



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Tom Field: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	19

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

Teacher: Mr Tom Field

Teacher ref number: 0243453

Teacher date of birth: 4 May 1979

TRA reference: 22552

Date of determination: 21 August 2025

Former employer: Ursuline College, Westgate-on-Sea

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 21 August 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Tom Field.

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

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Eleanor Bullen-Bell of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Field that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Field provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr Adam Ridley of Capsticks LLP Solicitors, Mr Field or any representative for Mr Field.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 7 May 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Field was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Ursuline College ("the School"):

1. On or around 20 or 21 June 2023, he:
 - a) Contacted Pupil A via his personal mobile phone;
 - b) Took Pupil A to his home; and/or
 - c) Engaged in sexual intercourse and/or sexual activity with Pupil A.
2. On or around 20 June 2023, he:
 - a) Invited and/or took one or more pupils to a public house; and/or
 - b) Drove one or more pupils home.
3. On or around 26 June 2023, he:
 - a) Arranged to meet Pupil A outside of School,
 - b) Picked up Pupil A from her home and/or took her to his home; and/or
 - c) Engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A.
4. His conduct as may be proven at allegations 1 and/or 3 was sexually motivated.

Mr Field admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) to (c), 2(a) to (b), 3(a) to (c) and 4 as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. He further admitted that those admitted facts amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or 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 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 6 to 24

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 25 to 34

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 35 to 296

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 297 to 303

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”).

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Field for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Field commenced employment at the School on 1 January 2005.

During the February 2023 half-term, a school trip [REDACTED]. Pupil A attended the trip, and Mr Field went on the trip for the first week as a member of staff. To facilitate communication on the trip, there was a group chat on WhatsApp comprising the personal phone numbers of staff and pupils, including Mr Field and Pupil A.

On or around 20 June 2023, Mr Field allegedly took four pupils to the pub. Mr Field drove two pupils to the pub and dropped three of the pupils off at their home addresses later in the evening.

On 21 June 2023, Mr Field allegedly drove Pupil A to his home and engaged in sexual intercourse with them.

On or around 21 June 2023, Mr Field allegedly messaged Pupil A from his personal mobile number.

On 26 June 2023, Mr Field allegedly drove to Pupil A's house to collect them and drove them back to his house. Mr Field allegedly engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A whilst they were at his house.

On 30 June 2023, Pupil A disclosed to a member of staff that Mr Field had engaged in sexual activity with them at his home address.

On 1 July 2023, Individual A, the [REDACTED] at the School, contacted Mr Field and he admitted during their telephone conversation that he had engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A.

Individual A visited Pupil A's home address on 2 July 2023 to obtain an account from Pupil A. During their conversation, Pupil A disclosed that a second instance of sexual activity had occurred between them and Mr Field on 26 June 2023.

Mr Field resigned from the School on 2 July 2023.

The TRA received a referral for the matter on 26 September 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:

1. On or around 20 or 21 June 2023, you:

a) Contacted Pupil A via your personal mobile phone;

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted allegation 1(a).

The panel noted that in that statement of agreed facts, Mr Field admitted to communicating with Pupil A via messages sent from his personal phone, following the incident on 21 June 2023 where they had engaged in sexual intercourse at his house. The statement of agreed facts set out that in these messages Mr Field was seeking to see Pupil A again outside of School.

Notwithstanding Mr Field's admissions, the panel made its own determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered the investigation report prepared by the School. The panel considered the statement of Individual A dated 2 July 2023, from within the investigation report. Individual A had provided a write up of her notes from when she discussed the

matter with Pupil A. The panel noted the following comment from Individual A's notes in particular:

- *"[Mr Field] text [REDACTED] that evening. He asked if [REDACTED] was ok."*

The panel considered the record of the investigation meeting with Mr Field by the School and noted that Mr Field admitted he spoke to Pupil A via WhatsApp message, and that they last exchanged these on the day of [REDACTED] 2023. Mr Field admitted that he and Pupil A had each other's personal phone numbers due to the School trip [REDACTED] that had taken place in February half-term of 2023.

On examination of the documents and Mr Field's admission in the statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1(a) was proven.

b) Took Pupil A to your home; and/or

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted allegation 1(b).

The panel noted that in that statement of agreed facts, Mr Field admitted to responding to an email, via his school email, from Pupil A where they had requested to make arrangements to return their [REDACTED] books on 21 June 2023. Mr Field stated in his email to Pupil A that he would be available from the end of period 2, and that he was then supposed to be going to a colleague's house to help with timetabling but that he would probably be going home first to change.

Mr Field admitted that on or around 21 June 2023, after Pupil A had come into School to return their [REDACTED] books, he invited them to come to his home and drove them to his home address.

Notwithstanding Mr Field's admissions, the panel made its own determination.

The panel considered the investigation report prepared by the School and contemporaneous statements and notes within this report. The panel particularly noted the screenshots of the emails between Mr Field and Pupil A, which were appended to the report.

The panel noted the following emails in particular:

- 20 June 2023, at 23:39, Pupil A to Mr Field *"Forgot to give back my [REDACTED] textbook, I'm going to have to run in tomorrow and give it back to you. When do you have a free lesson so I can come then?"*
- 21 June 2023, at 06:56, Mr Field to Pupil A *"Hey, first morning of freedom!!! Yeah need to give books back at some point. I'm teaching yr12 1 and 2 then supposed to be going to Individual B's house to help with timetable. I'll probably be going*

home first to change. End of period 2/break time probably be best, but not sure how that fits in your plans?"

The panel considered the investigation report prepared by the School, which attested to the emails above. The panel considered the statement of Individual A dated 2 July 2023, from within the investigation report. Individual A had provided a write up of her notes from when she discussed the matter with Pupil A. The panel noted the following comment from Individual A's notes in particular:

- *"[Mr Field] says to [REDACTED] how good [REDACTED] looked, before offering [REDACTED] a lift home. Pupil A agreed to lift home. [Mr Field] leaves school site at 11:18am with Pupil A. [Mr Field] then said that he needed to go to his house first to get changed and that he would take [REDACTED] home afterwards. Pupil A agreed to that to see his dog. The conversation was normal, [Mr Field] talked about having a girlfriend. Pupil A waited in the kitchen for [Mr Field] to get changed."*

The panel considered the record of the investigation meeting by the School. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted that Pupil A came and dropped the books to him at School and that, at some point on leaving the School's site, he asked if they wanted to come back to his house and they agreed.

On examination of the documents and Mr Field's admission in the statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1(b) was proven.

c) Engaged in sexual intercourse and/or sexual activity with Pupil A.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted allegation 1(c).

The panel noted that in that statement of agreed facts, Mr Field admitted to engaging in sexual intercourse with Pupil A on 21 June 2023 at his home address.

Notwithstanding Mr Field's admissions, the panel made its own determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered the written statement of Individual C, taken as part of the School's investigation, dated 1 July 2023. Individual C stated that he was informed about Pupil A's disclosure on the evening of 1 July 2023 via phone call. He stated that he went to visit Mr Field at his house, and Mr Field admitted to "*sleeping with*" a [REDACTED] student.

The panel also noted the written statement of Individual B, taken as part of the School's investigation, dated 1 July 2023. Individual B stated that he was informed via phone call about Pupil A's disclosure around lunchtime on 1 July 2023. He stated that he went to

visit Mr Field at his house with Individual C, and Mr Field admitted that he had “*slept with*” a [REDACTED] student, corroborating Individual C’s account.

The panel considered the investigation report prepared by the School. The panel particularly noted the statement of Individual D, dated 1 July 2023. Individual D stated that on 30 June 2023 at approximately 11:45pm, Pupil A disclosed that they had “*slept*” with Mr Field.

The panel considered the statement of Individual A dated 2 July 2023, from within the investigation report. Individual A had provided a write up of her notes from when she discussed the matter with Pupil A. The panel noted the following comment from Individual A’s notes in particular:

- *“Pupil A waited in the kitchen for [Mr Field] to get changed. Then [Mr Field] ‘came on’ to [REDACTED], took [REDACTED] arm and led [REDACTED] upstairs. Pupil A said “I never said no, but I felt like it was wrong”.”*

In addition, the panel noted the statement of Individual A dated 1 July 2023, from the School’s investigation documents. Individual A had produced a write up of her notes from when she first raised the allegation with Mr Field. In this statement, the panel noted that when Mr Field was directly asked if he had sex with a pupil, he admitted it.

The panel also considered the record of the investigation meeting by the School and noted that Mr Field admitted on a number of occasions that after he had taken Pupil A back to his house they went upstairs and had sex.

On examination of the documents and Mr Field’s admission in the statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1(c) was proven.

2. On or around 20 June 2023, you:

- a) Invited and/or took one or more pupils to a public house; and/or**
- b) Drove one or more pupils home.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted allegations 2(a) and 2(b).

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, Mr Field admitted that he agreed to a trip to the pub for himself and four pupils on 20 June 2023 following the completion of their [REDACTED] that day.

The statement of agreed facts set out that Mr Field stated that he notified the Head [REDACTED] via text message that he intended to take pupils to the pub. Mr Field admitted that he did not seek appropriate permissions, as he should have done.

The panel noted that Mr Field admitted to driving two of the pupils to the pub and that he and the four pupils were at the pub for approximately an hour and a half. He admitted that he also drove three of the pupils back to their homes later in the evening, dropping Pupil A home last. He also admitted that he had not sought permission to transport the pupils in his car or take them to the pub. The panel also noted that there was no evidence that Mr Field had undertaken any risk assessment.

Notwithstanding Mr Field's admissions, the panel made its own determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered the investigation report prepared by the School. The report set out that on 20 June 2023 the final [REDACTED] exam was held, and Mr Field had spoken to four pupils about taking them out for a treat. The report set out that Mr Field recalled giving the pupils different options of where they could go including ice cream or pizza, but they chose the local pub. Mr Field transported Pupil A and one other pupil to the pub and recalled the pupils having *"a few drinks and some food"*.

The panel considered the record of the investigation meeting with Mr Field by the School, and noted that Mr Field said he had given the pupils the option of going out for a treat and the pupils suggested the pub. He stated that he took Pupil A and another pupil to the pub whilst the others made their own way and then dropped three of them off individually at their home addresses, dropping Pupil A home last.

The panel noted the statement of Individual A dated 1 July 2023, which was provided as part of the investigation report. In Individual D's statement dated 21 July 2023, it stated "on the day of their last exam, Pupil A had a lift home from Mr Field."

The panel considered the statement of Individual A dated 2 July 2023, from within the investigation report. Individual A had provided a write up of her notes from when she discussed the matter with Pupil A. The panel noted the following comment from Individual A's notes in particular:

- *"Following the [REDACTED] final paper, the MOS invited the class of students to go to the pub to celebrate finishing the course. They all had a few drinks, he then dropped them all home, dropping Pupil A last."*

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegations 2(a) and 2(b) were proven.

3. On or around 26 June 2023, you:

a) Arranged to meet Pupil A outside of School,

**b) Picked up Pupil A from her home and/or took her to your home;
and/or**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted allegations 3(a) and 3(b).

The panel noted that in that statement of agreed facts, Mr Field admitted that following the incident on 21 June 2023, he contacted Pupil A to ask to see them on 26 June 2023. Mr Field further admitted that the purpose of that request was to meet with Pupil A outside of School.

The statement of agreed facts further set out that Mr Field admitted to driving to Pupil A's home address to collect them and then drive back to his home address on 26 June 2023.

The panel also noted the record of the investigation meeting with Mr Field by the School, where Mr Field admitted to arranging to meet Pupil A outside of school via message and picking them up on 26 June 2023 to take them to his house.

The panel considered the statement of Individual A dated 2 July 2023, from within the investigation report. Individual A had provided a write up of her notes from when she discussed the matter with Pupil A. The panel noted the following comments from Individual A's notes in particular:

- *"Pupil A agreed to meet up. [Mr Field] picked [REDACTED] up from the bottom of [REDACTED] road in the early part of the following week at about 9:30am and went to Mr Field's house. Mr Field had called into work sick. They watched a movie and talked."*

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegations 3(a) and 3(b) were proven.

c) Engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted allegation 3(c).

The panel noted that in that statement of agreed facts, Mr Field admitted that on 26 June 2023, whilst he and Pupil A were at his home address, they engaged in sexual activity.

The panel considered the statement of Individual A dated 2 July 2023, from within the investigation report. Individual A had provided a write up of her notes from when she discussed the matter with Pupil A. The panel noted the following comments from Individual A's notes in particular:

- *“Whilst together at his house, [Mr Field] asked Pupil A to make him ‘cum’. Pupil A felt that [REDACTED] had to but didn’t want to. [Mr Field] asked [REDACTED] to take [REDACTED] top off. Pupil A didn’t want to but did. Pupil A said “I just wanted it to end”.”*

The panel also noted the record of the investigation meeting with Mr Field by the School, where Mr Field stated that *“we did fool around a bit, but didn’t have sex”* when referring to when Pupil A was at his house on 26 June 2023.

On examination of the documents before it, the panel was satisfied that on the balance of probabilities, Mr Field had engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A and therefore found allegation 3(c) proven.

4. Your conduct as may be proven at allegations 1 and/or 3 was sexually motivated.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Field on 14 January 2025. The panel noted that Mr Field admitted allegation 4.

The panel noted that in *Basson v General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 505 (Admin)* it was stated that *“A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship”*.

The panel further noted that in *General Medical Council v Haris [2021] EWCA Civ 763*, it was stated that, *“In the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves. A sexual motive was plainly more likely than not; I would go so far as to say that that inference was overwhelming.”*

The panel therefore considered whether a plausible innocent explanation for the conduct which they had found proven at allegations 1 and 3 had been demonstrated by Mr Field.

The panel considered that there was no innocent explanation for Mr Field’s conduct and considered that the act of engaging in sexual intercourse and/or sexual activity with Pupil A was by its very nature, sexual.

The panel noted that Mr Field’s actions leading up to the events in allegations 1 and 3, highlighted his sexual motivations. In particular, the panel considered the following statement by Mr Field during the investigation meeting by the School when discussing the incident where he dropped Pupil A home after the pub:

- *“Well before [REDACTED] got out of the car, I told [REDACTED] that I’d like to have sex with [REDACTED].”*

The panel noted that this comment was verified in the notes Individual A had written up from when she discussed the matter with Pupil A on 2 July 2023:

- *“In the car, [Mr Field] said to [Pupil A] “I really want to have sex with you and have done for a while”.”*

In considering the evidence before it, the panel found that on the balance of probabilities, Mr Field’s conduct was sexually motivated.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 4 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 Field, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Field was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Field, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”) or Working Together to Safeguard Children as the panel was not invited to consider any breaches of particular provisions of these guidance documents in the course of the hearing. The panel noted from its own knowledge and experience that for the purposes of these guidance documents, the term ‘children’ includes everyone under the age of 18.

Despite this, the panel considered that Mr Field seriously breached several of the School’s policies, most notably regarding safeguarding and the School’s code of conduct.

The panel also considered whether Mr Field'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 of sexual activity was relevant in this case. In relation to this, the panel was particularly concerned that Mr Field made a proposition for sexual intercourse at the first opportunity after Pupil A completed their exams on or around 20 June 2023.

For this reason, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Field 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 Field was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Field'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 Field'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 Field was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that sexual activity was relevant.

The panel was concerned that Mr Field demonstrated a complete lack of professional boundaries, failing to uphold the standards expected of someone in a position of trust and authority. His actions reflected a profound disregard for the School's policies and training and the responsibilities inherent in his role as a teacher, particularly the duty to safeguard and support pupils. It was evident that Mr Field had no understanding of the appropriate boundaries of a teacher-pupil relationship. By exploiting his influential position, Mr Field undermined the perception of the teaching profession and compromised the safe environment that educational settings are meant to provide.

The panel therefore considered that Mr Field's conduct could seriously damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Field's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Field, which involved contacting Pupil A via his personal mobile phone, taking Pupil A to his home, engaging in sexual intercourse and sexual activity with Pupil A, taking pupils to the pub and driving them home, meeting Pupil A outside of School and picking up Pupil A from their home and taking them to his home, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Field 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 Field 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 Field in the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Field 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 that Mr Field's actions demonstrated a continuing risk and retaining him in the profession would likely only lead to further risk to the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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 Field.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil; and
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position.

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 Field's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Field was acting under extreme duress.

The panel was not presented with any evidence that Mr Field demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector beyond what would have been expected of a teacher with his years of experience.

The panel considered the written statement of Mr Field dated 5 February 2025, where he set out that he was sorry, regretful and ashamed of his actions. He stated that he has let down the profession, his family and friends, colleagues, the School and most importantly the pupils.

Mr Field stated that he has no justification or excuse for his conduct though stated that he was at a low point [REDACTED] and was struggling.

Mr Field recognised that his responsibility and position means that he should have known better and that he recognises his choices have caused what has happened.

However, the panel noted that Mr Field demonstrated limited insight and remorse for his actions. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Field stated that Pupil A “*makes out that [he] was the chief and sole pursuer/orchestrator*”, reflecting an attempt to deflect responsibility and apportion blame to Pupil A. This demonstrated to the panel Mr Field’s limited insight and remorse for his actions and his understanding of the pupil-teacher power dynamic. This lack of accountability suggests that Mr Field does not fully comprehend the gravity of his position as a teacher and the vulnerabilities of pupils. The panel considered his perspective was indicative of an underdeveloped understanding of the seriousness of his position and the safeguarding responsibilities it entails.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Field 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 Field. The findings relating to Mr Field’s sexual activity with a pupil on more than one occasion and deliberate exploitation of his position of authority and trust were significant factors in forming that 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 two 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.

These include serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly

where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons.

The panel considered that Mr Field's sexual intercourse and sexual activity with Pupil A who still remained a pupil of the School, weighed in favour of not offering a review period. The panel noted that no evidence was present that a period of review would result in a different outcome to rebuild public confidence in Mr Field returning to the teaching profession.

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

The panel considered that Mr Field's behaviour towards Pupil A indicated a sustained and concerning pattern of conduct towards Pupil A. The panel was particularly concerned that at the first opportunity after Pupil A completed their exams on or around 20 June 2023, Mr Field made a proposition for sexual intercourse. The panel found that Mr Field seriously exploited his position of trust as a teacher by engaging in sexual misconduct, completely disregarded the teacher-pupil relationship and demonstrated limited insight and a lack of genuine remorse. These factors provided evidence to the panel of a potential risk of repetition.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a 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 Tom Field should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Field is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Field, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and/or involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children. However, I have noted the following comment "Despite this, the panel considered that Mr Field seriously breached several of the School's policies, most notably regarding safeguarding and the School's code of conduct."

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of engaging in sexual intercourse and sexual activity with Pupil A, taking pupils to the pub and driving them home, meeting a Pupil A outside of School and picking up Pupil A from their home.

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 Field, 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, “In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Field, which involved contacting Pupil A via his personal mobile phone, taking Pupil A to his home, engaging in sexual intercourse and sexual activity with Pupil A, taking pupils to the pub and driving them home, meeting Pupil A outside of School and picking up Pupil A from their home and taking them to his home, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.” 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 the written statement of Mr Field dated 5 February 2025, where he set out that he was sorry, regretful and ashamed of his actions. He stated that he has let down the profession, his family and friends, colleagues, the School and most importantly the pupils.” I have therefore given this element some 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 Field were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of engaging in sexual activity with a pupil in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Field himself and the panel comment “The panel was not presented with any evidence that Mr Field demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector beyond what would have been expected of a teacher with his years of experience.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Field 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 level of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “However, the panel noted that Mr Field demonstrated limited insight and remorse for his actions. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Field stated that Pupil A *“makes out that [he] was the chief and sole pursuer/orchestrator”*, reflecting an attempt to deflect responsibility and apportion blame to Pupil A. This demonstrated to the panel Mr Field’s limited insight and remorse for his actions and his understanding of the pupil-teacher power dynamic. This lack of accountability suggests that Mr Field does not fully comprehend the gravity of his position as a teacher and the vulnerabilities of pupils. The panel considered his perspective was indicative of an underdeveloped understanding of the seriousness of his position and the safeguarding responsibilities it entails.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel was concerned that Mr Field demonstrated a complete lack of professional boundaries, failing to uphold the standards expected of someone in a position of trust and authority. His actions reflected a profound disregard for the School’s policies and training and the responsibilities inherent in his role as a teacher, particularly the duty to safeguard and support pupils. It was evident that Mr Field had no understanding of the appropriate boundaries of a teacher-pupil relationship. By exploiting his influential position, Mr Field undermined the perception of the teaching profession and compromised the safe environment that educational settings are meant to provide.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Field 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 or 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 "The panel considered that Mr Field's sexual intercourse and sexual activity with Pupil A who still remained a pupil of the School, weighed in favour of not offering a review period. The panel noted that no evidence was present that a period of review would result in a different outcome to rebuild public confidence in Mr Field returning to the teaching profession."

The panel also said "The panel considered that Mr Field's behaviour towards Pupil A indicated a sustained and concerning pattern of conduct towards Pupil A. The panel was particularly concerned that at the first opportunity after Pupil A completed their exams on or around 20 June 2023, Mr Field made a proposition for sexual intercourse. The panel found that Mr Field seriously exploited his position of trust as a teacher by engaging in sexual misconduct, completely disregarded the teacher-pupil relationship and demonstrated limited insight and a lack of genuine remorse. These factors provided evidence to the panel of a potential risk of repetition."

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 seriousness of the findings and the lack of full insight or remorse.

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 Tom Field 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 Field 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 Tom Field 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: 26 August 2025

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