



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr John Field: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

April 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
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 John Field

Teacher ref number: 0155969

Teacher date of birth: 9 February 1960

TRA reference: 22344

Date of determination: 23 April 2026

Former employer: Woodgate Primary School, Birmingham (the “School”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 23 April 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Field.

The panel members were Ms Charlotte Kelly (lay panellist – in the chair), Miss Amy Howe (teacher panellist) and Mr Robert Della-Sala (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Elizabeth Gilbert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Callum Heywood of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Field was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of hearing dated 3 February 2026.

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

1. On 9 October 2024, he was convicted of 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children.

Mr Field submitted a form dated 12 March 2026 to the TRA in response to the notice of hearing in which he stated that he admitted the allegation and that he admitted that the facts of the allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. However, Mr Field was not present at the hearing. As such, the facts of the allegation and whether his conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence was treated as not admitted by Mr Field.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of hearing and response – pages 4 to 24

Section 2: TRA documents – pages 27 to 61

The panel also received the following additional document, which it decided to admit:

- Mr Field's response to the notice of hearing dated 12 March 2026.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, and the additional document it decided to admit, 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").

Witnesses

No witnesses were called to give oral evidence at the hearing. Mr Field did not give oral evidence at the hearing as he did not attend.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Field was employed at the School from 1 September 2008 until 1 July 2023.

Mr Field was referred to the TRA on 29 June 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation against Mr Field proved, for these reasons:

1. On 9 October 2024, you were convicted of 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children.

Mr Field was not present at the hearing. As such, the allegation was treated as not admitted by Mr Field.

On 28 July 2025, the presenting officer's firm emailed Mr Field seeking confirmation as to whether he accepted the facts of his conviction. Mr Field responded the same day and stated "I have always accepted the facts of my conviction".

Mr Field submitted a form dated 12 March 2026 to the TRA in response to the notice of hearing in which he stated that he admitted the allegations and has admitted his guilt throughout.

The panel was presented with a certificate of conviction from Wolverhampton Crown Court, confirming that Mr Field was convicted on 9 October 2024 of the offence particularised in this allegation.

Mr Field was sentenced on 2 January 2025 to:

- 16 months imprisonment, suspended for 24 months;
- rehabilitation activity requirements for 55 days;
- deprivation of laptop;
- sexual offenders notice for 10 years;
- sexual harm prevention order for 10 years; and

- surcharge of £150.

The panel was presented with the transcript of the sentencing remarks dated 2 January 2025, summarising the offences and the reasons for the sentence imposed.

The panel considered that Mr Field had provided no further evidence to persuade the panel that there were any exceptional circumstances to call into question the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. The panel therefore accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of this offence by Mr Field.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found allegation 1 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - not undermining the rule of law.
- 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, as Mr Field’s conviction relates to indecent photographs of children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public given the harm caused to children by the making of the indecent photographs.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Field'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 Field's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of 16 months imprisonment, albeit that it was suspended for 24 months, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning offences involving making indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of a child, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted the following statements made within Mr Field's sentencing remarks dated 2 January 2025:

- "You have been committed to this court for sentence having admitted your offending at the first available opportunity"
- "The matters that were recovered were eight category A images, five category B and 16 category C images. Those were images physically recovered by the investigating officers, but I note that the facts of this case, which you acknowledged when you were questioned, that you had been viewing such material for a considerable period of time albeit the charges here reflect a period of about four months between the last date in 2022 to Spring of 2023"
- "Your position is obviously compounded by the fact that at the time which correspond with some of your viewing of this material you were engaged as a primary school teacher in the establishment which has been referred to both in the paperwork and in court. There is no suggestion I hasten to add that there was any contact with any child. You would be facing very different charges were that to have been suggested, and there is similarly no suggestion that any of the images relate to any child whose care you were responsible for."

The panel also took into account the following statements within the Police Report dated 17 April 2023, which summarised the evidence in relation to Mr Field's offences:

- "[Mr Field] stated that he was responsible for downloading indecent images of children from the internet, using his laptop computer. He stated that he would use internet search engines for 'teens' and 'jailbait' and explained that he was interested in sexual images of female children aged between approximately 14 and 15. He stated that he also used other methods to source child sexual abuse material, via peer-to-peer networking and the dark web. When asked, [Mr Field]

stated that he had been viewing indecent images of children for approximately five years. He stated that whilst he preferred to view images of teenage girls, he had sometimes downloaded images of younger children being sexually abused, but simply deleted those images that he was not interested in”

- “The victims in the identified child sexual abuse material were aged between approximately 5 to 14 years. The images included some children who were tied with ligatures. All of the images were inaccessible having previously been deleted by the user.”

The panel also considered Mr Field’s response dated 12 March 2026 to the notice of hearing, within which he stated he had undergone various courses “to overcome” his “addictions and obsessions” which Mr Field stated he had done “successfully”. However, the panel noted that no supporting evidence was provided by Mr Field to confirm the courses he had undertaken.

The panel considered Mr Field’s offending behaviour to be extremely serious and grave in light of the police report and sentencing remarks, which stated that Mr Field had actively sought out indecent photographs of children across various categories over a significant period of time.

Whilst the panel took into account that Mr Field had engaged in strategies to prevent his conduct from re-occurring, and that Mr Field had admitted the offences at an early stage within the criminal proceedings and had also admitted his conviction within the TRA’s proceedings, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Field’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 a 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 the light of the panel's findings against Mr Field, which involved a conviction of a relevant offence, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public. The serious findings relating to an offence of making indecent photographs of children raises significant public and child protection concerns.

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 concluded there was not a public interest consideration in retaining Mr Field in the profession. The panel considered the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Field in the profession, given the nature of the allegation in this case, regardless of whether there had been any evidence that Mr Field ought to be regarded as having ability as an educator.

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 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;
- 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; and
- any activity involving making any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents.

Even though 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 Field's actions were deliberate, as he intentionally searched for indecent photographs of children over a prolonged period of time.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Field was acting under extreme duress, such as a physical threat or significant intimidation

There was no evidence of Mr Field having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector.

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

The panel were not provided with any character references regarding Mr Field. As such, the panel did not consider the behaviour to be out of character for Mr Field.

The panel considered there to be a number of aggravating factors in relation to Mr Field's conduct, including:

- the duration of the offending behaviour, which spanned approximately five years of viewing indecent images of children in addition to the four-month period reflected in the charges;
- the severity of the material, which included eight category A images (the most serious category, depicting penetrative sexual activity involving children), five category B images, and 16 category C images;
- the ages of the victims depicted in the material, which included children as young as approximately five years old;

- the nature of the material, which included images of children who were tied with ligatures;
- the deliberate and sustained nature of the offending, as evidenced by Mr Field's use of multiple methods to source child sexual abuse material, including internet search engines, peer-to-peer networking, and the dark web; and
- the use of specific search terms such as "teens" and "jailbait," demonstrating a purposeful and targeted effort to locate indecent photographs of children.

The panel acknowledged that, in his response dated 16 March 2026, Mr Field stated that he had been "successful" in overcoming his "addictions and obsessions" as a result of his attendance on courses. However, the panel was not provided with any independent or corroborative evidence to confirm that Mr Field had in fact attended any such courses, nor any evidence as to the content, duration, or outcomes of those courses, or that his attendance had had any positive impact on his behaviour.

The panel noted that Mr Field had demonstrated a degree of accountability for his actions, having admitted his offending behaviour at the first available opportunity within the criminal proceedings and having admitted the allegation within the TRA's proceedings.

The panel further considered that Mr Field had shown some limited insight and remorse. In his response dated 12 March 2026, he described his behaviour as "unforgivable" and stated that he was taking steps to address it. However, the panel considered that Mr Field's insight remained materially limited, in particular by reason of his failure to acknowledge or engage with the impact of his actions on others, including the children who were the victims of the material he had engaged with.

In light of the absence of any substantive evidence that Mr Field had taken effective steps to address the underlying causes of his behaviour, coupled with the limited insight he had demonstrated regarding the impact of his conduct on victims, the panel determined that there remained a risk of Mr Field repeating his behaviour. The panel was not satisfied that Mr Field had provided any evidence capable of demonstrating that this risk had been adequately addressed or mitigated.

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 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 seriousness of the conduct and the harm caused to children 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 included any activity involving making indecent photograph or indecent pseudo photograph of a child. The panel found these behaviours to be relevant as Mr Field had been convicted of an offence relating to making indecent photographs of children.

Whilst the panel acknowledged that Mr Field had admitted his offending behaviour at an early stage and had expressed a degree of remorse, the panel considered that these mitigating factors were significantly outweighed by the seriousness and duration of the conduct, the deliberate and varied steps taken to source the material, and the nature of the images involved, which included category A images.

The panel further considered that Mr Field's insight into his actions remained materially limited. Although he had described his behaviour as "unforgivable," he had not demonstrated a meaningful understanding of the harm caused to the children depicted in the material he engaged with, nor had he considered the broader consequences of his conduct for the teaching profession and the public's trust in it.

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 those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr John 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - not undermining the rule of law.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Field was relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting and amounts to a relevant offence.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction of possessing indecent images of children which were aged between approximately 5 and 14 years.

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 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. The panel has observed, *“The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public given the harm caused to children by the making of the indecent*

photographs.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows,

“The panel noted that Mr Field had demonstrated a degree of accountability for his actions, having admitted his offending behaviour at the first available opportunity within the criminal proceedings and having admitted the allegation within the TRA’s proceedings.

The panel further considered that Mr Field had shown some limited insight and remorse. In his response dated 12 March 2026, he described his behaviour as “unforgivable” and stated that he was taking steps to address it.”

The panel has also commented *“...that Mr Field’s insight remained materially limited, in particular by reason of his failure to acknowledge or engage with the impact of his actions on others, including the children who were the victims of the material he had engaged with.”*

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel 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 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 Field himself. The panel comment

“There was no evidence of Mr Field having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector.

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

The panel were not provided with any character references regarding Mr Field. As such, the panel did not consider the behaviour to be out of character for Mr Field.”

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 lack of full insight or remorse. The panel has said, *“In light of the absence of any substantive evidence that Mr Field had taken effective steps to address the underlying causes of his behaviour, coupled with the limited insight he had demonstrated regarding the impact of his conduct on victims, the panel determined that there remained a risk of Mr Field repeating his behaviour. The panel was not satisfied that Mr Field had provided any evidence capable of demonstrating that this risk had been adequately addressed or mitigated.”*

I have also placed considerable weight on the seriousness of the proven conduct, including the finding of the panel that Mr Field was in possession of some category A images.

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 remorse or insight, 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 *“...that Mr Field's insight into his actions remained materially limited. Although he had described his behaviour as "unforgivable," he had not demonstrated a meaningful understanding of the harm caused to the children depicted in the material he engaged with, nor had he considered the broader consequences of his conduct for the teaching profession and the public's trust in it.”*

I have considered whether allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct and the limited insight demonstrated by Mr Field.

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 John 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 allegation 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 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 cursive script, appearing to read 'S. Blomfield'.

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 24 April 2026

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