



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Jamie Cranfield: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

March 2026

Contents

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

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

Teacher: Mr Jamie Cranfield

TRA reference: 24997

Date of determination: 24 March 2026

Former employer: The Peterborough School, Peterborough

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 24 March 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Jamie Cranfield.

The panel members were Mrs Shelley Barlow-Ward (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist) and Mr Jonathan Wettreich (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Nicholas West 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 Cranfield that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Cranfield 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 Cranfield or any representative for Mr Cranfield.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 15 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Cranfield had been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On, or around, 17 August 2024, he was convicted at Huntingdon Magistrates' Court for the following offence:
 - a. Drive motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit

Mr Cranfield admitted the allegation and further admitted that the offence for which he was convicted was a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Cranfield on 6 November 2025.

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 – pages 6 to 25

Section 2: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 26 to 34

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 37 to 173

Section 4: Teacher Documents – pages 176 to 198

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 May 2020, (the 'Procedures').

Statement of Agreed Facts

The panel considered a Statement of Agreed Facts which was signed by Mr Cranfield on 6 November 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 7 November 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 Cranfield 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 Cranfield commenced work as a self-employed peripatetic teacher of music at The Peterborough School ('the School') on 1 January 2012.

At around 8pm on 15 August 2024, Mr Cranfield was driving and was involved in a collision with another vehicle. He was breathalysed in custody and blew 122 micrograms of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath.

On 17 August 2024, Mr Cranfield pleaded guilty at Huntingdon Magistrates' Court to driving a motor vehicle when his alcohol level was above the limit. On 18 September 2024, he was sentenced to 18 weeks' imprisonment suspended for 18 months, an obligatory 36 months driving disqualification and a rehabilitation activity requirement. In addition, he had to pay prosecution costs and a victim surcharge.

On 10 January 2025, 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 allegation against you proved, for these reasons:

1. On, or around, 17 August 2024, you were convicted at Huntingdon Magistrates' Court for the following offence:

a. Drive motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit

The panel considered the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by Mr Cranfield on 6 November 2025. In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Cranfield admitted the particulars of allegation 1 and further admitted that the facts of the allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

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 any exceptional circumstances applicable in this case.

The panel had been provided with an unsigned copy of the certificate of conviction from Huntingdon Magistrates' Court, which detailed that Mr Cranfield had been convicted on 17 August 2024 of driving a motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit. The panel noted that Mr Cranfield pleaded guilty to this offence and this was supported by the Statement of Agreed Facts that he had signed.

The panel noted documentary evidence which confirmed that Mr Cranfield was sentenced on 18 September 2024 to a prison sentence of 18 weeks suspended for 18 months, an obligatory 36 months driving disqualification and a rehabilitation activity requirement. In particular, the panel noted an [REDACTED], meeting notes between Mr Cranfield and the School dated 7 January 2025, a Police National Computer record printout dated 3 February 2025 and a letter from [REDACTED] dated 29 April 2025, all of which mentioned his sentencing.

After examining the documents before the panel and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1 was proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel noted that in the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Cranfield admitted that the facts of the allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law

The panel considered whether Mr Cranfield's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children, and working in an education setting. Although the offence took place outside of Mr Cranfield's working hours, the panel considered that it nevertheless touched upon his role as a teacher because of his influential role working with young people.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety of members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Cranfield'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 Cranfield's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed.

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

This was a case concerning a serious driving offence, in particular involving alcohol, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered that Mr Cranfield had committed a serious driving offence, having been almost five times over the legal alcohol limit, and he had been involved in a collision with another vehicle. The panel's view was that this was not a minor driving offence as a result of these aggravating factors.

The panel took into account the character reference letters provided by Mr Cranfield, taking particular note of the references from Mr Cranfield's colleagues including his head of department which praised his professionalism, responsibility and commitment to the teaching profession.

[REDACTED].

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Cranfield'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 finding 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 protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Cranfield, which involved a serious driving offence involving alcohol, there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of members of the public and the public confidence in the profession.

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

The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining Mr Cranfield in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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

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...;
- 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.

The panel considered that Mr Cranfield's actions were deliberate, even though he was under the influence of alcohol at the material time of committing the offence.

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

The panel noted the significant mitigation from Mr Cranfield in his written statement and character references which explained why his behaviour and decision making may have been adversely impacted at the material time.

Mr Cranfield did have a previously good history, having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel accepted that the incident was out of character.

The panel saw no evidence that showed Mr Cranfield was previously subject to any disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

The panel was provided with evidence to attest to Mr Cranfield's history and ability as a teacher. Mr Cranfield provided four written character references, and the panel paid particular note to the comments set out below:

- Individual A,[REDACTED]
 - *"I overhear Jamie teach expertly and calmly; he gives warm praise where it is due and his pupils value him immensely...It would be a huge shame if he were unable to continue sharing and passing on his talent to those eager to learn from him"*

- Individual B, [REDACTED]:
 - *“I believe that Jamie is an asset to the teaching profession. He has shown dedication and commitment over many years to teaching and playing the guitar and has given so much to his students over the years.”*
- Individual C, [REDACTED]:
 - *“Jamie is an integral part of our team; we hope that he will continue to be so for many years to come. He would be very difficult to replace.”*
- Individual D, [REDACTED]
 - *“Jamie has proven to be a valued colleague, consistently supporting his fellow teachers and demonstrating diligence as a motivational guitar teacher... He consistently prioritized the needs of his pupils and collaborated effectively with colleagues. He is a valued member of staff by staff and pupils”*

The panel also noted that in Mr Cranfield’s statement, he expressed regret and remorse stating, *“I’m still disgusted and ashamed of myself and I realise it was a very serious offence. It’s on my mind 24/7”* readily acknowledging his error of judgement. He also recognised the impact of his actions stating, *“I felt extreme guilt and felt I’d ruined my life, career and shamed my family. It could of also been so much worse. I still have nightmares about it now ten months on”* and *“I understand fully that the third party in the vehicle must have been very distressed which I feel absolutely terrible about”*.

The panel noted that [REDACTED] also commented that Mr Cranfield *“has completed victim awareness courses under probation to understand the importance of his offending behaviour, which he has presented very remorseful for”*, adding that he has also *“attended rehab and fully engaged and complied”* with his rehabilitation programme.

The panel noted that Mr Cranfield voluntarily attended [REDACTED]. The panel considered documentary evidence confirming that Mr Cranfield had successfully completed the [REDACTED] between 10 October 2024 and 30 October 2024. [REDACTED]

The panel considered that Mr Cranfield has showed significant insight into his actions. His written statement confirmed he has support from his rehabilitation provider to avoid similar behaviours in the future, as well as *“great family support”* from his parents and support from the School.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Having considered the significant mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case.

The panel was of the view that publication of the adverse findings was a less intrusive measure available. Taking all of the circumstances into account, the panel decided that the public interest considerations weighed in favour of retaining Mr Cranfield in the profession. The fact that Mr Cranfield appears to have continued working as a teacher at the School throughout these proceedings has been a significant factor in forming that opinion. The documentary evidence suggests that Mr Cranfield has been honest and transparent with the School about the nature of these proceedings, and the School spoke about him in glowing terms. The panel considered that prohibition would not produce any material change or serve any useful purpose.

The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to Mr Cranfield as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of sanction.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found the allegation 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 Jamie Cranfield should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the finding of a relevant conviction should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law

The finding of misconduct is serious as it involves a conviction for driving a motor vehicle when the alcohol level was above the limit, which resulted in a suspended custodial sentence.

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 Cranfield, 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:

“The panel considered whether Mr Cranfield’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children, and working in an education setting. Although the offence took place outside of Mr Cranfield’s working hours, the panel considered that it nevertheless touched upon his role as a teacher because of his influential role working with young people.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety of 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. The panel has noted that Mr Cranfield expressed regret and remorse in his statement. It has also noted that Mr Cranfield has completed a victim awareness course, engaged and complied with his rehabilitation programme, and completed an addiction recovery programme. The panel has observed:

“The panel considered that Mr Cranfield has showed significant insight into his actions. His written statement confirmed he has support from his rehabilitation provider to avoid similar behaviours in the future, as well as “*great family support*” from his parents and support from the School.”

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:

“The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Cranfield’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.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for a serious driving offence involving alcohol 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 Cranfield himself. The panel has commented:

“Mr Cranfield did have a previously good history, having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel accepted that the incident was out of character.”

The panel has also noted 4 written character references which attested to Mr Cranfield’s ability as a teacher.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Cranfield 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 on the significant mitigating factors. Although the panel considered that Mr Cranfield’s actions were deliberate and that there was no evidence to suggest that he was acting under extreme duress, the panel has noted:

“[REDACTED].”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding that Mr Cranfield had shown remorse for, and significant insight into, his actions and that he had taken positive steps to address his behaviour.

I have also taken account of the panel's comment:

"Taking all of the circumstances into account, the panel decided that the public interest considerations weighed in favour of retaining Mr Cranfield in the profession. The fact that Mr Cranfield appears to have continued working as a teacher at the School throughout these proceedings has been a significant factor in forming that opinion. The documentary evidence suggests that Mr Cranfield has been honest and transparent with the School about the nature of these proceedings, and the School spoke about him in glowing terms."

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 26 March 2026

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