



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Frederick Peppert: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2025

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	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher: Mr Frederick Peppert

Teacher ref number: 8145865

Teacher date of birth: 13 March 1958

TRA reference: 21059

Date of determination: 4 August 2025

Former employer: Vision for Education Ltd, Middlesbrough

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 4 August 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Frederick Peppert (“Mr Peppert”).

The panel members were Mr Dara Islam (lay panellist – in the chair), Miss Louisa Munton (teacher panellist) and Ms Jessica Sheldrick (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish 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 Peppert that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Peppert provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer; Mr Jon Walters of Brabners LLP, and without Mr Peppert or any representative for Mr Peppert.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 22 July 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Peppert had been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 7 December 2023 he was convicted at Teesside Crown Court of:
 - a) Between 21 January 2012 and 2 September 2022 making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, namely 2 category A indecent images of a child, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
 - b) Between 21 January 2012 and 2 September 2022 making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, namely 2 category B indecent images of a child, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
 - c) Between 21 January 2012 and 2 September 2022 making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, namely 26 category C indecent images of a child, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.

The panel noted that Mr Peppert admitted the allegations as set out in his notice of proceedings form signed by him on 2 May 2025 and the statement of agreed facts, signed by him on 2 July 2025.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notices – pages 2 to 11

Section 2: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 12 to 13

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 14 to 30

Section 4: Teacher documents – page 31

On a procedural point the panel had regard to e-mail correspondence which confirmed that Mr Peppert waived any right to have 10 weeks' notice of the meeting.

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Peppert on 2 July 2025 and by Mr Jon Walters of Brabners LLP solicitors on behalf of the TRA on 3 July 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Peppert 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 Peppert had been employed as a supply teacher at Vision for Education Ltd.

Following an investigation by the National Crime Agency, it was alleged that Mr Peppert was arrested and subsequently convicted on three separate counts of the criminal offence of making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978 at Teesside Crown Court on 7 December 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel scrutinised the entire bundle. The panel noted that the evidence within a number of documents, in particular the police report and the e-mail from Mr Peppert of 15 May 2024 was hearsay, but considered in each case that it was relevant and in the interests of justice that the evidence be considered. The panel therefore admitted those documents but noted that the evidence should be considered carefully and cautiously, including in relation to the weight placed on it.

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

1. On 7 December 2023 you were convicted at Teesside Crown Court of:

- a. Between 21 January 2012 and 2 September 2022 making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, namely 2 category A indecent images of a child, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- b. Between 21 January 2012 and 2 September 2022 making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, namely 2 category B indecent images of a child, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- c. Between 21 January 2012 and 2 September 2022 making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, namely 26 category C indecent images of a child, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Peppert on 2 July 2025. In that statement of agreed facts, Mr Peppert admitted the particulars of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) and further admitted the facts of the allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence. The panel also noted the admissions of fact within Mr Peppert's notice of proceedings form signed by him on 2 May 2025.

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 ('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 did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Teesside Crown Court dated 19 September 2024 which detailed that Mr Peppert had been convicted on 7 December 2023 of three separate counts of 'make indecent photograph/pseudo photograph of a child', contrary to Sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978.

The panel noted that Mr Peppert pleaded guilty to these offences.

In respect of the allegations, Mr Peppert was sentenced on 8 January 2024 to 6 months imprisonment, suspended for 24 months, rehabilitation activity of 30 days and 150 hours

of unpaid work. Mr Peppert was required to register with the police on the Sex Offenders Register for 7 years, with a sexual harm prevention order in place during this time.

Following examination of the documents before the panel and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel found allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Peppert, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Peppert 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 democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Peppert's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting, given that the convictions related directly to the violation of the welfare and privacy of children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Peppert's behaviour in committing the offences could affect

public confidence in the teaching profession, especially given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Peppert's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment (albeit that it was suspended) which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel noted a number of parts of KCSIE were engaged including part one paragraphs 2, 4 and 12.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice which provides that it is likely that a conviction for any offence that relates to, or involves, any of the offences listed there would be considered "a relevant offence".

The panel noted that this was a case concerning offences which fell within the paragraph *"any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child"*.

The panel considered the offences of which Mr Peppert had been found guilty to be very serious ones. The panel noted that they involved indecent images of children and that these were category A, B and C images and that there were multiple counts over a prolonged period; seemingly 10 years. The panel also noted that Mr Peppert had been sentenced to a period of imprisonment, albeit suspended, and the various other sanctions listed within the certificate of conviction.

The panel considered that it was not aware of any mitigating circumstances.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Peppert'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 took into account the remorse expressed in Mr Peppert's e-mail before them but noted that this was since discovery of the offences and did not consider that this was relevant or sufficient mitigation.

The panel found that there had been a conviction of a relevant offence.

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 was 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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public and the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Peppert, which involved the conviction of a relevant offence of making indecent photographs/pseudo-photographs of children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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

There was no evidence in the bundle regarding Mr Peppert's ability to teach and the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Peppert 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 or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Peppert.

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 it found relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- 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 mitigating factors.

In light of the panel's findings there was clear evidence that the teacher's actions were deliberate and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Peppert was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Peppert demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence that the incidents were out of character and again noted the prolonged period over which the offences had occurred.

The panel noted that Mr Peppert had pleaded guilty to the offences. The panel referred to the transcript of sentencing remarks in which Judge Adkin referred to strong personal mitigation from "*glowing*" character references. The panel also noted that Mr Peppert offered some limited awareness of the impact of his actions, in the letter to the TRA dated 15 May 2024, in which he stated that his behaviour is '*unacceptable*', and he has regretted his '*betrayal of trust with colleagues, past and present and more importantly students past and present*' and ... '*I will have to live with the consequences of my actions for the rest of my life*'.

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 Peppert 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 Peppert. The three counts of the offence of making an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child were the key significant factors in forming that opinion.

Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

The panel found that the paragraph *“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”* was relevant.

The panel noted the comments from Mr Peppert which it had seen but did not consider that Mr Peppert had demonstrated any meaningful insight or remorse regarding his actions. The panel noted in particular that it had no evidence of any remorse at all from Mr Peppert in relation to the children who were the victims of his criminal activity.

The panel considered that the seriousness and extent of Mr Peppert’s offending, involving multiple counts of related offences over a long period of time, which demonstrated a pattern of behaviour and indicated that there was a very serious risk of repetition.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Peppert 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 democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) were engaged in this case, including part one paragraphs 2, 4 and 12.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding which involved a conviction of a relevant offence of making indecent photographs/pseudo photographs 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 Peppert, 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 light of the panel's findings against Mr Peppert, which involved the conviction of a relevant offence of making indecent photographs/pseudo-photographs of children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel took into account the remorse expressed in Mr Peppert's e-mail before them but noted that this was since discovery of the offences and did not consider that this was relevant or sufficient mitigation." In my judgement, the lack of full insight or remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Peppert's behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, especially given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a relevant offence which involved making 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 Peppert himself and the panel comment "There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Peppert demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence that the incidents were out of character and again noted the prolonged period over which the offences had occurred."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Peppert 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 level of insight or remorse. The panel has said, "The panel noted that Mr Peppert had pleaded guilty to the offences. The panel referred to the transcript of sentencing remarks in which Judge Adkin referred to strong personal mitigation from "*glowing*" character references. The panel also noted that Mr Peppert offered some limited awareness of the impact of his actions, in the letter to the TRA dated 15 May 2024, in which he stated that his behaviour is '*unacceptable*', and he has regretted his '*betrayal of trust with colleagues, past and present and more importantly students past and present*' and ... '*I will have to live with the consequences of my actions for the rest of my life*'." The panel went on to say "The panel noted the comments from Mr Peppert which it had seen but did not consider that Mr Peppert had demonstrated any meaningful insight or remorse regarding his actions. The panel noted in particular that it had no evidence of any remorse at all from Mr Peppert in relation to the children who were the victims of his criminal activity."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that "The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Peppert. The three counts of the offence of making an indecent photograph / pseudo- photograph of a child were the key significant factors in forming that opinion."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Peppert has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight or remorse, 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 certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period."

The panel found that the paragraph "*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*" was relevant."

The panel has also said “The panel considered that the seriousness and extent of Mr Peppert’s offending, involving multiple counts of related offences over a long period of time, which demonstrated a pattern of behaviour and indicated that there was a very serious risk of repetition.”

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 findings involving indecent images of children and the lack of full insight or remorse.

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

This means that Mr Frederick Peppert 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 Peppert 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 Peppert 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 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 6 August 2025

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