



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Peter Godfrey: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**October 2024**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Peter Godfrey
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	8841886
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	14 December 1965
<b>TRA reference:</b>	20061
<b>Date of determination:</b>	24 October 2024
<b>Former employer:</b>	The White House School, Shropshire

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 24 October, to consider the case of Mr Peter Godfrey (“Mr Godfrey”).

The panel members were Dr Martin Coles (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bev Williams (teacher panellist) and Mr Dara Islam (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Carly Hagedorn of Eversheds Sutherland (International) 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 Godfrey that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Godfrey provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted that he had been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Clare Hastie, or Mr Godfrey.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 18 October 2024.

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

1. On 29/06/2022, he was convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court for 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children on 05/05/20 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a) for which he was sentenced on 08/09/22;
2. On 29/06/2022, he was convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court for 1 count of Possession of Extreme Pornographic Images - of Intercourse/Oral Sex with Dead /Alice [sic] Animal on 05/05/20 contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63 (1) (7) (d) for which he was sentenced on 08/09/22;
3. On 29/06/2022, he was convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court for 1 count of Possess Prohibited Images of Children on 05/05/20 contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s.62 (1) for which he was sentenced on 08/09/22;
4. On 29/10/2022, he was convicted at South Derbyshire Magistrates Court for 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children on 13/09/22 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a) for which he was awaiting sentencing;
5. On 29/10/2022, he was convicted at South Derbyshire Magistrates Court for 1 count of Breach Sexual Harm Prevention Order on 28/10/22 contrary to the Sentencing Act 2020 s.354 (1) (4) for which he was awaiting sentencing.

Mr Godfrey admitted the facts of the allegations and that his conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

In advance of the meeting, 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 22

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 23 to 26

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 27 to 139

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 140 to 151

Section 6: Notice of meeting – pages 152 to 153

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

## **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Godfrey on 7 October 2024.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Godfrey 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.

Mr Godfrey was employed as a class teacher from September 2012 at the White House School (“the School”). On 5 May 2020, Mr Godfrey was arrested and interviewed by Staffordshire Police. Mr Godfrey admitted that any indecent images of children found on his electrical devices belonged to him. On 12 August 2020, Mr Godfrey ceased employment at the School.

On 29 June 2022, Mr Godfrey was convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court for the following offences:

1. 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children on 05/05/20 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a)
2. 1 count of Possession of Extreme Pornographic Images - of Intercourse/Oral Sex with Dead /Alice Animal on 05/05/20 contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63 (1) (7) (d)
3. 1 count of Possess Prohibited Images of Children on 05/05/20 contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s.62 (1)

Mr Godfrey was sentenced for the above three offences on 8 September 2022 to 150 hours of unpaid work, a rehabilitation requirement and a custodial sentence of 6 months, suspended for 2 years. Mr Godfrey was issued with a Sexual Harm Prevention Order (“SHPO”) for 10 years.

On 28 October 2022, Mr Godfrey was arrested and interviewed by the police. Mr Godfrey admitted that he had downloaded indecent images of children using a laptop. In using the laptop, which was capable of accessing the internet and storing images, Mr Godfrey breached the terms of his SHPO. Mr Godfrey admitted to the police that he had saved the images of children on the USB stick, which was seized by the Police. Mr Godfrey admitted that he did not disclose to his offender manager that he was in possession of the laptop and USB stick.

On 29 October 2022, Mr Godfrey was convicted at the South Derbyshire Magistrates Court for the following offences:

1. 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children on 13/09/22 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a)
2. 1 count of Breach Sexual Harm Prevention Order on 28/10/22 contrary to the Sentencing Act 2020 s.354 (1)(4)

Mr Godfrey was sentenced on 2 March 2023 to a total of 16 months imprisonment.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On 29/06/2022, you were convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court for 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children on 05/05/20 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a) for which you were sentenced on 08/09/22;**

Mr Godfrey admitted the facts of this allegation.

The panel had sight of the Certificate of Conviction which confirmed that Mr Godfrey was convicted on 29 June 2022 for three counts of making indecent photographs of a child.

The panel had sight of the sentencing transcript where Mr Godfrey was sentenced on 8 September 2022 to 150 hours of unpaid work, a rehabilitation requirement and a concurrent custodial sentence of 8 months (for all offences listed in allegations 1 to 3), suspended for 2 years. Mr Godfrey was also issued with a SHPO for 10 years and was required to sign the Sex Offenders Register for 10 years.

The panel found allegation 1 proved.

**2. On 29/06/2022, you were convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court for 1 count of Possession of Extreme Pornographic Images - of Intercourse/Oral Sex with Dead /Alice [sic] Animal on 05/05/20 contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63 (1) (7) (d) for which you were sentenced on 08/09/22;**

The panel noted that the second allegation contained a typographical error, in that it stated "Dead/Alice Animal", when it should have read "Dead/Alive Animal". The panel noted that the Statement of Agreed facts, signed by Mr Godfrey, it contained the wording "Dead/Alive Animal". The Certificate of Conviction also contained the wording "Dead/Alive Animal."

Mr Godfrey admitted the facts of this allegation.

The panel had sight of the Certificate of Conviction which confirmed that Mr Godfrey was convicted on 29 June 2022 for one count of possession of extreme pornographic image / images portraying an act of intercourse / oral sex with dead /alive animal.

The panel had sight of the sentencing transcript where Mr Godfrey was sentenced on 8 September 2022 to 150 hours of unpaid work, a rehabilitation requirement and a concurrent custodial sentence of 8 months (for all offences listed in allegations 1 to 3), suspended for 2 years. Mr Godfrey was also issued with a SHPO for 10 years and was required to sign the Sex Offenders Register for 10 years.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

**3. On 29/06/2022, you were convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court for 1 count of Possess Prohibited Images of Children on 05/05/20 contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s.62 (1) for which you were sentenced on 08/09/22;**

Mr Godfrey admitted the facts of this allegation.

The panel had sight of the Police National Computer ("PNC") records in respect of Mr Godfrey which listed the following offence "Possess prohibited images of children on 05/05/20" contrary to "Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s.62(1).

The panel had sight of the sentencing transcript which stated that as a result of the examination of a number of items the indecent images of children were recovered. The Prosecution Counsel stated that "*41 prohibited images of children*" were recovered.

Mr Godfrey was sentenced on 8 September 2022 to 150 hours of unpaid work, a rehabilitation requirement and a concurrent custodial sentence of 8 months (for all offences listed in allegations 1 to 3), suspended for 2 years. Mr Godfrey was also issued with a SHPO for 10 years and was required to sign the Sex Offenders Register for 10 years.

The panel found allegation 3 proved.

**4. On 29/10/2022, you were convicted at South Derbyshire Magistrates Court for 3 counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children on 13/09/22 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a) for which you are awaiting sentencing;**

The panel noted that by the time of this meeting, Mr Godfrey had already been sentenced for his conduct in this allegation on 2 March 2023.

Mr Godfrey admitted the facts of this allegation.

The panel had sight of the Certificate of Conviction dated 25 June 2024, which confirmed that Mr Godfrey was convicted on 29 October 2022 for three counts of making indecent photographs of a child.

The panel had sight of the sentencing transcript dated 2 March 2023, where Mr Godfrey was sentenced to a total custodial sentence of 8 months for all three counts of making indecent photographs of children. This sentence would run concurrently with the sentence as set out in the below allegation.

The panel found allegation 4 proved.

**5. On 29/10/2022, you were convicted at South Derbyshire Magistrates Court for 1 count of Breach Sexual Harm Prevention Order on 28/10/22 contrary to the Sentencing Act 2020 s.354 (1) (4) for which you are awaiting sentencing.**

The panel noted that by the time of this meeting, Mr Godfrey had already been sentenced for his conduct in this allegation on 2 March 2023.

Mr Godfrey admitted the facts of this allegation.

The panel had sight of the police report on the application for a SHPO which listed the prohibitions regarding Mr Godfrey's usage of devices.

The panel had sight of the Certificate of Conviction dated 25 June 2024, which confirmed that Mr Godfrey was convicted on 29 October 2022 for breaching the Sexual Harm Prevention Order.

Mr Godfrey was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment which would run concurrently with the sentence as set out in allegation 4 above. The Judge stated that Mr Godfrey "*must first serve the seven months of your suspended sentence that I have activated this morning. You will thereafter serve nine months in relation to the offences that you have been committed to this crown court for sentence for this morning. That makes an overall sentence, if you put those two together, of sixteen months' imprisonment, of which you will serve half before you are automatically released onto licence, and thereafter, if appropriate, post-sentence supervision.*"

The panel found allegation 5 proved.



## Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Godfrey, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Godfrey 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, including..., the rule of law...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the Mr Godfrey's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting, as he had committed offences contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Godfrey's behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Godfrey was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Godfrey's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed, and which the Advice states is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

This was a case concerning an offence involving 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 any such activity, including one-off incidents and child cruelty.

The Advice indicates that a conviction for any offence that relates to or involves such offences is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

The panel noted the seriousness of the offences, which led to a term of imprisonment. The panel also noted from the sentencing remarks on 2 March 2023 that shortly after his initial convictions in respect of the first three allegations, Mr Godfrey left the area to go to a seaside town, and used a laptop and a memory stick to download and retain indecent images of children, which demonstrated Mr Godfrey's tendency to repeat the behaviour and a clear disregard for his initial serious convictions.

The panel did not see any evidence to attest to Mr Godfrey's ability as a teacher. The panel noted that Mr Godfrey's legal representative described him as having "*a strong work ethic*" in the sentencing remarks dated 8 September 2022. The panel noted that there was also reference to Mr Godfrey's [REDACTED].

The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Godfrey's fitness to be a teacher. 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.

## **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 is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Godfrey and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. 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 and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Godfrey, which involved convictions for serious offences, including those contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making indecent photographs of children and possessing prohibited images of children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Godfrey 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 Godfrey was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel did not see any evidence to attest to Mr Godfrey's ability as a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Godfrey 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.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, 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 disclosure;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- 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;
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- collusion or concealment including: any activity that involves knowingly... concealing inappropriate actions;... lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest and the seriousness of the behaviour and the likely harm to the public interest were the teacher be allowed to continue to teach, the panel went on to consider whether there were mitigating circumstances.

There was evidence that Mr Godfrey's actions were deliberate.

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

There was some evidence to suggest that Mr Godfrey did have a previously good history from the sentencing remarks dated 8 September 2022. The panel did not have sight of character references to attest to Mr Godfrey's ability as a teacher.

The panel considered Mr Godfrey's personal circumstances and noted that he had explained in a police interview that [REDACTED].

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 Godfrey 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 Godfrey. The serious offences including making indecent photographs of children and possessing prohibited images of children 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 cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include 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 and child cruelty. The panel found that Mr Godfrey was responsible for serious offences, which included making indecent photographs of children and possessing prohibited images of children. This serious misconduct directly links to the above offences which weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

The panel considered the sentencing remarks dated 2 March 2023, where Mr Godfrey's legal representative referred to a [REDACTED]. The panel noted the Judge's comments in the sentencing remarks where Mr Godfrey had made "*expressions of contrition or*

*remorse*”, but noted that days after the sentencing for the first convictions, Mr Godfrey left the area to go to a seaside town, and used a laptop and a memory stick to download and retain and indecent images of children. Neither of those two electronic devices were disclosed to Mr Godfrey’s offender manager, which was part of his responsibility under the SHPO. The panel therefore considered that there was a strong possibility for risk of repetition in respect of his serious misconduct.

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 a relevant conviction

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Godfrey 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, including..., the rule of law...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Godfrey fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of relevant offences, including making indecent photographs of children and possessing prohibited 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 Godfrey, 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Godfrey, which involved convictions for serious offences, including those contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making indecent photographs of children and possessing prohibited images of children."

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 mitigation, "The panel considered Mr Godfrey's personal circumstances and noted that he had explained in a police interview". Although the panel did not comment on insight, they had noted the remorse/contrition shown as part of the sentencing remarks, however they also considered that following the first conviction, Mr Godfrey went on to offend again. In my judgment this could demonstrate a lack of full remorse or insight and there is some risk of 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 also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Godfrey's behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Godfrey was allowed to continue teaching." I am particularly mindful of the finding of serious convictions involving 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 Godfrey himself and the panel comment “There was some evidence to suggest that Mr Godfrey did have a previously good history from the sentencing remarks dated 8 September 2022. The panel did not have sight of character references to attest to Mr Godfrey’s ability as a teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Godfrey 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, “The panel noted that the Mr Godfrey’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting, as he had committed offences contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel considered the sentencing remarks dated 2 March 2023, where Mr Godfrey’s legal representative referred to a [REDACTED]. The panel noted the Judge’s comments in the sentencing remarks where Mr Godfrey had made “*expressions of contrition or remorse*”, but noted that days after the sentencing for the first convictions, Mr Godfrey left the area to go to a seaside town, and used a laptop and a memory stick to download and retain and indecent images of children. Neither of those two electronic devices were disclosed to Mr Godfrey’s offender manager, which was part of his responsibility under the SHPO. The panel therefore considered that there was a strong possibility for risk of repetition in respect of his serious misconduct.”

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater

relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include 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 and child cruelty. The panel found that Mr Godfrey was responsible for serious offences, which included making indecent photographs of children and possessing prohibited images of children. This serious misconduct directly links to the above offences which weigh in favour of not offering a review period.”

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 convictions 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 Peter Godfrey 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 Godfrey 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 Peter Godfrey has a right of appeal to the King’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 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 4 November 2024**

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