



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Timothy Fenn: Professional conduct panel meeting 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
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
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 Timothy Fenn

Teacher ref number: 4070960

Teacher date of birth: 14 September 1999

TRA reference: 21121

Date of determination: 29 April 2026

Former employer: Orminston New Academy, Wolverhampton

Introduction

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

The panel members were Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Scott Evans (lay panellist) and Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan 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 Fenn that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Fenn 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 Jack Gardner, or Mr Fenn.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 13 January 2026.

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

1. On 3 February 2025, he was convicted of three counts of making an indecent photograph and/or pseudo-photograph of a child, for which he was sentenced at Wolverhampton Crown Court on 7 May 2025.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of Referral and response – pages 6 to 14

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 15 to 17

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 18 to 155

Section 5: Notice of Meeting – pages 156 to 157

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Statement of Agreed Facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Fenn on 24 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 Fenn 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 Fenn commenced employment as a Teacher of Maths at Orminston New Academy ('The School') in September 2021. On 26 September 2022, he was arrested on suspicion of being in possession of indecent images; he was suspended from his role at The School on the same day. The School conducted an investigation into Mr Fenn from 11-23 January 2023. On 3 February 2025, Mr Fenn entered pleas of guilty in relation to three separate charges of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-photograph of children, contrary to s1(a) of the Protection of Children Act at Dudley Magistrates' Court. Mr Fenn was sentenced for these offences on 7 May 2025 at Wolverhampton Crown Court.

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:

You have been convicted of a relevant offence, at any time, in that:

- 1. On 3 February 2025, you were convicted of three counts of making an indecent photograph and/or pseudo-photograph of a child, for which you were sentenced at Wolverhampton Crown Court on 7 May 2025.**

The panel confirmed that it had sight of a Certificate of Conviction, demonstrating that Mr Fenn was convicted for three counts of making an indecent photograph and/or pseudo-photograph of a child, and that he was sentenced for this on 7 May 2025. The panel considered the Certificate of Conviction to be conclusive proof of the conviction. In addition, it had sight of other supporting material, including a transcript of the sentencing hearing, which further confirmed the position. It also recognised that Mr Fenn made full admissions to the allegation within the statement of agreed facts.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 1 proved.

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.

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 Fenn, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Fenn 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values..., 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 which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Fenn’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. Notably, his conviction directly concerned the consumption of media that directly involved the abuse of children. It considered that consuming material of this nature was directly contributing to the industrial mistreatment and harm of children and was directly contrary to the expectations that are held in relation to a teacher; teachers are expected to be alert to the dangers of abuse of children at all times, and material of this nature is contrary to that.

The panel also noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public, due to its inherent nature.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Fenn'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 Fenn'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 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, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

Although the panel found that Mr Fenn had taken rehabilitative steps following the conviction, it determined that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Fenn's ongoing suitability to teach. It had particular regard to the sentencing remarks and noted that the judge commented "I am satisfied also that you present a risk of sexual harm to the public or particular members of the public". Whilst it recognised that it may have different considerations before it than the judge, it considered that these remarks were particularly notable when considering the conviction against Mr Fenn's suitability to teach. It also had regard to the fact that the sentencing remarks made it evident that the offending behaviour took place over the period of a year and included a high volume of indecent images, with over 141 Category A images, including media depicting the sexual abuse of children who appeared to have been drugged.

The panel accordingly 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 protection of pupils and other members of the public
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Fenn, which involved the consumption, possession and making of a high volume of indecent images, all of the public interest considerations as above were engaged.

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and other members of the public, given the serious findings pertaining to the abuse of children. It noted that the judge stated "The impact upon the wider community as a result of sexual offending is the perpetual abuse of children and your involvement in this sort of offending contributes to this and that is why the public and the court treat these offences so serious" within the sentencing remarks, which it considered to directly reflect the significance of the public interest concern.

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

The panel considered that Mr Fenn was a new teacher and therefore, there was limited scope to explore his abilities as an educator; regardless it noted that his abilities as a teacher had not been brought into question. However, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Fenn in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standards of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 Fenn.

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;
- sexual misconduct
- 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;
- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

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 it saw no evidence that Mr Fenn's actions were not deliberate. It also saw no indication that he was acting under duress. It did however note that he was previously of good character and had not been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings prior to this matter. It however had been provided with no indication as to his level of insight or remorse as to his offending behaviour.

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 Fenn 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 Fenn. The seriousness of the offence, and the lack of any indication of insight or remorse, were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 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.

These include:

- serious sexual misconduct
- any sexual misconduct involving a child;
- 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 considered that all of these were engaged due to the fact that Mr Fenn's offending behaviour concerned child sexual abuse images and that this was serious in nature.

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.

The panel noted that Mr Fenn had provided no representations beyond the Statement of Agreed Facts. It therefore saw no recognition of the harm caused by his offending behaviour, or any indication that he had insight, or any remorse. It noted that within the judge's sentencing remarks, reference was made to the probation report stating that Mr Fenn had a "high level of victim empathy", however it considered that it could place no

weight on this, having not been provided with any representations to this effect. It also noted that per the sentencing remarks, Mr Fenn appeared to be undertaking some rehabilitative steps post-conviction to address his behaviour. However, in the absence of any update, or any reflection from Mr Fenn, the panel was not satisfied that there was no risk of repetition in relation to his behaviour. It considered this particularly notable when considered against the serious nature of the offending and the fact that the behaviour occurred at the expense of children. The fact that reference was made to Mr Fenn being “a high sexual risk to children” was therefore particularly relevant when determining what the appropriate and proportionate order would be in this particular case.

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.

The panel accordingly made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order is made with no provision for a review.

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 of 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 Timothy Fenn should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Fenn 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

- not undermining fundamental British values..., 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 which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Fenn, “...were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. Notably, his conviction directly concerned the consumption of media that directly involved the abuse of children.”

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Fenn amounted to a relevant offence.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding that Mr Fenn was convicted of a relevant offence in relation to possessing indecent images 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 Fenn, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “It considered that consuming material of this nature was directly contributing to the industrial mistreatment and harm of children and was directly contrary to the expectations that are held in relation to a teacher; teachers are expected to be alert to the dangers of abuse of children at all times, and material of this nature is contrary to that.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The panel considered that it saw no evidence that Mr Fenn’s actions were not deliberate. It also saw no indication that he was acting under duress. It did however note that he was previously of good character and had not been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings prior to this matter. It however had been provided with no indication as to his level of insight or remorse as to his offending behaviour.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence 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, “...*the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Fenn were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.*”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for the possession of 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 Fenn himself. The panel comment “*The panel considered that Mr Fenn was a new teacher and therefore, there was limited scope to explore his abilities as an educator; regardless it noted that his abilities as a teacher had not been brought into question.*”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Fenn 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 seriousness of the conduct and the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said,

“The panel noted that Mr Fenn had provided no representations beyond the Statement of Agreed Facts. It therefore saw no recognition of the harm caused by his offending behaviour, or any indication that he had insight, or any remorse. It noted that within the judge’s sentencing remarks, reference was made to the probation report stating that Mr Fenn had a “high level of victim empathy”, however it considered that it could place no weight on this, having not been provided with any representations to this effect. It also noted that per the sentencing remarks, Mr Fenn appeared to be undertaking some rehabilitative steps post-conviction to

address his behaviour. However, in the absence of any update, or any reflection from Mr Fenn, the panel was not satisfied that there was no risk of repetition in relation to his behaviour.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction, to the contribution that Mr Fenn 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 evidence of 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 “...reference was made to Mr Fenn being “a high sexual risk to children” was therefore particularly relevant when determining what the appropriate and proportionate order would be in this particular case.”

The panel has also said 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.”

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 lack of evidence of insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Timothy Fenn 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 Fenn 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 Fenn 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 that reads "S. Blomfield". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "S" and a distinct "B".

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 30 April 2026

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