



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Simon Wood: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**March 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

**Teacher:** Mr Simon Wood

**Teacher ref number:** 0437216

**Teacher date of birth:** 23 June 1979

**TRA reference:** 23023

**Date of determination:** 27 March 2025

**Former employer:** Wetherby High School, Wetherby

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 27 March 2025, to consider the case of Mr Simon Wood.

The panel members were Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist) and Ms Janette McCormick (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Rachel Phillips of Blake Morgan LLP.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Wood that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Wood provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, or Mr Wood.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation(s) set out in the notice of proceedings dated 21 March 2025.

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

He had been convicted at any time, of the following relevant offence:

1. On 11 April 2024, he was convicted at Kirklees Magistrates Court of the following relevant offences:
  - a) Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 10 June 2022 contrary to section 1 (a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
  - b) Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 16 November 2022 contrary to section 1 (a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and List of Key People – pages 3 to 4.

Section 2: Notice of Referral and Response – pages 5 to 10.

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 11 to 15.

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 16 to 26.

Section 5: Teacher's Documents – page 104.

Section 6: Notice of Meeting – pages 105 to 106.

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2022 (the “Procedures”).

## **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Wood on 3 March 2025.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Wood for the allegations to be considered without a hearing.

The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

The panel proceeded to consider the case carefully, having read all of the documents, and reached a decision. It accepted the legal advice provided.

Mr Wood was previously employed as a Teacher of History and Subject Manager for Humanities at Wetherby High School (“the School”), from 1 October 2020 until his resignation on 17 January 2023.

On 16 November 2022, Mr Wood was arrested for being in possession of indecent images of children.

Mr Wood appeared at Kirklees Magistrates’ Court on 11 April 2024, when he pleaded guilty to two counts of making indecent images of a child. On 3 June 2024, Mr Wood was sentenced for those offences at Leeds Crown Court.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons:

**You have been convicted at any time, of the following relevant offences:**

**1. On 11 April 2024, you were convicted at Kirklees Magistrates Court of the following relevant offences:**

- a) Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 10 June 2022 contrary to section 1 (a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- b) Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 16 November 2022 contrary to section 1 (a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**

The panel was presented with a statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Wood, in which this allegation was admitted.

The panel was also presented with a certificate of conviction from Leeds Crown Court (“the Court”), confirming that Mr Wood was convicted on 11 April 2024 of the following offences:

- making indecent photographs of a child (1 category A image);
- making indecent photographs of a child (17 category C images).

The certificate also confirmed that the sentence imposed by the Court on 3 June 2024 was a Community Order for 18 months, rehabilitation activity requirements, forfeiture of seized devices and payment of a victim surcharge of £114. Mr Wood was also made the subject of a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for 10 years.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of the offences by Mr Wood.

In light of this and Mr Wood’s admission, the panel found particulars 1(a) and 1 (b) proved.

### **Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wood in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Wood 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
  - 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
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of 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.

In addition, the panel noted that, pursuant to the Advice a "relevant offence" includes:

- A conviction for any offence that relates to, or involves, any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents.

The panel noted that, whilst the conduct took place outside the education setting, the nature of the alleged conduct relates directly to the conduct expected of those within the teaching profession and the standards which they are expected to uphold. Given the significance of these findings, and the fact that the behaviour concerned related to children, the panel determined that Mr Wood's actions were clearly relevant to his teaching role and working in an education setting.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Wood's behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should be at the very core of the practice of a teacher with a duty of care towards children.

The panel noted that whilst Mr Wood's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, the actions which culminated in his conviction would be likely to significantly affect the public confidence in the teaching profession if the teacher were allowed to continue teaching.

The panel went on to consider any evidence of mitigating circumstances in relation to Mr Wood's conduct. It was noted in the sentencing hearing that just prior to the commission of the offences for which Mr Wood had been convicted, he had been going through a difficult time [REDACTED]. However, the panel also noted that the sentencing judge did

not consider Mr Wood's personal circumstances excused his conduct. The panel considered the dates of the two offences were several months apart, signifying a pattern in behaviour rather than a momentary lapse of judgement.

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

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of 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 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.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making indecent photographs of children and the category of such photographs.

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



Whilst no doubt had been cast upon Mr Wood's abilities as an educator, given the nature of the allegations in this case and in the absence of any evidence that he ought to be regarded as an exceptional teacher, the panel concluded there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Wood.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Wood. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved.

In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- actions or behaviours that undermine fundamental British values of the rule of law.

Even though some of the behaviours 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.

The panel considered that the following mitigating factors are present in this case:

- Mr Wood made full admissions to the allegation against him.
- Mr Wood pleaded guilty to the offences at an early stage for which he was given credit in sentencing.

Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case included that:

- Mr Wood's actions were pre-meditated, repeated and deliberate.

- There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Wood was acting under duress.
- Mr Wood's actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and raised serious public and child protection concerns.
- Mr Wood has been convicted of and sentenced for serious offences involving children.
- Mr Wood was in a position of trust and responsibility. He had fallen significantly short of the standards expected of him in that regard.
- Mr Wood remains subject to an ongoing Community Order until December 2025. He is also subject to a Sexual Prevention Order for 10 years from the date of his sentence, which suggests that the risk of repetition remains high.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Wood of prohibition.

Mr Wood's actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. This was conduct of a serious nature. The nature and gravity of the offence was a matter of significant concern. Accordingly, there were particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protecting the public, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.

The panel was therefore of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Wood.

Additionally, when balancing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances present in this case, its overall seriousness called for a higher regulatory sanction to protect the wider public interest factors.

Accordingly, it 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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period.

These behaviours include:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

In this case, Mr Wood had engaged in making indecent images of children, one of which was within the most serious category. The panel considered that this behaviour was on a par with the specific circumstances listed in the Advice that would militate against a review period.

The panel considered that whilst Mr Wood had expressed a level of insight into his actions, he did not engage with the severity of his actions or the impact they had on the children involved or the wider profession of teaching.

Additionally, in the absence of any material advanced by Mr Wood as to sustained rehabilitation or in relation to any measures he has put in place to prevent reoccurrence, the panel could not be satisfied that the conduct would not be repeated.

In light of this and the seriousness of the offences, the panel decided its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate. The public interest considerations that Mr Wood's conviction give rise to were such that this was necessary and proportionate.

## **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 a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Simon Wood should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Wood 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
  - 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
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of 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 finds that the conduct of Mr Wood fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a relevant conviction for making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children.

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 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 Wood, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making indecent photographs of children and the category of such photographs." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows, "The panel considered that whilst Mr Wood had expressed a level of insight into his actions, he did not engage with the severity of his actions or the impact they had on the children involved or the wider profession of teaching." In my

judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed that “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Wood were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of making indecent photographs of children 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 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 Wood himself. The panel has commented, “Whilst no doubt had been cast upon Mr Wood’s abilities as an educator, given the nature of the allegations in this case and in the absence of any evidence that he ought to be regarded as an exceptional teacher, the panel concluded there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Wood 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 the serious nature of the misconduct. The panel has said, “Mr Wood’s actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. This was conduct of a serious nature. The nature and gravity of the offence was a matter of significant concern. Accordingly, there were particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protecting the public, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Wood has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in

light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight and remorse, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments, "In this case, Mr Wood had engaged in making indecent images of children, one of which was within the most serious category. The panel considered that this behaviour was on a par with the specific circumstances listed in the Advice that would militate against a review period."

I have also taken account of the panel's view of the risk of repetition. The panel has said that "in the absence of any material advanced by Mr Wood as to sustained rehabilitation or in relation to any measures he has put in place to prevent reoccurrence, the panel could not be satisfied that the conduct would not be repeated."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences of which Mr Wood was convicted, the lack of full insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

**This means that Mr Simon Wood is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Wood shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Wood 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 'David Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 28 March 2025**

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