



Mr Joseph Amankwah: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

September 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	14
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

Teacher: Mr Joseph Amankwah

TRA reference: 23154

Date of determination: 30 September 2026

Former employer: Castle Manor Academy, Haverhill

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 28 to 30 September 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Joseph Amankwah.

The panel members were Mrs Julie Wells (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist) and Mrs Emma Garrett (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Amy Tinsley of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr David Collins of Capsticks solicitors.

Mr Joseph Amankwah was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public, save that parts of the hearing took place in private, and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 19 December 2025, as amended on the first day of the hearing in the terms set out below.

It was alleged that Mr Amankwah was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 15 July 2022 he was convicted of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in his breath exceeded the prescribed limit contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.

It was further alleged that Mr Amankwah was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Castle Manor Academy (“the School”) between 8 July 2019 and 6 December 2023:

2. On or around 9 August 2023 he resisted arrest by the police.
3. On 10 August 2023 he accepted a conditional caution for the offence of obstruction/resistance of a constable in execution of duty.

Mr Amankwah admitted the facts of the allegations, as set out in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 10 March 2026 but did not admit unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 40

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 41 to 281

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 282 to 285

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 286 to 293

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A - REDACTED]

Witness B - [REDACTED]

Witness C - [REDACTED]

Mr Amankwah was also present at the hearing and provided oral evidence.

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 Amankwah was arrested on 13 July 2022 following a drink-driving incident. A referral to the LADO was subsequently made on 14 July 2022.

On 15 July 2022, Mr Amankwah was convicted of one count of driving a motor vehicle on a road after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in his breath exceeded the prescribed limit, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act.

On 2 August 2022, Mr Amankwah was sentenced at Suffolk Magistrates Court and received a 32-month driving ban, a fine and a community order.

On 10 August 2023, Mr Amankwah accepted a police caution for obstructing/resisting a police constable in the execution of their duty. A further referral to the LADO was made on 16 August 2023.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 2 February 2024.

Mr Amankwah was dismissed from his role as a teacher on 6 December 2023.

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:

It was alleged that you were guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

- 1. On 15 July 2022 you were convicted of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath exceeded the prescribed limit contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.**

The panel noted that Mr Amankwah admitted the facts of allegation 1, as set out in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 10 March 2026 and as he later confirmed during his oral evidence. The panel reviewed the admission alongside the evidence before it, including the certificate of conviction. The panel considered the admission to be consistent with that evidence.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers (“the Advice”) which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel considered the memorandum from Suffolk Magistrates Court which set out that, on 15 July 2022, Mr Amankwah was convicted of one count of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in his breath exceeded the prescribed limit, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988. On 2 August 2022, Mr Amankwah was sentenced and was disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 32 months. He also received a community order, which included an alcohol abstinence requirement, rehabilitation activity requirement and an unpaid work requirement, was ordered to pay a surcharge of £114 to fund victim services, to pay costs of £105 to the Crown Prosecution Service, and a collection order was made.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 1 proved.

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Castle Manor Academy (“the School”) between 8 July 2019 and 6 December 2023:

- 2. On or around 9 August 2023 you resisted arrest by the police.**

The panel noted that Mr Amankwah admitted the facts of allegation 2, as set out in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 10 March 2026 and as he later confirmed during his oral evidence. The panel reviewed the admission alongside the evidence before it and considered the admissions to be consistent with that evidence.

The panel noted the adult conditional caution signed by Mr Amankwah and dated 10 August 2023, which set out the offence details as “*Obstruct/resist a constable in execution of duty..*”. The document further detailed that, on 9 August 2023 at Bury St Edmunds in the County of Suffolk, Mr Amankwah resisted Witness B, a constable, in the execution of her duty.

The panel considered the witness statement and oral evidence of Witness A, who was involved with the police investigation relating to Mr Amankwah. Witness A explained that, on 9 August 2023, following a computer aided despatch report of a [REDACTED] she attended the home of Mr Amankwah and Person B. Upon arrival, Witness A spoke to Mr Amankwah whilst her colleague, Witness B, spoke to Person B who was located outside of the house. Person B made a disclosure to Witness B. Upon learning this information, Witness B returned to the house and arrested Mr Amankwah. Witness A then placed Mr Amankwah in a ‘front stack position’, in that Mr Amankwah’s hands were handcuffed in front of his body.

Witness A submitted that Mr Amankwah became very agitated and started to make verbal demands, when asked to move out of the door, which he refused to do. A decision was therefore made to move Mr Amankwah to a “rear stack position”, which the panel understood meant being handcuffed behind the back rather than in front of the body. Witness A explained during her oral evidence that the decision to place an individual in a rear stack position is based on a police officer’s opinion as to how an individual is representing themselves at the time. Due to the escalating nature of Mr Amankwah’s behaviour, it was determined that he needed to be placed in the rear stack position to ensure everyone’s safety.

Whilst trying to place Mr Amankwah in the rear stack position, Witness A submitted that Mr Amankwah actively resisted. Witness A and [REDACTED] were unable to “*beat his strength*” and were therefore left with no choice but to call for assistance from other colleagues. Witness A explained that it took 3 or 4 police officers to restrain Mr Amankwah and place him in a rear stack position.

The panel considered the witness statement and oral evidence of Witness B (Witness B at the time of the incident), who was also involved in the police investigation relating to Mr Amankwah. Witness B explained that, on 9 August 2023, after reports were made of a [REDACTED] she attended the home of Mr Amankwah and Person B. Upon arrival, she located a female [REDACTED] outside of the property with a male, now known to be Mr Amankwah, sat on the doorstep. Witness B walked Person B [REDACTED] down the

driveway away from the house, whilst Witness A spoke to Mr Amankwah inside the property.

Whilst outside, Witness B heard shouting coming from inside the property and entered the property to check on her colleague. Witness B submitted that Mr Amankwah was clearly irate and unhappy, although she had not been privy to the initial interaction between him and Witness A. Witness B subsequently informed Witness A of a disclosure made by Person B and arrested Mr Amankwah. Mr Amankwah was then placed in a front stack position. At this point, Witness B submitted that Mr Amankwah did not demonstrate any aggressive behaviour. However, upon trying to get Mr Amankwah to leave the property, Witness B explained that there was a shift in his body language, in that he started to clench his fists, make verbal demands and began “*squaring up*” to her and Witness A.

Witness B explained that she considered Mr Amankwah needed to be placed in a rear stack position for the safety of everyone involved, including his own. One of Mr Amankwah’s hands was therefore released from handcuffs to allow Witness B and Witness A to place Mr Amankwah in handcuffs behind his back. Witness B stated that Mr Amankwah was much taller and stronger than her and Witness A and they therefore struggled to move him into a rear stack position due to him resisting. This resulted in Witness B and Mr Amankwah both falling to the floor. During this time, Mr Amankwah told Witness B that he would bite her if she continued.

Witness B submitted that they were able to place Mr Amankwah across the sofa but, realising they were struggling to take control, they called for urgent assistance from colleagues. During this time Witness B and Witness A were able to hold Mr Amankwah’s arms to the sofa and held him in place until support arrived.

The panel considered the witness statement and oral evidence of Witness C, Director of Education at Unity Schools Partnership. Witness C explained that he was not involved with the School until concerns were raised relating to an incident involving Mr Amankwah which required police involvement. Witness C first met Mr Amankwah in the Summer term of 2023 when the School’s investigation into the incident began, following notification from the LADO. Witness C was asked to conduct an internal investigation.

Witness C submitted that Mr Amankwah was very open, honest and willing to participate throughout the investigation. Witness C understood that Mr Amankwah was obviously going through a turbulent time due to the circumstances around the concerns. Witness C submitted that there appeared to be genuine lapses in Mr Amankwah’s memory but that Mr Amankwah was able to recollect some things relating to the incident that had taken place.

The panel noted the witness statement of Individual A. Individual A did not attend the hearing and the statement was therefore hearsay evidence. The panel decided on

balance that it was in the interests of justice and the public interest to admit her evidence but determined to place limited weight on it. Individual A confirmed that, prior to the School's investigation in 2022, which related to Mr Amankwah being convicted of a drink driving offence, there were no concerns related to alcohol consumption or police involvement.

Mr Amankwah was signed off sick until early December 2022. He had an extended phased return and had only just returned full time when another incident occurred in May 2023. This involved Mr Amankwah being arrested [REDACTED]. No further action was taken by the police, although this matter was referred to the LADO and another investigation commenced.

The panel considered the statement and oral evidence of Mr Amankwah, who explained that on 9 August 2023, he had been to London to see family. Upon his return, Mr Amankwah submitted that he and Person B had an argument which resulted in the police being called. When the police attended the incident, Mr Amankwah was sitting at the front door when the police informed him that a report of a domestic incident had been made.

Mr Amankwah submitted that when initially told he was under arrest, he did not resist being placed in handcuffs although he later became frustrated as he did not see any reasons that warranted his arrest. Mr Amankwah explained that he asked Witness A whether he could get something to eat as he was very hungry and had not eaten. Mr Amankwah explained that when he was placed in front handcuffs, it was hurting him, and he made Witness A aware of this.

Mr Amankwah submitted that when his hand was released to place him in the rear stack position, due to the discomfort he had felt in having his hands in handcuffs, he had to stretch his arm. Mr Amankwah submitted that he was then "*grabbed*" and he told Witness A and Witness B he believed his shoulder would become dislocated if they continued trying to place his hands behind his back. Mr Amankwah accepted that he told Witness B, if she did not stop, he would bite her.

Mr Amankwah accepted that there is no excuse for not allowing the police to do their job but, at the time he was frustrated by the number of times the police had previously attended his house and arrested him on allegations which he considered to be unfounded. Mr Amankwah was concerned that going with the police could have implications for his career. Mr Amankwah submitted that, in hindsight, he should have walked away with the police rather than resisting.

The panel considered that there was clear evidence that Mr Amankwah had resisted arrest. The Panel found Witness B to be particularly compelling while giving evidence, noting her extensive experience in incidents of a similar nature. Witness B explained clearly how matters had escalated throughout her time at the property and detailed the

struggle that she and Witness A faced whilst attempting to move Mr Amankwah into a rear stack position, due to his resistance. The panel noted that Mr Amankwah did not initially resist arrest when placed in front handcuffs but understood that the term “arrest” refers to the duration of the arrest. The panel noted that Mr Amankwah became resistant as he was asked to leave the property.

The panel noted Mr Amankwah’s explanation that when one hand was released from handcuffs, he stretched his arm due to the discomfort he was feeling. However, the panel considered that Mr Amankwah could have complied with the police on a number of occasions throughout the arrest, and the resistance was not limited to one action that had taken place as made clear in the police officers’ evidence. The panel also noted that Mr Amankwah acknowledged that he had threatened to bite a police officer and it did not find to be plausible his suggestion that this was done to make the situation “*more relaxed*”.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 2 proved.

3. On 10 August 2023 you accepted a conditional caution for the offence of obstruction/resistance of a constable in execution of duty.

The panel noted that Mr Amankwah admitted the facts of allegation 3, as set out in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 10 March 2026 and as he later confirmed during his oral evidence. The panel reviewed the admission alongside the evidence before it and considered the admissions to be consistent with that evidence.

The panel again noted the adult conditional caution signed by Mr Amankwah and dated 10 August 2023, which set out the offence details as “*Obstruct/resist a constable in execution of duty..*”. It further detailed that, on 9 August 2023 at Bury St Edmunds in the County of Suffolk, Mr Amankwah resisted Witness B, a constable, in the execution of her duty.

The panel further noted the offender declaration that was attached to the caution, which confirmed, amongst other things, that Mr Amankwah had been informed of the evidence against him and the decision by the police to administer a conditional caution before signing.

The panel noted the witness statement and oral evidence of Mr Amankwah. Mr Amankwah submitted that, on release from the police station, he was cautioned for resisting arrest.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 3 proved.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence

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 and/or conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Amankwah, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Amankwah 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

Conviction of a relevant offence

The panel considered whether Mr Amankwah's conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence, in respect of allegation 1 only.

The panel decided that Mr Amankwah's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting.

The panel decided that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Amankwah's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Amankwah's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning an offence involving serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs; and serious offences involving alcohol, which the Advice states are likely to be considered relevant offences.

The panel considered Mr Amankwah's conviction to be of a serious nature particularly given the level of alcohol in his breath at the time he was driving, namely 128 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, which is more than 3 times the legal limit.

The panel noted from Mr Amankwah's own account that the incident had been reported by another road user.

Though not directly part of the conviction the panel was particularly concerned by Mr Amankwah's account that, on 13 July 2022, [REDACTED], he returned home and began drinking alcohol, intending to sleep until he needed to [REDACTED]. Mr Amankwah reported having "*one glass after the other*", despite knowing he would need to drive later. [REDACTED], the panel considered that his actions could have had a much wider implication.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Amankwah's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

The panel considered whether Mr Amankwah's conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in respect of allegation 2 and 3 only.

The panel considered whether Mr Amankwah'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 the offence type of violence was relevant, in that Mr Amankwah was physical in resisting arrest requiring further officers to restrain him.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. The panel noted the witness statement of Witness C, who submitted that there was no evidence

that Mr Amankwah's conduct impacted the School and all of the concerns occurred outside of the School.

The panel received legal advice and noted that professionals are not expected to be paragons of virtue. However, the panel was concerned about pupils becoming aware of the incidents involving Mr Amankwah, particularly his aggressive conduct towards the police officers and his threat to bite them. The panel's view was that this was serious and entirely unacceptable behaviour and against the professional standards which all teachers should abide by. Mr Amankwah's apparent inability to govern his behaviour and be actively violent towards police officers clearly had direct implications for his professional role and the appropriateness of his holding a position as a teacher.

In considering its views, the panel was mindful of the influential role that teachers hold in the lives of pupils.

The panel also noted that Mr Amankwah submitted during his oral evidence that his behaviour was not appropriate for a teacher. Mr Amankwah explained that he was a role model in his role at the School, and knew that this would have a negative impact on the children, who could think his behaviour was "*cool*".

The panel considered that this conduct as proven would clearly affect the way a person fulfils their teaching role and may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way.

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

In relation to whether Mr Amankwah'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 Amankwah'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 Amankwah was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of violence was relevant.

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 Amankwah's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. In particular the panel considered a member of the public, properly informed, would consider it wholly unacceptable that Mr Amankwah would fail to cooperate with the police and would go so far as to actively and physically resist them and threaten violence against them when being arrested. The panel considered that this was behaviour that the general public would consider to be inappropriate for a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Amankwah'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; and a conviction of a relevant offence, 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 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 Amankwah which involved a conviction for drink driving and resisting arrest and noting his acceptance of a police caution in respect of the same, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Amankwah 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 Amankwah 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 Amankwah in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining Mr

Amankwah in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator. The panel noted that it was evident from the bundle of documents before it, that matters had not impacted upon Mr Amankwah's work within the School. The panel took account of Mr Amankwah's own desire to return to the classroom and believed Mr Amankwah would be able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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.

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 Amankwah.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards; and
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures

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 Amankwah's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Amankwah was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence before the panel that demonstrated Mr Amankwah had been subject to any disciplinary proceedings.

The panel did not have evidence that Mr Amankwah demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered the difficult personal circumstances experienced by Mr Amankwah at the relevant time, as set out in a letter from Mr Amankwah dated 5 April 2024, and later explained during his oral evidence.

Mr Amankwah explained that a number of incidents occurred in the spring term of 2022, [REDACTED].

[REDACTED].

[REDACTED].

The panel noted that it had limited contemporaneous evidence before it however, it was strongly persuaded that Mr Amankwah had actively put in place a number of steps [REDACTED] which it considered to be a reflection of Mr Amankwah's significant insight and remorse. Mr Amankwah submitted that he had [REDACTED] and accessed various forms of support and [REDACTED]. The panel was assured that Mr Amankwah had demonstrated his ability to identify and access appropriate sources of support and that there had been no reoccurrence of this behaviour in the last 3 years.

The panel noted that it had no evidence before it that concerns had been raised regarding Mr Amankwah's teaching or of any safeguarding concerns and no concerns prior to the incidents. The panel noted the witness statement of Witness C, who submitted that Mr Amankwah's conduct had not impacted upon his teaching within the School.

The panel noted that Mr Amankwah pleaded guilty to the conviction of drink driving and had appeared to cooperate with the police. Whilst Mr Amankwah was guilty of resisting a police officer on a later date, the panel noted Mr Amankwah's acceptance of the caution in this regard.

The panel considered that Mr Amankwah had demonstrated insight into his conduct. He acknowledged that he had acted wrongly and was able to reflect upon how he would respond differently in the future. In particular, Mr Amankwah expressed that he had developed an understanding of his triggers and the circumstances which had contributed to his behaviour.

The panel noted Mr Amankwah's evidence as to how he would respond if faced with similar difficulties in the future. He demonstrated an understanding of the need to recognise potential triggers at an early stage and to make effective use of the wide range of support and resources that he had proactively made available for himself. The panel considered that his ability to recognise when he required assistance and to seek appropriate support demonstrated developed insight into how he could manage difficult circumstances differently in the future.

The panel also took account of the changes Mr Amankwah had made in his personal life, [REDACTED].

The panel was satisfied that Mr Amankwah had demonstrated remorse for his conduct. He expressly and repeatedly stated that he was sorry and acknowledged that what he

had done was wrong. The panel also took account of Mr Amankwah's acceptance of the consequences of his actions, including his view that he had deserved to be punished for his offending through a high-level community order.

The panel considered Mr Amankwah's remorse alongside his insight and the practical steps he had taken to address the matters which had contributed to his behaviour. It noted that he had fully engaged with the processes arising from his conduct and had taken opportunities to demonstrate his understanding of what had gone wrong and the changes he had made subsequently.

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of some of the behaviour was serious but at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a unique and extreme set of circumstances had led to the behaviours and considered it highly unlikely such circumstances would happen again.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Amankwah's insight into his response and consequent poor judgements led to him putting sufficient mitigation in place, that would enable him to appropriately manage any future incidents.

The panel therefore recommended that no prohibition order be made in this case.

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 sanction.

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, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction.

The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, and a relevant conviction in respect of Mr Joseph Amankwah should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Amankwah 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of Mr Amankwah's *"...apparent inability to govern his behaviour and be actively violent towards police officers..."*.

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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, and a relevant conviction, 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 Amankwah, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has found that the behaviour of violence was engaged in this case, as Mr Amankwah had resisted arrest by police officers. I am mindful of the transferrable risk of this type of behaviour into the classroom. A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, *"The panel considered that Mr Amankwah had demonstrated insight into his conduct. He acknowledged that he had acted wrongly and was able to reflect upon how he would respond differently in the future. In particular, Mr Amankwah expressed that he had developed an understanding of his triggers and the circumstances which had contributed to his behaviour."*

The panel has also commented that Mr Amankwah had *"...demonstrated developed insight..."* into his behaviour. I have given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *"...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Amankwah were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, and a relevant conviction, 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 Amankwah himself. The panel comment *"Mr Amankwah submitted that he had [REDACTED] and accessed various forms of support and [REDACTED]. The panel was assured that Mr Amankwah had demonstrated his ability to identify and access appropriate sources of support and that there had been no reoccurrence of this behaviour in the last 3 years."*

The panel also considered the statement of Witness C, *"...who submitted that Mr Amankwah's conduct had not impacted upon his teaching within the School."* Although the panel also stated that it did not have evidence that Mr Amankwah had contributed significantly to the education sector.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Amankwah 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 concerning insight or remorse. The panel has said, *"The panel considered Mr Amankwah's remorse alongside his insight and the practical steps he had taken to address the matters which had contributed to his behaviour. It noted that he had fully engaged with the processes arising from his conduct and had taken opportunities to demonstrate his understanding of what had gone wrong and the changes he had made subsequently."*

I have placed considerable weight on the impact Mr Amankwah's personal circumstances had on him at the time of these events, as well as the developed insight into his offending behaviour. The panel has noted that *"...a unique and extreme set of circumstances had led to the behaviours and considered it highly unlikely such circumstances would happen again."*

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 5 October 2026

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