to the petition.

The panel noted Witness C's oral evidence that the School identified the pupils who had interacted with Mr Adusei on social media. Witness C stated that the students concerned were good friends, among the more outspoken members of the year group, were confident using their voices, were part of bigger group of pupils exerting influence, were well known in the year group and were well-liked by pupils and staff.

Witness C commented that the content of a number of the tweets from students who interacted with Mr Adusei and his petition made it obvious that the authors must be current pupils of the School.

The panel carefully considered the screenshots of online postings and communications on social media between Mr Adusei and others within the bundle. The panel considered that it would have been clear to Mr Adusei from the wording of a number of the pupils' messages that one or more of the individuals he was interacting with were current pupils of the School.

The panel considered the screenshots of communications between Mr Adusei and Pupil A on twitter demonstrating a significant number of communications between Mr Adusei and Pupil A on twitter. The panel noted that Mr Adusei had retweeted Pupil A's reply to him, where Pupil A stated *"Even though they silenced us in school and on the petition we're not giving up thank you sir you've helped us get our voice heard..."* and that he re-tweeted and commented on a message in which they had [REDACTED].

The panel considered the screenshots of communication between Mr Adusei and Pupil J, Pupil K and Pupil C on Twitter regarding the petition. The panel noted that pupils had retweeted Mr Adusei's posts and that Pupil J had replied to Mr Adusei's post which had asked for support for the petition.

The panel noted that Pupil H had retweeted Mr Adusei's post which encouraged signature of his petition and that Mr Adusei also re-tweeted a message from Pupil H and Mr Adusei then stated *"make some noise"*. Given the evidence the panel was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, the TRA had demonstrated that in or around April 2021 Mr Adusei encouraged one or more pupils at the Academy to support an online petition seeking the resignation of Witness B by speaking to pupils about the petition during school hours and/or on school premises and engaging with pupils via social media.

The panel found allegation 3 proven.

4. The Petition made one or more serious allegations against Colleague A;

a) Which were untrue and/or misleading;

b) In circumstances where you had not raised such concerns, via any appropriate means, with the Academy and/or the Harris Federation;

The panel again considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B regarding his meeting with Mr Adusei as described above.

The panel noted that Witness B was clear in this meeting that there was no attempt by Mr Adusei to particularise his grievances or the basis upon which he was asking Witness B to resign. Rather, he simply indicated he would start a petition calling for Witness B's resignation if he did not resign.

Witness B stated that on 20 April 2021 he received a visit from Witness C, who reported being aware of an online petition. He stated that he could not recall at what stage he first saw the petition, but that it initially included his full name and said that four students had been excluded.

Witness B set out in evidence that the assertions in the petition were false and/or misleading in particular in that:

1. he did not permanently exclude four students in the first month of his leadership, in fact he had only been directly involved in excluding two students [REDACTED]. He further confirmed that he had taken the decision which was proper and appropriate and was made on the basis of the students' behaviour and in context. He stated that the decision was taken in consultation with various other members of the management team, including Witness A, and having followed a proper process,
2. he had not introduced a zero-tolerance behaviour policy, with its emotive implication that any behaviour would result in immediate sanction. He stated that what he had done, again in consultation with senior staff, was make limited changes to the behaviour policy but principally seek a cultural change in requiring the enforcement of the pre-existing behaviour policy by staff. Witness B indicated that in doing this he was enforcing the best practice which was in place in a large number of schools and seeking to improve standards, behaviour and the conditions for safety and learning at the School. There was no basis for asserting that his actions disproportionately affected BAME or SEN students.
3. there was a restructuring occurring in the School at the time but Mr Adusei was not one of the staff potentially impacted. Witness B stated that each meeting which occurred within that process occurred in the presence of HR and, usually, a colleague of the potentially impacted employee or a union representative. He confirmed that he was not aware of any complaints of bullying regarding the

redundancy process from any staff and that there would be no basis for the same based on his actions. He confirmed that to his knowledge no more than one employee departed as a result of that restructure.

4. at all times he acted in the best interests of the School and the community and did not believe that Mr Adusei had asserted any basis to consider otherwise or to implicitly accuse him of racial bias as he appeared to be doing.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness C, who stated that the petition referred to the permanent exclusion of four pupils which was incorrect, and heavily implied that the exclusions were made on the basis of race, which was also incorrect, though the panel noted that she had had no direct involvement in the exclusion of the pupils.

Witness C submitted that the description “*zero tolerance behaviour policy*” did not reflect the nature of the policy which was implemented. Instead, she said, there had been a cultural change mainly involving enforcement of the pre-existing policy as also described by Witness B. She stated that she was aware of no evidence that the policy disproportionately affected black and SEND pupils and that she did not believe this to be correct. Witness C commented that Mr Adusei would not have had any behavioural data or analysis available to him to verify the claims that he made in the petition in this regard. She indicated that she would have been privy to such data, had it existed, but she did not believe that it did.

Witness C stated that the petition also used inflammatory statements such as ‘*bullying staff into redundancy*’ which was not correct to the best of her knowledge. Witness C had been one of the potentially impacted employees in the redundancy consultation process and had not witnessed, or heard of, any bullying behaviour by Witness B, or otherwise in that process.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness D, who stated that the first time he saw the petition was when someone sent it around via WhatsApp. He stated that the petition said that the School, and specifically Witness B, were racist. Witness D stated that he did not believe there was any truth to the petition whatsoever.

The panel consider the written and oral evidence of Witness A that the new approach to the behaviour policy on Witness B’s arrival reflected the implementation of best practice.

The panel heard from various witnesses and observed in evidence the various ways in which Mr Adusei could have raised his complaints and concerns including via the grievance process, via his management structure, via the various levels of management above Witness B in the wider Harris Academy structure, via the safeguarding policy, via the whistleblowing processes or via his union.

Mr Adusei had provided no basis to conclude that he availed himself of any of these options before initiating the petition nor was there any evidence before the panel to suggest that he had. The panel noted, that he did not even seek to set out the basis of his complaints to Witness B when he went to his office and requested his resignation.

The panel was satisfied that the petition made one or more serious allegations against Colleague A which were untrue and/or misleading and that there was no evidence that Mr Adusei had raised any such concerns via any of the appropriate means available to him.

The panel found allegation 4 proven.

5. On or around 21 April 2021, you failed to take any, or any adequate steps to safeguard a pupil, who was subsequently identified as Pupil A, following comments they had posted in response to one or more of your online Twitter posts, as set out in Schedule A.

The panel considered the tweets by Pupil A in evidence made in response to Mr Adusei's twitter posts, and noted the following comments in particular:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness E, who stated that pupils were responding to Mr Adusei's tweets, and that Pupil A's tweets referenced [REDACTED]. She stated that these are serious safeguarding concerns and that even if Mr Adusei was suspended from teaching at the time of the tweets, he still had safeguarding responsibilities for the students and he should have reported the concerns.

Witness C confirmed in her evidence that during 21 April 2021 she became aware of online action by someone who appeared to be a pupil on Twitter including as set out in the schedule to the allegations. Witness C confirmed that she and another colleague; [REDACTED] were able to confirm that it was Pupil A. Witness C confirmed that the concerns she had as a result of those tweets included that the pupil [REDACTED] Witness C confirmed that she considered this to be a serious safeguarding concern and contacted [REDACTED] out of hours to escalate it.

The panel found that the wording of the tweets clearly disclosed that the author was a pupil and that the pupil was disclosing very serious safeguarding risks. The panel do not consider that Mr Adusei would have been in any doubt either as to the seriousness of the risk or as to the fact that this was concerning a current pupil of the School.

The panel noted that Mr Adusei remained employed at the time, albeit under suspension.

The panel noted that Mr Adusei was clearly aware of the messages from Pupil A including in that he engaged with them and indeed re-tweeted them as set out in evidence.

The panel noted Mr Adusei's assertion that he had been instructed as part of his suspension not to contact staff at the School but found that Mr Adusei cannot legitimately have considered that such an instruction superseded his obligations, including, without limitation, under Part 1 of KCSIE points 2, 9, 13 and 37 in respect of these serious safeguarding concerns.

The panel also noted the terms of the School's safeguarding policy to which Mr Adusei was bound which stated that:

"All staff will have read and understand Part 1 and Annex A of [...] Keeping Children Safe in Education"

"All adults working in the Academy [...] are required to report instances of actual or suspected safeguarding concerns to a designated person with responsibility for safeguarding"

The panel found that, on the balance of probabilities, the TRA had demonstrated that on or around 21 April 2021 Mr Adusei failed to take any steps to safeguard Pupil A following comments they had posted in response to one of more of his online Twitter posts including as set out in Schedule A.

The panel found allegation 5 proven.

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

Having found all of 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 first considered whether the conduct of Mr Adusei, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Adusei 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law
- 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 Adusei, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE") 2020.

The panel considered that Mr Adusei was in breach of the following provisions of KCSIE: 2, 9, 13 and 37.

The panel also considered whether Mr Adusei's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel was mindful in their considerations of the pattern of behaviour displayed in the proven allegations whereby Mr Adusei appeared to be seeking to shape the views and actions of the children for his own personal benefit including in encouraging them to support his position and his petition. The panel considered that in doing so he was placing himself first, rather than the pupils, in breach of his professional boundaries.

The panel was mindful of the potential safeguarding risks to the wellbeing of pupils including, without limitation, in that Mr Adusei:

1. failed to conduct safeguarding calls with 26 pupils and seemingly failed to raise this with anyone until prompted,
2. engaged in social media interactions with pupils,
3. re-tweeted pupils' comments in support of his own position bringing them in contact with others on twitter,

4. failed to raise any safeguarding concerns with regard to Pupil A and their posts and re-tweeted their tweets thereby bringing them in contact with others

The panel was mindful of the lack of respect for Colleague A's rights and the interests of the School and its pupils in posting an online petition, a substantial amount of which was untrue and/or misleading, and exposing Colleague A, the School and its pupils to risk and harm.

The panel's view was that the allegations took place within the education setting but they noted that even if they had not, Mr Adusei's actions clearly affected the way he fulfilled his teaching role and may have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, his behaviour in a harmful way as set out above.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Adusei 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 Adusei was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Adusei's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It 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.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Adusei's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Adusei was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

Including for the reasons set out in connection with its findings of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel formed the view that the public would be very concerned to find a teacher engaging with children in the playground and on social media to seek to encourage them to support an untrue and/or misleading petition and to advance his personal agenda. The panel considered that the actions of Mr Adusei in failing to meet safeguarding concerns and in failing to escalate a concern about a child very clearly describing [REDACTED] (and rather re-tweeting their post offering vague placatory advice) would be considered by the general public to be entirely unacceptable.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Adusei's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Adusei'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/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. The panel was conscious that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils/the protection of other members of the public/the maintenance of public confidence in the profession/declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Adusei, which involved amongst other things:

1. serious and repeated safeguarding failings including, in one case, a decision to publicly repeat, rather than escalate via the appropriate channels, a child's [REDACTED],
2. a deliberate decision to repeatedly place his own interests above those of pupils,
3. a decision to widely publish untrue and/or misleading allegations which exposed the School, his colleagues and pupils to the risk of harm and then,
4. encourage the pupils to support those public statements,

there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Adusei in the profession and considered the balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Adusei in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Adusei.

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 found to be 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 safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;

- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;

The panel was also conscious of its obligation to give appropriate weight and seriousness to online behaviours including online misconduct and actions which facilitated online abuse.

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 Adusei's actions were not deliberate indeed the panel considered the evidence revealed that a number of his actions in relation to the allegations found proved were pre-determined and deliberate.

There was no evidence that Mr Adusei was acting under extreme duress.

The panel had no evidence that Mr Adusei demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that Mr Adusei had not provided evidence of insight and/or remorse and had not engaged in the process at all or, apparently, taken responsibility for his actions in any way save, in very limited terms, in relation to allegations 1 and 2.

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 and indeed would undermine public confidence in the profession. 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 Adusei 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 Adusei.

The panel noted that it had no evidence that Mr Adusei had given any consideration to the serious risk of harm to which his actions exposed the School, the pupils and Colleague A.

The panel noted Mr Adusei's deliberate and pre-determined decisions to publish untrue and/or misleading comments about Colleague A and then to manipulate the actions of children for his own private purposes rather than acting in those children's interests both in the playground and online. The panel considered these actions an abuse of his position and an abuse of trust.

The panel noted that in re-tweeting certain pupils' tweets Mr Adusei was exposing these pupils to a wide public forum and to risk of harm and/or abuse.

The panel was aware that evidence had been put forward as to the extent to which Mr Adusei's actions impacted the focus of the children on education and was undermining of the School and of his colleagues.

The panel noted that they had received evidence of the serious harm caused to Colleague A as well as the threatening online abuse which he had suffered as a direct result of Mr Adusei having posted the petition. The panel noted the evidence it had received that parents and pupils were confused by Mr Adusei's actions and that these actions had led to plain clothes police officers being placed at the gates of the School and to Colleague A being contacted by Scotland Yard to implement enhanced protection measures for him.

The panel was very aware of Mr Adusei's repeated safeguarding failures and that his failure to act on evidence that indicated Pupil A's welfare may have been at risk, and again his decision to instead further publish that pupil's [REDACTED] rather than report them, was a clear failure of his duties towards the child under KCSIE as found by the panel.

The above were, the panel considered, evidence of failures in Mr Adusei's core duties and were significant factors in forming its 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 for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

The panel noted that none of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. The panel noted that none of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

The panel again noted Mr Adusei's repeated breaches of trust and his professional obligations as set out above. The panel was conscious that that there was no mitigation provided on behalf of Mr Adusei and no evidence of material insight or any remorse on Mr Adusei's part. The panel had no evidence with regard to Mr Adusei's actions in the 4 years since the events which formed the allegations. The panel noted Mr Adusei's apparently conscious decision not to engage with the TRA in relation to these proceedings or to respond to the allegations at all.

The panel was conscious that the allegations found proven were serious ones and had no basis to determine that they would not be repeated.

The panel did not though consider that Mr Adusei, who they noted had been in the early stages of his career, had necessarily reached the bar of a required prohibition from teaching for life, without possibility of review, by his actions.

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 5 year 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 Joshua Adusei should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Adusei 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law
- 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 Adusei, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of serious and repeated safeguarding failings, a decision to publish misleading allegations exposing the school and pupils to risk of harm.

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 Adusei 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “The panel was very aware of Mr Adusei’s repeated safeguarding failures and that his failure to act on evidence that indicated Pupil A’s welfare may have been at risk, and again his decision to instead further publish that pupil’s [REDACTED] rather than report them, was a clear failure of his duties towards the child under KCSIE as found by the panel.” 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 noted that Mr Adusei had not provided evidence of insight and/or remorse and had not engaged in the process at all or, apparently, taken responsibility for his actions in any way save, in very limited terms, in relation to allegations 1 and 2.” In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight or 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 observe, “the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Adusei were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of safeguarding failures 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 or 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 Adusei himself and the panel comment “The panel had no evidence that Mr Adusei demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Adusei 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 following “The panel noted Mr Adusei’s deliberate and pre-determined decisions to publish untrue and/or misleading comments about Colleague A and then to manipulate the actions of children for his own private purposes rather than acting in those children’s interests both in the playground and online. The panel considered these actions an abuse of his position and an abuse of trust.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “The panel was aware that evidence had been put forward as to the extent to which Mr Adusei’s actions impacted the focus of the children on education and was undermining of the School and of his colleagues.”

I have placed weight on the following comment “The panel was mindful in their considerations of the pattern of behaviour displayed in the proven allegations whereby Mr Adusei appeared to be seeking to shape the views and actions of the children for his own personal benefit including in encouraging them to support his position and his petition. The panel considered that in doing so he was placing himself first, rather than the pupils, in breach of his professional boundaries.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Adusei 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 or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel again noted Mr Adusei’s repeated breaches of trust and his professional obligations as set out above. The panel was conscious that that there was no mitigation provided on behalf of Mr Adusei and no evidence of material insight or any remorse on Mr Adusei’s part. The panel had no evidence with regard to Mr Adusei’s actions in the 4 years since the events which formed the allegations. The panel noted Mr Adusei’s apparently conscious decision not to engage with the TRA in relation to these proceedings or to respond to the allegations at all.” The panel has also said “The panel did not though consider that Mr Adusei, who they

noted had been in the early stages of his career, had necessarily reached the bar of a required prohibition from teaching for life, without possibility of review, by his actions.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a lesser review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings involving safeguarding failures and the lack of evidence of either insight or remorse.

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

This means that Mr Joshua Adusei is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 23 May 2030, 5 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 Adusei remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Adusei has a right of appeal to 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 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 21 May 2025

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