



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Benjamin Woodvine: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mr Benjamin Woodvine

Teacher ref number: 1681473

Teacher date of birth: 7 April 1993

TRA reference: 24459

Date of determination: 14 August 2026

Former employer: Sutton School, Dudley

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 14 August 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Benjamin Woodvine.

The panel members were Mr Dara Islam (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Rachel Curry (lay panellist) and Mr Benjamin Drouet (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Madison Taylor 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 Benjamin Woodvine that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Benjamin Woodvine 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, Ms Carolyn Thackstone of Browne Jacobson LLP, Mr Woodvine or any representative of Mr Woodvine.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 4 August 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Woodvine was guilty of having been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 5 August 2025, he was convicted of six offences of making indecent photographs/ pseudo photographs of a child between 14.06.2013 and 17.07.2024.

Mr Woodvine admitted the allegation, including that the offences for which he was convicted were relevant offences, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Woodvine on 4 July 2026.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of referral and response – pages 4 to 17

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 19 to 22

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 25 to 121

Section 4: Teacher's documents – pages 124 to 137

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

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 Woodvine on 4 July 2026 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 7 July 2026.

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 Woodvine 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 2 October 2023, Mr Woodvine commenced employment as a Class Teacher at Sutton School ('the School').

On 17 July 2024, Mr Woodvine was arrested at the School and interviewed by police under caution for viewing, possessing and/or distributing indecent images.

On 6 September 2024, Mr Woodvine was suspended from his role at the School and was subsequently dismissed from his role on 3 October 2024. The matter was referred to the TRA on the same date.

On 5 August 2025, Mr Woodvine pled guilty to, and was convicted at Wolverhampton Crown Court of, six counts of making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child between 14 June 2013 and 17 July 2024.

On 17 September 2025, at Wolverhampton Crown Court, Mr Woodvine was sentenced, with terms including a community order, sexual harm prevention order, statutory surcharge and payment of costs.

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 5 August 2025, you were convicted of six offences of making indecent photographs / pseudo photographs of a child between 14.06.2013 and 17.07.2024.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, in which Mr Woodvine admitted the allegation 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 document ('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 had sight of a certificate of conviction from Wolverhampton Crown Court, which detailed that Mr Woodvine had, upon his own confession, been convicted on 5 August 2025 of six counts of making indecent photographs / pseudo photographs of a child between 14.06.2013 and 17.07.2024.

The panel did not find any exceptional circumstances applicable in this case. It therefore accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

The panel noted evidence in the bundle produced as part of the School's investigation which confirmed that Mr Woodvine had accepted the facts of the allegation "when questioned by the police on 17/7/24" and "also [...] on 6/9/24 when questioned as part of the School's Disciplinary Process".

As well as the certificate of conviction, the panel also had sight of the sentencing remarks made by the recorder during their sentencing of Mr Woodvine on 17 September 2025 at Wolverhampton Crown Court.

Mr Woodvine was sentenced to a community order which consisted of the following conditions: participation in the Building Choices Programme for 26 days; an unpaid work requirement for 200 hours to be completed within 12 months; a rehabilitation activity requirement for a maximum of 30 days; forfeiture and destruction of mobile phones; and, ordered to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 5 years.

Mr Woodvine was also subject to a sexual harm prevention order, which included conditions requiring him to: use only internet-enabled devices that are available for police inspection and capable of retaining and displaying internet history; make any home broadband router available for inspection on request; not delete any internet usage history; make any device capable of storing digital images available for inspection; make any remote electronic storage (cloud storage) available for inspection and provide any associated passwords; permit the installation of risk management software on any device capable of accessing the internet; not tamper with, remove, bypass, disable or alter any such software or its settings; not install an additional operating system on any device without authorisation from the local public protection unit; not use the internet to contact or attempt to contact any child under the age of 18; not have unsupervised contact with any child under the age of 18 other than incidental contact arising in the course of daily life or where the child's parent or guardian, having knowledge of his convictions, had obtained written consent from children's social services; and not reside in the same household as a child under the age of 18 without the written approval of children's social services.

A statutory surcharge and costs were also ordered.

Having considered the admitted facts, and the supporting evidence including the certificate of conviction and sentencing remarks, the panel found the allegation 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 Advice.

The panel noted paragraph 32, which confirmed that an offence can be considered relevant even if it did not involve misconduct in the course of teaching. That paragraph also sets out that the panel should consider all the facts of the case, providing a list of suggested considerations. The panel considered the following to be relevant to Mr Woodvine's actions, in that the panel found those actions:

- were contrary to the standards of personal and professional conduct expected of a teacher, with reference to the Teachers' Standards;
- were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting;
- would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession if the teacher were allowed to continue teaching.

In respect of whether Mr Woodvine's conduct was contrary to the standards of personal and professional conduct expected of a teacher, the panel considered that, by reference to Part 2 of the Teachers' Standards, Mr Woodvine 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;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel considered that, by committing criminal offences, Mr Woodvine had undermined the fundamental British value of the rule of law.

The panel noted evidence in the bundle produced as part of the School's investigation, in which it was specifically put to Mr Woodvine that he had breached the School's practices and policies. Examples of relevant parts of those policies included:

- the School's Guidance for Safer Working Practices: "All staff have a responsibility to maintain public confidence in their ability to safeguard the welfare and best interests of children. They should adopt high standards of personal conduct in order to maintain confidence and respect of the general public and those with whom they work. This means staff should not: behave in a manner which would lead any reasonable person to question their suitability to work with children or to act as an appropriate role model."
- the School's Staff Code of Conduct: "It includes that Safeguarding is everyone's responsibility to protect children, young people and adults at risk. In addition, that you will comply and follow council policies and procedures at all times."

During the School's investigation, Mr Woodvine accepted that he had breached these policies and practices. The panel considered this to be compelling evidence which demonstrated a failure on Mr Woodvine's part to have "proper and professional regard" to the policies and practices of the school in which he taught.

The panel had regard to Keeping Children Safe in Education 2023 and noted that Mr Woodvine's conviction engaged a number of fundamental safeguarding principles underpinning that guidance. In particular, the panel considered that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility and that all adults working with children share responsibility for promoting their welfare and protecting them from harm.

The panel noted the importance of protecting children from neglect, abuse and exploitation, and the expectation that those entrusted with their care will act in a manner consistent with that objective.

Further, the panel considered that the conduct proven was relevant to Mr Woodvine's suitability to work with children and to teach and that standards of staff conduct are themselves a safeguarding matter, given the critical role that teachers play in maintaining safe environments for children.

The panel considered that these principles were all engaged by the circumstances of the conviction, and that in breaching these principles, Mr Woodvine had failed to act within the statutory frameworks which set out his professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Woodvine's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting insofar as it had found that he had been convicted of making indecent photographs/pseudo photographs of a child. The panel considered that this conduct perpetuated the exploitation of children, which is specifically relevant to teachers and Mr Woodvine, who worked in an alternative education

environment specifically for children who were unable to go through traditional education. The panel noted that Mr Woodvine not only worked as a teacher, with children in an education setting, he also did so in connection with children who could reasonably be viewed as having additional vulnerabilities due to the unique nature of the School.

The panel considered that the behaviour involved in committing the offence had an impact on the safety or security of members of the public.

The panel took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Woodvine's behaviour in committing the offences could seriously and legitimately affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel recognised that the public would not consider it acceptable for a teacher to access the types of indecent materials Mr Woodvine had accessed.

The panel noted that Mr Woodvine's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which could potentially be taken as indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel 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.

The panel noted Mr Woodvine's admission in the agreed statement of agreed facts that the offences constituted relevant offences.

The panel found no material evidence of any mitigating circumstances in Mr Woodvine's case.

The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was clearly relevant to Mr Woodvine'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 found, in connection with the offences listed in the allegation as found proven, that Mr Woodvine had been convicted of relevant offences.

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. The panel recognised that 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: 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 Woodvine, which related to his conviction for six offences of making indecent photographs/ pseudo-photographs of a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Woodvine 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 Woodvine 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 Woodvine in the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations set out above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Woodvine 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 it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Woodvine.

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 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.

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 guidance in the Advice relating to mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Woodvine's actions were not deliberate, there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Woodvine was acting under extreme duress, such as the presence of a physical threat or significant intimidation, nor had Mr Woodvine demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Accordingly, the panel did not consider any of the mitigating factors set out in the Advice to be applicable in this case.

In considering whether Mr Woodvine had demonstrated insight into his conduct, the panel noted references in the sentencing remarks relating to Mr Woodvine [REDACTED] courses in respect of his offences. The panel noted the Recorder's comment that Mr Woodvine had "*taken steps to try and help with your interest in children*". The panel recognised that Mr Woodvine had voluntarily elected to undertake at least one course to try to address his mindset.

The panel noted that Mr Woodvine had pled guilty at the earliest opportunity during the criminal justice process and had accepted the allegations at the earliest opportunity during the police investigation, School's investigation and as part of these TRA proceedings.

Ultimately, the panel had no meaningful evidence before it to demonstrate that the action Mr Woodvine had undertaken had given positive results of rehabilitation and/or development of strategies to help him cope with his sexual predilections. The panel noted that the recorder was satisfied that Mr Woodvine was taking positive steps to try and deal with his offending behaviour, but the panel had no evidence before it to reach a finding in respect of the outcome of those steps.

In considering whether Mr Woodvine had shown remorse for his actions, while the panel noted that his guilty plea implied an element of feeling guilt for the conduct, it concluded that it had not had sight of any substantive expression of remorse or reflection by Mr Woodvine for his actions. While he plainly accepted that he had committed these acts and recognised that those acts were wrong, the panel had not had sight of any specific evidence to meaningfully demonstrate remorse.

The panel found limited evidence of insight and no material evidence of remorse on the part of Mr Woodvine.

The panel considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, and specifically 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 Woodvine of prohibition. The panel did not consider that a recommendation that an individual convicted of crimes of this nature should not be prohibited from teaching children would serve the public interest or maintain public confidence in the profession.

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 Woodvine. 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 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.

This 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 Mr Woodvine's case involved conduct falling within the above category of the Advice. The panel also noted these were exceptionally serious offences involving indecent material of children.

The panel noted the Recorder's comment that the images underpinning Mr Woodvine's conviction were 9 category A images, 14 category B images and 14 category C images. The panel recognised that category A images constituted the most serious types of indecent images, and that while category B and category C images necessarily decrease in perceived seriousness by nature of the categorisation scale itself, these images would still have been serious. Mr Woodvine had been found to have been in possession of multiple images within each category.

The panel also noted the recorder's comments that aggravating factors in Mr Woodvine's case included the "ages of the children in this case and the fact that there was a moving image".

The panel acknowledged the seriousness of these offences and specifically noted that these were not victimless crimes. The images Mr Woodvine had accessed existed because children had been harmed. The panel considered this was an inescapable fact. Mr Woodvine's engagement in and tacit endorsement of harm being caused to children in this way were wholly incompatible with him working as a teacher.

The Advice 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 considered the risk of repetition by Mr Woodvine. The panel recognised that Mr Woodvine was subject to a number of sentencing requirements which could facilitate rehabilitation and minimise the risk of repetition of behaviour of this type. The panel further recognised Mr Woodvine's voluntary completion of [REDACTED] courses beyond his sentencing requirements.

The panel also noted the time span within the conviction, being 2013 to 2024. The panel considered this to be a significant period of time and contextualised this with the evidence in the bundle that Mr Woodvine had accessed pornography [REDACTED].

The panel concluded it would pose an exceptionally high risk to children if Mr Woodvine were permitted to continue to teach, given what the panel considered to be ongoing issues posed by his sexual predilections.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Woodvine 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;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Woodvine 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 involve a conviction for six offences of making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child.

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 Woodvine, 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:

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Woodvine, which related to his conviction for six offences of making indecent photographs/ pseudo-photographs of a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.”

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:

“Ultimately, the panel had no meaningful evidence before it to demonstrate that the action Mr Woodvine had undertaken had given positive results of rehabilitation and/or development of strategies to help him cope with his sexual predilections. The panel noted that the recorder was satisfied that Mr Woodvine was taking positive steps to try and deal with his offending behaviour, but the panel had no evidence before it to reach a finding in respect of the outcome of those steps.

In considering whether Mr Woodvine had shown remorse for his actions, while the panel noted that his guilty plea implied an element of feeling guilt for the conduct, it concluded that it had not had sight of any substantive expression of remorse or reflection by Mr Woodvine for his actions. While he plainly accepted that he had committed these acts and recognised that those acts were wrong, the panel had not had sight of any specific evidence to meaningfully demonstrate remorse.

The panel found limited evidence of insight and no material evidence of remorse on the part of Mr Woodvine.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence 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 has observed:

“The panel took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Woodvine’s behaviour in committing the offences could seriously and legitimately affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel recognised that the public would not consider it acceptable for a teacher to access the types of indecent materials Mr Woodvine had accessed.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for making indecent images of a child 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 Woodvine himself. The panel has commented:

“There was no evidence that Mr Woodvine’s actions were not deliberate, there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Woodvine was acting under extreme duress, such as the presence of a physical threat or significant intimidation, nor had Mr Woodvine demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Woodvine 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 offences of which Mr Woodvine was convicted. The panel has said:

“The panel did not consider that a recommendation that an individual convicted of crimes of this nature should not be prohibited from teaching children would serve the public interest or maintain public confidence in the profession.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that there was no material evidence of mitigating circumstances in this case.

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

The panel has noted that the Advice states that where cases involve making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child, the public interest will weigh in favour of not offering a review period. The panel has commented:

“The panel noted that Mr Woodvine’s case involved conduct falling within the above category of the Advice. The panel also noted these were exceptionally serious offences involving indecent material of children.”

I have also considered the panel’s comments on the risk of repetition:

“The panel concluded it would pose an exceptionally high risk to children if Mr Woodvine were permitted to continue to teach, given what the panel considered to be ongoing issues posed by his sexual predilections.”

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 Woodvine was convicted, the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

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 Benjamin Woodvine 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 Woodvine 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 Benjamin Woodvine 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 loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 17 August 2026

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