



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Jason Ledgister: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**April 2022**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Jason Ledgister
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0684316
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	16 March 1978
<b>TRA reference:</b>	17430
<b>Date of determination:</b>	13 April 2022
<b>Former employer:</b>	Monarch Education

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 11 to 13 April 2022 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Jason Ledgister.

The panel members were Mrs Emma Moir (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist) and Mr Adnan Qureshi (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Sam Haldane of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Andrew Cullen of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Ledgister was present and was represented by Mr Philip Dayle of Counsel.

The hearing took place by way of a virtual hearing in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 11 February 2022.

It was alleged that Mr Ledgister was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that he:

1. On one or more occasions exposed his penis to one or more female members of the public, including:
  - a. in or around November 2013, when he drove up next to a woman, opened the car door and;
    - i. shouted 'look';
    - ii. engaged in masturbation;
  - b. on or around 27 June 2017, when he drove up next to a woman and;
    - i. suggested that she should watch him;
    - ii. engaged in masturbation;
  - c. on or around 8 May 2018, when he was holding his penis and/or engaging in masturbation in front of a woman in a park.
2. His conduct as may be found proven at 1a and/or 1b and/or 1c was conduct that was of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.
3. He provided false and/or misleading information to the police, and/or failed to disclose relevant information, in that when arrested in connection with the incident set out at 1c above he gave his profession as 'labourer', despite the fact that he had been undertaking work as a Supply Teacher via Monarch Education.
4. His conduct as may be found proven at 3 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Mr Ledgister denied the facts of the allegations, as set out in the response to the notice of proceedings, dated 14 March 2022.

## Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

The panel noted that since the date of the referral to the TRA in this case, new ‘Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession’ were published in May 2020 (the “May 2020 Procedures”). The panel understands that the earlier provisions contained within the ‘Teacher misconduct: disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession’ updated in April 2018 (the “April 2018 Procedures”) apply to this case, given that those provisions applied when the referral was made. Although the panel has the power to direct that the May 2020 Procedures should apply in the interests of justice or the public interest, the panel had received no representations that this should be the case. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the panel confirms that it has applied the April 2018 Procedures in this case.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology – pages 6 to 7
- Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 20
- Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 23 to 38
- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 40 to 137
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 139 to 185

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

### Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the TRA:

- Female C [redacted]
- Individual A [redacted]
- Individual B [redacted]

Mr Ledgister was present at the hearing and therefore gave oral evidence.

## Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

My Ledgister was employed as a physical education teacher for Ark Boulton Academy ('the School') from 1 September 2005.

On 1 November 2013, Mr Ledgister allegedly drove up to Female A and exposed himself ('First Incident').

On 20 June 2017, Mr Ledgister resigned from the School.

Mr Ledgister allegedly exposed himself to Female B on 27 June 2017 ('Second Incident').

Mr Ledgister began working at GB Taekwondo on 20 November 2017 until he was made redundant on 21 March 2018.

In March 2018, Mr Ledgister registered with Monarch Education ('the Agency') and began working as a supply teacher. On 8 May 2018, Mr Ledgister taught at Small Heath School from 9am to 10am. Later that day, Mr Ledgister allegedly exposed himself to Female C at 10:42am ('Third Incident').

On 3 July 2018, the police informed the Agency of the offences alleged against Mr Ledgister and the Agency ceased their employment with him.

The Agency referred the matter to the TRA on 9 August 2018.

On 14 January 2019, Mr Ledgister was found not guilty at the Black Country Magistrates' Court of the offences alleged in relation to the Third Incident.

## **Findings of fact**

- 1. On one or more occasions exposed your penis to one or more female members of the public, including:**
  - a. in or around November 2013, when you drove up next to a woman, opened the car door and;**
    - i. shouted 'look';**
    - ii. engaged in masturbation;**
  - b. on or around 27 June 2017, when you drove up next to a woman and;**
    - i. suggested that she should watch you;**
    - ii. engaged in masturbation;**

**c. on or around 8 May 2018, when you were holding your penis and/or engaging in masturbation in front of a woman in a park.**

The panel noted the oral evidence, the letters to the TRA dated 1 May 2019 and 30 July 2019, and the witness statement dated 15 March 2022 of Mr Ledgister. Mr Ledgister submitted that the referral from the Agency was made as a result of him jogging in the park and stopping to urinate. Mr Ledgister described this as a very stressful and embarrassing ordeal. Mr Ledgister described the lengths he had gone to, to avoid being seen; Mr Ledgister alleged that he stopped to urinate around 90ft away from the nearest path and in a secluded area. Mr Ledgister was found not guilty at the Magistrates' Court and gave evidence that he took every precaution to screen himself from members of the public.

The panel considered the statement made by Female A in which she describes a vehicle registered to Mr Ledgister pulling alongside her at a bus stop, with the occupant opening the driver's side door and pulling his tracksuit bottoms to his ankles and starting to masturbate, shouting "LOOK". The entire incident lasted for around fifteen minutes. There were a number of similarities with Mr Ledgister including his age, glasses and car registration. It was noted that there were also some discrepancies including build and the beard Mr Ledgister alleges to have worn at the time not being mentioned.

Mr Ledgister further described that he was continually stopped and pulled over by the police as his car was alerting a response on the police system. Mr Ledgister submitted that he sought to investigate the problem by discussing it with the officers.

Mr Ledgister stated that he was asked to attend a police interview in relation to an indecent exposure; Mr Ledgister did not know why his vehicle was believed to be involved. Mr Ledgister had told the police in an interview in 2017 that he could not remember if anyone had driven his car and then confirmed nobody else had driven his car. The panel noted that when giving evidence Mr Ledgister was asked about who else used his car to which he accepted that his brother may have used it from time to time. The panel noted he had not raised this before and felt that this was a significant inconsistency within his evidence.

The panel noted the letter from McGrath & Co solicitors, dated 26 March 2019, confirming that Mr Ledgister was found not guilty of indecent exposure on 8 May 2018.

The panel also noted the transcript of the police interview with Mr Ledgister, in which Mr Ledgister denied the allegation of indecent exposure on 27 June 2017.

The panel noted the oral evidence and witness statement of Individual B. Individual B submitted that on 27 June 2017, a call was made to the police by a Female B who alleged she was waiting at a bus stop when a blue car stopped nearby. Female B said the driver had no trousers on and was masturbating. Female B noted the car registration

number, which was registered to Mr Ledgister. Again, there were a number of similarities alongside some discrepancies with the witness' description.

Individual B submitted that on 12 September 2017, Mr Ledgister attended a voluntary interview with a police station representative. During the interview, Mr Ledgister denied the allegation, although he admitted that the vehicle was his and nobody else had permission to use it. Mr Ledgister denied the victim's description matched him; Mr Ledgister had a shaved head which he said was the usual style he had his hair and a beard of substantial length, which the victim had not described.

The panel noted the fact Mr Ledgister expressed his reluctance to take part in an identification parade and felt that there was no justification for that reluctance.

The panel noted the oral evidence and witness statement of Female C. Female C submitted that on 8 May 2018 at 9:34am, she entered the West Smethwick Park with her dog. Female C stated that, upon crossing the wood bridge, there is a new bridge to the right where she saw a male leaning with his back on a post. The male had his jogging bottoms on the ground around his ankles, was not wearing underwear and his t-shirt pulled up with his left hand. The male was holding his penis with his right hand and was masturbating and was "*swinging his penis around like a Catherine wheel*". Female C described the male as black, around five foot eight inches tall and of a stocky build. The male had a bald head and an unkempt beard. Female C believed that the male was in his mid-thirties to forties.

The panel considered that, when giving evidence, Female C was confident, clear, consistent and compelling. The panel noted that on a number of occasions she confirmed that she was "*100% sure*" of what she had observed. The panel further noted that the incident itself took place in broad daylight and that Female C had seen Mr Ledgister with an unobstructed view for up to 30 seconds which they felt was not an insignificant period of time.

The panel particularly considered the photos that had been provided of the park and noted that Mr Ledgister agreed that the undergrowth was not particularly different from the time of the incident to the time that the photos were taken. The panel formed the view that this would have been a difficult place for Mr Ledgister to have concealed himself and that any members of the public walking from the either side of the bridge could have seen him. Mr Ledgister initially asserted he was deep in the undergrowth but later accepted that he was an arms-length from the bridge.

The panel also noted that Mr Ledgister had initially said he had not been the park before but when asked about how he knew the location of some exercise equipment in the park he accepted that he had been there perhaps 2 or 3 three times before. The panel found this be a further inconsistency in Mr Ledgister's evidence.



The panel carefully considered the case of *R v Turnbull* [1977] QB 224 and the considerations of identification evidence. The Panel reminded itself of the evidence provided by Individual B who said that it is fairly commonplace for witnesses not to get all of the characteristics of a suspect right.

The panel noted the striking similarities between the incidents in 2013 and 2017 and noted that a common feature of both was the modus operandi of the offences, identification of the vehicle and the locality.

Whilst Mr Ledgister provided a number of photo exhibits showing his appearance, none of these were date stamped and the panel could not satisfy itself of when they were taken. The panel felt that the photographs were not the clearest in terms of some of the locations. Mr Ledgister claimed corroborating evidence was available, although this was not provided to the panel.

The panel attributed less weight to those parts of the evidence that were hearsay and could not be tested. However, in considering the hearsay evidence, the panel noted a pattern of behaviour between all three allegations.

On the balance of probabilities the panel found allegation 1 proven.

## **2. Your conduct as may be found proven at 1a and/or 1b and/or 1c was conduct that was of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.**

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 *Sexual Offences Act 2003* and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council* [2018], *Basson v General Medical Council* [2018] and *The General Medical Council v Haris* [2020] EWHC 2518.

The panel considered whether the conduct was sexually motivated. It noted that in *Basson* it was stated that "A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship". The panel further considered that in *Haris*, the High Court indicated that the criteria in *Basson* sets the bar too high. Foster J stated:

*"in the present case it is in my judgement clear beyond argument that the intimate touching of Patients A and B was sexual and that answering a question as to the motivation of the toucher, the only available answer, is yes, the motivation must have been sexual[...]"*

*"Of course, there are significant differences in the context and the analogy is not exact, but it does seem to me that pleading 'sexual motivation' is unhelpful. Similarly to look for 'sexual gratification' may be misleading or overcomplicating. It is irrelevant to the actions which the GMC would wish to proscribe whether or not the perpetrator was sexually 'gratified' at all – whether before, after or during the act in question. Gratification, as with 'pursuit of a relationship' are, pace the analysis of Mostyn J in Basson, not helpful in my*

*judgement in promoting the public interests at stake here. These criteria set the bar too high and I respectfully disagree that they represent the law”.*

*“Had the touching been pleaded as being ‘sexual’ and had the Tribunal asked themselves whether in all the circumstances, which includes the absence of accident[...] absence of consent [...] and any other clinical or other proper justification [...] then it seems to me impossible they would have reached any conclusion other than that the touching was sexual”.*

On examination of the documents before the panel and consideration of the wider documentary and oral evidence, the panel concluded that Mr Ledgister’s conduct as set out in allegations 1a)i-ii, 1b)i-ii and c was sexually motivated.

The panel found allegation 2 proven on the balance of probabilities

**3. You provided false and/or misleading information to the police, and/or failed to disclose relevant information, in that when arrested in connection with the incident set out at 1c above you gave your profession as ‘labourer’, despite the fact that you had been undertaking work as a Supply Teacher via Monarch Education.**

The panel noted the undated letter from [redacted] submitted on behalf of Mr Ledgister, which stated that Mr Ledgister was engaged as a general labourer on their construction projects between July 2017 and August 2018.

The panel noted the witness statement and oral evidence of [redacted]. [redacted] submitted that, on 8 May 2015, Mr Ledgister was arrested at West Smethwick Park for an allegation of committing an act of outrage public decency. During the booking in process, [redacted] asked Mr Ledgister what his current occupation was; Mr Ledgister stated that his occupation was a labourer.

The panel heard evidence from Mr Ledgister that, having been released from custody, he did not go back and inform the police of his teaching profession nor did he inform the school where he was working or his current employer. In giving evidence Mr Ledgister accepted that he was familiar with Keeping Children Safe in Education which is clear on the issue regarding disclosures.

The panel considered that there was ample opportunity for Mr Ledgister to have disclosed his profession but he chose not to do so.

The panel found allegation 3 proven on the balance of probabilities

**4. Your conduct as may be found proven at 3 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.**

At the hearing, Mr Ledgister confirmed that the facts of the allegation were not admitted and considered these a matter for the panel to determine.

The panel firstly considered whether Mr Ledgister had failed to act with integrity. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*. The panel considered that Mr Ledgister had failed to act in accordance with the ethical standards expected of a teacher for a significant and sustained period of time

The information about the allegations of indecent exposure would be relevant at any School, because teachers are placed in a position of trust. The panel found that Mr Ledgister had not acted with integrity by failing to disclose that he was a teacher.

The panel then considered whether Mr Ledgister had acted dishonestly in relation to the proven facts of allegation 3. In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel noted that Mr Ledgister was working as a teacher and was booked to cover supply work only 2 days after his arrest. The panel found it unlikely that he would simply have forgotten his work as a teacher and that therefore his actions lacked integrity and were dishonest

The panel found allegation 4 proven on the balance of probabilities.

### **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute**

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document *Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers February 2022*, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ledgister, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Ledgister 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
- 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 Ledgister amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mr Ledgister's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of sexual activity was relevant. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is more likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting, however, the panel considered that the nature of Mr Ledgister's misconduct impacted upon his profession as a teacher.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Ledgister was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Ledgister's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

The panel therefore found that Mr Ledgister's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of allegations 1, 2, 3 and 4 proved, the panel further found that Mr Ledgister's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, 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 were aware 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: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Ledgister, which involved indecent exposure and a lack of integrity and/or being dishonest, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ledgister was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Ledgister was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 Ledgister.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Ledgister. 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;
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Ledgister's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Ledgister was acting under extreme duress, and, in fact, the panel found Mr Ledgister's actions to be calculated and motivated.

Some evidence in the form of two references was submitted to attest to Mr Ledgister's previous history as a teacher which demonstrated high standards in both personal and professional conduct. No character references or evidence by way of continued professional development was provided and there was no evidence that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. It was noted that Mr Ledgister had given a significant length of service to the profession.

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.

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 Ledgister. The nature of the incidents and the sexual element of them 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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons. The panel found that Mr Ledgister was responsible for indecent exposure on a number of occasions. These offences have resulted in harm to other people and caused them to change their behaviours.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours include fraud of serious dishonesty. The panel found that Mr Ledgister lacked integrity and was dishonest.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Jason Ledgister should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Ledgister 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
- 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 finds that the conduct of Mr Ledgister fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings which involved indecent exposure, conduct found to be sexually motivated, lacked integrity and was dishonest.

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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Ledgister, 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/or safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Ledgister, which involved indecent exposure and a lack of integrity and/or being dishonest, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ledgister was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of indecent exposure and sexual motivation 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 unacceptable professional conduct, 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 Ledgister himself and the panel comment "Some evidence in the form of two references was submitted to attest to Mr Ledgister's previous history as a teacher which demonstrated high standards in both personal and professional conduct. No character references or evidence by way of continued professional development was provided and there was no evidence that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. It was noted that Mr Ledgister had given a significant length of service to the profession."



A prohibition order would prevent Mr Ledgister 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 dishonesty "The panel heard evidence from Mr Ledgister that, having been released from custody, he did not go back and inform the police of his teaching profession nor did he inform the school where he was working or his current employer. In giving evidence Mr Ledgister accepted that he was familiar with Keeping Children Safe in Education which is clear on the issue regarding disclosures."

The panel considered that there was ample opportunity for Mr Ledgister to have disclosed his profession but he chose not to do so."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that "there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Ledgister was acting under extreme duress, and, in fact, the panel found Mr Ledgister's actions to be calculated and motivated."

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

In considering the panel's recommendation, I have not read any information related to insight or remorse shown by Mr Ledgister, I am aware that he denied the allegations. Although the allegations took place outside the education setting, the nature of Mr Ledgister's misconduct impacted upon his profession as a teacher.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons. The panel found that Mr Ledgister was responsible for indecent exposure on a number of occasions. These offences have resulted in harm to other people and caused them to change their behaviours."

I have considered whether not 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 nature of the findings involving indecent exposure, the impact on the profession and conduct that lacked integrity and was dishonest.

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 Jason Ledgister is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Ledgister 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 Ledgister has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of 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 'S Buxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 20 April 2022**

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