



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Arran Johnson: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

February 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	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	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

Teacher:	Mr Arran Johnson
Teacher ref number:	1988438
Teacher date of birth:	06 July 1996
TRA reference:	21362
Date of determination:	18 February 2026
Former employer:	The Victory Academy, Kent

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 18 February 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Johnson.

The panel members were Ms Sue Davis (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Erin Sudds (teacher panellist) and Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Samantha Cass 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 Johnson that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Johnson 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, Mr Johnson or any representative for Mr Johnson.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

Allegations

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

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

On 18 June 2024 he was convicted at North Kent Magistrates Court of:

1. 3 counts of making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 4 August 2022 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a)
2. Possessing prohibited images of children on 4 August 2022 contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s. 62 (1)
3. Possessing extreme pornographic images of intercourse/oral sex with dead/alive animal on 4 August 2022 contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s. 63 (1) (7) (d).

Mr Johnson admitted to allegations 1, 2 and 3 in his Statement of Agreed Facts which he signed on 10 September 2025 and in his response to the Notice of Referral which was signed and dated 27 March 2025. Mr Johnson also admitted that those facts amounted to 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 referral form, statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 4 to 16

Section 2: TRA documents – pages 18 to 76

Section 3: Teacher's response – pages 78 to 79

The panel also had sight of the notice of meeting dated 14 November 2025.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Mr Johnson's plea in mitigation; and
- Mr Johnson's probation officer's correspondence regarding a request for privacy.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the 2020 Procedures.

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Johnson on 10 September 2025 and signed by the presenting officer on 22 September 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 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.

On 1 September 2020, Mr Johnson commenced his employment at Victory Academy (the "School") as a teacher.

On 4 August 2022, Mr Johnson was interviewed by the police within which interview he disclosed that he had been in possession of indecent images of children. [REDACTED].

As part of the process, the police seized Mr Johnson's phone, laptop and school laptop.

On 12 August 2022, Mr Johnson had a meeting with the principal of the School and disclosed that he had been in possession of indecent images of children on his phone and laptop.

On 26 October 2022, Mr Johnson's employment with the School was terminated.

On 19 December 2022, the matter was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against Mr Johnson proved, for these reasons:

On 18 June 2024 he was convicted at North Kent Magistrates Court of:

1. 3 counts of making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 4 August 2022 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a)

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Johnson on 10 September 2025. In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Johnson admitted the particulars of allegation 1 and accepted that his conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel had been provided with a certificate of conviction from Medway Magistrates’ Court which set out that on 18 June 2024, Mr Johnson was convicted of 3 counts of making indecent photograph/ pseudo-photograph of a child.

Mr Johnson was committed for sentence at Maidstone Crown Court on 1 January 2027 and placed on unconditional bail. He was required to register with the police in accordance with the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Following examination of the documents before it, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1 was proven.

2. Possessing prohibited images of children on 4 August 2022 contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s. 62 (1)

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Johnson on 10 September 2025. In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Johnson admitted the particulars of allegation 2 and accepted that his conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel had been provided with a certificate of conviction from Medway Magistrates Court which set out that on 18 June 2024, Mr Johnson was convicted of possessing a prohibited image of a child.

Mr Johnson was committed for sentence at Maidstone Crown Court on 1 January 2027 and placed on unconditional bail.

Following examination of the documents before it, the panel was satisfied that allegation 2 was proven.

3. Possessing extreme pornographic images of intercourse/oral sex with dead/alive animal on 4 August 2022 contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s. 63 (1) (7) (d).

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Johnson on 10 September 2025. In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Johnson admitted the particulars of allegation 3 and accepted that his conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel had been provided with a certificate of conviction from Medway Magistrates' Court which set out that on 18 June 2024, Mr Johnson was convicted of possessing extreme pornographic image/ images portraying an act of intercourse/ oral sex with a dead/alive animal.

Mr Johnson was committed for sentence at Maidstone Crown Court on 1 January 2027 and placed on unconditional bail.

Following examination of the documents before it, the panel was satisfied that allegation 3 was proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to 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

- 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
- not undermining...the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks including Keeping Children Safe in Education (“KCSIE”) 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. The panel considered the investigation meeting notes dated 6 October 2022 which recorded Mr Johnson stating that he understood his behaviour was a significant breach of various policies because of “*the current age range*” that he taught, as well as the nature of the media he was found in possession with.

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Johnson’s behaviour in committing the offences 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 was committed for sentence at Maidstone Crown Court on unconditional bail and was required to register with the police in accordance with the Sexual Offences Act 2003, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences that Mr Johnson had committed.

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

This case included offences involving activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, which the Advice states are likely to be considered relevant offences.

The panel noted that the Advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other offences that panels consider to be “a relevant offence”. This case also concerned an offence involving possessing extreme pornographic images of intercourse/oral sex with a dead/alive animal. The panel considered the offence to be a relevant offence given the

nature of the offence and that it inherently demonstrated a serious risk that Mr Johnson posed in relation to the safety of the children and members of the public.

The panel took into account the investigation meeting notes dated 6 October 2022 which recorded the School's principal [REDACTED]. Mr Johnson had said that he was provided links which led to images of child pornography. Mr Johnson had stated that he did not find himself sexually attracted to the subjects of the images, and that he could [REDACTED] in those images which caused him to continue to return to the images. Mr Johnson had also described [REDACTED].

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 these convictions were 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; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Johnson, which involved being convicted of offences of making indecent images of children, possessing prohibited images of children and possession of extreme pornographic images of intercourse/oral sex with dead/alive animals, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making and possessing inappropriate 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 was 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 Mr Johnson in the profession. 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....
- 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;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- actions or behaviours that...undermine...the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance...;

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. On the contrary, Mr Johnson had made indecent images and repeatedly and intentionally accessed images for which he had been convicted and the panel considered that his actions were therefore deliberate.

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

The panel did not have sight of sufficient evidence demonstrating Mr Johnson's teaching record. The panel therefore could not determine Mr Johnson's ability as an educator and whether or not he had made an exceptional contribution to the profession.

The panel noted that Mr Johnson admitted the offences on several occasions, entered guilty pleas and did not dispute the factual basis of the convictions. The panel also noted that Mr Johnson had stated that [REDACTED] and that he claimed this was relevant to the behaviour for which he was convicted.

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 volume of images involved with Mr Johnson's repeated misconduct 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 includes 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.

The panel noted that the offences for which Mr Johnson was convicted were of a serious nature.

The panel noted that Mr Johnson had demonstrated a level of insight and remorse, in particular with regards the content of his plea in mitigation and had engaged with a number of rehabilitation and health services in respect of his behaviour. Notwithstanding this, the panel found that the offences were so serious that a review period would not be appropriate.

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 a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Arran 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
 - 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
 - not undermining...the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...

- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks including Keeping Children Safe in Education (“KCSIE”) which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Johnson involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for the relevant offence of 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 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 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 and possessing inappropriate 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 has set out as follows:

“The panel noted that Mr Johnson had demonstrated a level of insight and remorse, in particular with regards the content of his plea in mitigation and had engaged with a number of rehabilitation and health services in respect of his behaviour.”

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 has observed:

“Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Johnson was not

treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of making and possessing indecent images 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 Johnson himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel did not have sight of sufficient evidence demonstrating Mr Johnson’s teaching record. The panel therefore could not determine Mr Johnson’s ability as an educator and whether or not he had made an exceptional contribution to the profession.”

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 comments concerning the seriousness of the misconduct found proven. The panel has said:

“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 these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.”

The panel has also said:

“There was no evidence that Mr Johnson’s actions were not deliberate. On the contrary, Mr Johnson had made indecent images and repeatedly and intentionally accessed images for which he had been convicted and the panel considered that his actions were therefore deliberate.”

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. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, 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 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 includes 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.

The panel noted that the offences for which Mr Johnson was convicted were of a serious nature.

The panel noted that Mr Johnson had demonstrated a level of insight and remorse, in particular with regards the content of his plea in mitigation and had engaged with a number of rehabilitation and health services in respect of his behaviour. Notwithstanding this, the panel found that the offences were so serious that a review period would not be appropriate."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response 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 Johnson was convicted and the potential damage to the public's perception of the teaching profession.

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 Arran 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 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 20 February 2026

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