



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Daniel Johnson: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

January 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
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:	Daniel Johnson
Teacher ref number:	1075019
Teacher date of birth:	26 March 1991
TRA reference:	24525
Date of determination:	29 January 2026
Former employer:	Heygarth Primary School, Eastham, Wirral

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 29 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Daniel Johnson.

The panel members were Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Peter Whitelock (lay panellist) and Ms Amy Barron (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Kim Findlow of Eversheds Sutherland (International) 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 Johnson that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Johnson provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted a conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Sherelle Appleby, Mr Johnson or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 14 November 2025.

It was alleged that Daniel Johnson was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 15 October 2024 he was convicted at Merseyside Magistrates Court of two counts of the following offence:

- a) Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 13 April 2024, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a)

Mr Johnson provided a statement of facts confirming that he admitted the allegation as set out above and accepted that this is a conviction of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of meeting and response to notice of referral – pages 4 to 14

Section 2: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 16 to 17

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 56

Section 4: Teacher documents – N/A

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 Daniel Johnson on 1 June 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 Johnson for the allegation 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 Johnson was employed by Heygarth Primary School (“the School”) from 1 September 2018 as a teacher. On 23 May 2024 Mr Johnson was arrested for possession of indecent images of children. Mr Johnson was suspended from the school whilst police conducted an investigation. On 10 June 2024 Mr Johnson resigned from his position with immediate effect.

On 8 October 2024 the headteacher of the School referred the case to the TRA.

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:

1. On 15 October 2024 you were convicted at Merseyside Magistrates Court of two counts of the following offence:

a. Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 13 April 2024, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a)

In response to the Notice of Hearing dated Mr Johnson admitted the allegation on 27 February 2025 and provided a statement of agreed facts signed by him on 1 June 2025.

The panel was provided with the certificate of conviction confirming Mr Johnson’s conviction of the alleged offence. This confirms Mr Johnson’s conviction on 15 October 2024 at Liverpool Crown Court of two counts of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children (Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a)).

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the convictions and the facts necessarily implied by the convictions.

The panel was satisfied that the certificate of conviction relates to Mr Johnson.

The panel noted that the certificate of conviction referenced two category B images and one category A image, the latter being the most serious offence in respect of possession of images of children.

The panel noted from the certificate of conviction that Mr Johnson had pleaded guilty.

The panel further noted that the Judge in his sentencing remarks made reference to having been confronted by [REDACTED], he made “*prompt admissions*” [REDACTED] of what had been happening.

The sentencing remarks set out that Mr Johnson’s sentence was a community order for 18 months, 70 hours unpaid work and 35 rehabilitation activity requirement days. Mr Johnson was also subjected to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for 5 years.

The panel considered on the balance of probabilities that the TRA had proved the conviction occurred.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of this proved allegation amounted to 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 first considered whether the conduct of Mr Johnson in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Johnson 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining ... the rule of law ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach,
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the individual’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting because the offence related to making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, as set out in the certificate of conviction. The panel considered that someone prepared to download indecent images of children does not show the requisite level of respect for the safeguarding of children and thus the level of trust that can be placed in him is seriously diminished.

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Johnson'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 Johnson's offences did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment and the Judge's rationale in handing down that decision.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted the Judge's sentencing remarks that stated:

"The circumstances are very far from the typical circumstances which courts hear about relating to the possession of indecent images. It seems that the small number of images here combine with a number of other factors which take this case outside the normal or typical case by some degree. Having been confronted by [REDACTED], you made prompt admissions [REDACTED] of what had been happening; [REDACTED]; that you resigned from your position and your career almost immediately and as soon as matters came to potentially everybody, and you are of course someone of good character and the personal mitigation here is such that it has painted, [REDACTED], a very different picture to that which is typically the case".

Whilst it was noted that there was reference in the documents to [REDACTED], there was no evidence for the panel to determine whether this was a factor at the time of the offences.

[REDACTED]

Whilst the panel considered it was important to take into account that Mr Johnson was open and honest about his misdemeanours and that the images were of a small number, the panel still considered the offence to be extremely serious and also noted that the offence included possession of an image of the most serious category of images of children.

The panel noted that there was reference to Mr Johnson having been the Computing Lead. They found no further evidence of Mr Johnson's teaching proficiency. The panel

found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Johnson'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.

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 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 Johnson, which involved conviction of a relevant offence relating to possession of indecent images of children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of possession of indecent images of children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson in the profession.

There was no evidence provided of Mr Johnson's teaching ability. In any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Johnson in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 Johnson.

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;
- 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;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- actions or behaviours that undermine ... the rule of law...

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 Johnson's actions were not deliberate.

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

There was no evidence to support that Mr Johnson had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The sentencing remarks did state:

“...you are of course someone of good character and the personal mitigation here is such that it has painted, [REDACTED], a very different picture to that which is typically the case”.

The panel considered this indicated that evidence of Mr Johnson’s good character had been provided to the Court however this was not within the evidence before the panel so as to allow the panel to weigh this up.

The panel was of the view that there was limited evidence within the bundle to address Mr Johnson’s insight and remorse. The panel acknowledged that Mr Johnson pleaded guilty in his criminal trial and had admitted his wrongdoing as part of these proceedings, which demonstrated a degree of accountability. Mr Johnson had engaged [REDACTED]. Overall, the panel was not presented with evidence that Mr Johnson demonstrated a high level of insight or remorse that would satisfy them that there was no risk of repetition.

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 would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Johnson 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 Johnson. The seriousness of the offence and its incompatibility with the teaching profession was a significant factor 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 2 years.

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

One of these 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.

Mr Johnson had been convicted of offences relating to such matters.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

There was insufficient evidence before the panel of insight or remorse that would indicate Mr Johnson was sufficiently rehabilitated such that he would not pose a risk of repeating the conduct.

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 the allegation proven and found that the proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Johnson 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining ... the rule of law ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach,

- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding “...*that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils*”.

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 Johnson, 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. The panel has observed, “*In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Johnson, which involved conviction of a relevant offence relating to possession of indecent images of children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of possession of indecent images of children.*” 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 was of the view that there was limited evidence within the bundle to address Mr Johnson’s insight and remorse.*” The panel has also commented “*the panel was not presented with evidence that Mr Johnson demonstrated a high level of insight or remorse that would satisfy them that there was no risk of repetition*”.

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “...*that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Johnson 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 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 Johnson himself. The panel comment *“There was no evidence to support that Mr Johnson had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector”*.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Johnson 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 findings of the seriousness of the proven conduct as well as the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Johnson 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.

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 *“There was insufficient evidence before the panel of insight or remorse that would indicate Mr Johnson was sufficiently rehabilitated such that he would not pose a risk of repeating the conduct”*.

The panel has also considered the Advice,

“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.

One of these 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.*

Mr Johnson had been convicted of offences relating to such matters”.

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.

Taking all of the circumstances into account, I consider that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Daniel Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 'S. Blomfield', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 2 February 2026

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