



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Peter Ledwidge: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

January 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	8
Decision and reasons	9
Findings of fact	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	27
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	30

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

Teacher: Mr Peter Ledwidge
Teacher ref number: 9752536
Teacher date of birth: 15 July 1966
TRA reference: 20191
Date of determination: 22 January 2026
Former employer: Anglo European School, Essex

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 19 January 2026 to 22 January 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Peter Ledwidge.

The panel members were Ms Rachel Kruger (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Sarah Daniel (lay panellist) and Mr Laurie Marks (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Charlotte Black of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Zahra Evans of Capsticks Solicitors LLP.

Mr Ledwidge was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 5 November 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Ledwidge was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while employed as a teacher at Anglo European School, he:

1. Between October 2019 and May 2021 sent one or more emails to Pupil A which contained comments that were inappropriate, as set out within Schedule 1;

Schedule 1

- a. 'Pupil A have this dance?'
- b. '...so it is for you, it is all for you'
- c. 'thinking you most kind of beast [sic] wishes'
- d. 'Like the moon: her splendour when visible, her attraction when invisible'
- e. 'My favourite time of the week and the saddest part of my week'
- f. 'To my dalit Untouchable'
- g. 'I just wanted to proffer an apology, in case my last email(s) may have been misconstrued...'
- h. 'I do have a tendency to go a little far in joking/ punning/ banter...'
- i. '...because you are special'
- j. '...you are my favourite...'
- k. '...please don't say anything about this to ANYONE'
- l. 'Happy birthday'
- m. 'Actually, I've just (able to now get back on) created a little thing for you...so I've created a Class just for you...'
- n. 'Fav one'
- o. 'Heh fab fav bestest'
- p. 'It occurs to me I missed your birthday – anything you'd like?'

- q. 'Your droog'
 - r. 'Pupil A – all the glory of the world? Yes, you did. And all that glory should be mine you said...and it is'
 - s. 'your very own: class'
 - t. ' A secret message to read'
 - u. 'Your favourite teacher'
2. Between October 2019 and May 2021, engaged in conduct that was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil A by:-
- a. Emailing a 'You Tube link to Pupil A, referring to 'My Fair Lady', which was not for an educational purpose;
 - b. Sending and/or giving one or more unwanted gifts to Pupil A;
 - c. Creating one or more video(s), using photo images of Pupil A;
 - d. Demonstrating a karate kick and kicking pupil A on her bottom;
 - e. Making and/or using customised wrapping paper containing the face of Pupil A;
 - f. Storing photographs and/or personal information relating to Pupil A on his personal computer/ electronic device/ mobile phone;
 - g. Conducting one or more internet searches in respect of Pupil A as set out in Schedule 2;

Schedule 2

- a. Searches to locate Pupil A's home address;
 - b. Map searches to view Pupil A's home address;
 - c. Searches to locate Pupil A's personal '[REDACTED]' account;
 - d. Searches to locate news stories relating to Person W's death.
3. Between October 2019 and May 2021, passed handwritten notes to Pupil A which contained one or more comments that were inappropriate, as set out within Schedule 3;

Schedule 3

- a. 'We ok? Still friends';
 - b. 'I hope you didn't mind that I put down in words (to paraphrase Elton John) how wonderful life is while you're in class';
 - c. 'What are you doing reading notes, instead of concentrating on your lesson';
 - d. 'If you'd chosen Spanish over R.S., I'd have quickly trained to become a Spanish teacher';
 - e. 'One side is truly lovely, the other has your name on it'
4. In or around September 2020, supplied mock exam questions to Pupil A, in advance of the exam, without providing the questions to any other pupil;
 5. Between 29 April 2020 and 15 July 2021, downloaded and/or stored one of more photographs of Pupil A on his personal device;
 6. Between October 2019 and May 2020, engaged in conduct that was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil B by:-
 - a. Making customised wrapping paper containing the face of Pupil B;
 - b. Sending/giving an unwanted gift to Pupil B, namely a pair of black and red stockings;
 - c. Making inappropriate comment to Pupil B to the effect of, "I like your tights", and/or "I've found something at my house that made me think of your tights, I'll bring them in for you";
 7. Between October 2019 and May 2021, engaged in conduct that was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil G, by:-
 - a. Creating one or more video(s), using photo images of Pupil G;
 - b. Conducting internet searches in respect of Pupil G.
 8. Between October 2019 and May 2021, on one or more occasions, recorded videos of Pupil A, and/or Pupil C, and/or Pupil E, on your mobile phone, without their consent;
 9. On 18 May 2021 followed Pupil A, Pupil E, and Pupil F in their vehicle whilst they were driving;
 10. Between 22 January 2021 and 17 May 2021 sent videos from your personal email address to his work email address depicting scenes of violence and of a sexual nature;

11. The Conduct as set out at any or all of paragraphs (1) – (10) above was sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature.

In the absence of Mr Ledwidge, the allegations were not admitted, and there was no admission that Mr Ledwidge was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 5 to 11

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 12 to 59

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 60 to 132

Section 4: to Section 6: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 133 to 669

Section 5: Further Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 481 - 661

Section 6: Further Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 662 - 669

Section 7: Teacher documents – pages 670 to 691

The panel also received three video recordings of Pupil A.

A bundle of documents relevant to service pages (28 pages).

A written hearsay application dated 12 January 2025 with an accompanying bundle of documents (116 pages).

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

A correspondence bundle containing correspondence between the TRA and Mr Ledwidge pages (89 pages).

A further correspondence bundle containing correspondence between the TRA and Mr Ledwidge including further documents from 16 January 2026 (25 pages).

The panel agreed to it was fair to admit the additional evidence contained in the correspondence bundles so that the panel had the up to date position in order to consider the proceeding in absence application.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle and viewed the video recordings of Pupil A, in advance of the hearing and read the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A

Witness B

Person V

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

On 11 April 2016, Mr Ledwidge commenced employment at Anglo European School (the "School") as a Religious Studies Teacher.

On 18 May 2021, Pupil A made a disclosure to the School of alleged conduct by Mr Ledwidge.

On 19 May 2021, Mr Ledwidge was suspended and a referral was made to the Local Authority Designated Officer (the "LADO"). The LADO referred the concerns to Essex Police on the same day.

On 20 July 2021, the Teacher was arrested on suspicion of two counts of harassment by officers from Essex Police. The allegations were in respect of two separate females, Pupil A and Pupil B.

The Crown Prosecution Service did not take any further action against the Teacher. The Police made a referral to the TRA on 30 July 2021.

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:

While employed as a teacher at Anglo European School you:

- 1. Between October 2019 and May 2021 sent one or more emails to Pupil A which contained comments that were inappropriate, as set out within Schedule 1;**

The panel reviewed emails from Mr Ledwidge to Pupil A that were disclosed by Witness 2 to the Police as part of their investigation. The emails were obtained following a search of Mr Ledwidge's computer by the School's IT team and were reviewed by Witness 2 during the School's investigation.

The panel reviewed Schedule 1 to the allegation alongside emails from Mr Ledwidge to Pupil A and the Police and witness statements provided. The panel established that all of the comments listed within Schedule 1 were made by Mr Ledwidge in emails to Pupil A.

In the summary of Mr Ledwidge's first interview with the Police, Mr Ledwidge was asked whether he had sent the emails obtained by the Police to Pupil A to which he said that he

had. Mr Ledwidge said that he had no contact with Pupil A outside of school emails but admitted that Pupil A was the only pupil that he had sent emails like that to. Mr Ledwidge was asked whether Pupil A was his favourite pupil to which he replied that she was.

Having found that all comments contained in Schedule 1 had been made by Mr Ledwidge in the emails from him to Pupil A, the panel went on to consider whether the comments were inappropriate.

The panel found that all comments contained in Schedule 1 save for i. 'happy birthday' were inappropriate in themselves. The comments indicated favouritism and a blurring of professional boundaries towards Pupil A and included multiple references to 'keeping things a secret'. Whilst the panel considered that the comment referred to in Schedule 1 i. was not inherently inappropriate, in the context of the other communications from Mr Ledwidge to Pupil A that breached professional boundaries the sending of an email with this subject line was also considered inappropriate.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

2. Between October 2019 and July 2021, engaged in conduct that was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil A, by:-

a. Emailing a 'You Tube' link to Pupil A, referring to 'My Fair Lady', which was not for an educational purpose;

The panel was provided with an email from Mr Ledwidge's school email address to Pupil A containing the YouTube link to the song 'On The Street Where You Live' from 'My Fair Lady' that had been disclosed to the Police by Witness 2. In this email Mr Ledwidge stated that Pupil A should substitute the lyrics for lyrics that relate to the school environment.

As outlined above, when asked whether he had sent the emails that had been disclosed to the Police, Mr Ledwidge admitted that he had. As such the panel were satisfied that Mr Ledwidge had sent the email to Pupil A.

The panel considered whether the email was for an educational purpose and could see no obvious educational purpose associated with the song.

In the context of the rest of the email, which had a subject line of "like the moon: her splendour when visible, her attraction when invisible" and Mr Ledwidge prompting Pupil A to substitute the song lyrics from "street" to "playground/ corridor" and "live" to "work/study/learn" and the overall lyrics of the song, the panel considered that emailing the link to Pupil A was inappropriate and a failure to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 2a. proven.

b. Sending and/or giving one or more unwanted gifts to Pupil A;

The panel was provided with a number of photographs of police exhibits of the gifts purported to have been given to Pupil A by Mr Ledwidge. Pupil A provided the physical gifts to Witness 2 who disclosed them to the Police.

In his Police interview, Mr Ledwidge was asked about the gifts that he had given to Pupil A including a flat cap, an engraved mirror, a record and a George Harrison drawing in reference to "Pupil A, my sweet lady". Mr Ledwidge admitted giving the gifts to Pupil A. He said that he gave the gifts to Pupil A because he wanted to apologise but accepted that the gifts were inappropriate.

The panel was satisfied based on the exhibits and the admission from Mr Ledwidge that he had given several gifts to Pupil A.

The panel considered whether the gifts were unwanted. In Pupil A's witness statement to the Police, she said that she did not ask for the items and that they made her feel "sick with disgust". Pupil A said that she wanted to report Mr Ledwidge on receipt of the gifts and that she felt so disgusted that she did not want to acknowledge them.

The panel then considered whether the conduct was inappropriate and a failure to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil A. The panel was satisfied that the giving of the gifts without authorisation was a breach of the School's policies. The panel also took into account the nature of the gifts, specifically the engraving on the mirror and the picture of George Harrison with "Pupil A - sweet lady" which had a romantic undertone. The panel concluded that the conduct was inappropriate and a failure to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 2b. proven.

c. Creating one or more video(s), using photo images of Pupil A;

In the notes of an interview with Pupil A as part of the School's investigation, one of the disclosures made by Pupil A is that Mr Ledwidge created 'Showbie' classes just for Pupil A. Showbie was an application used by the School for teaching during the Covid-19 lockdown.

Following the disclosure from Pupil A, as part of the School investigation a search was conducted on Mr Ledwidge's Showbie account. A video log containing the findings of the search was compiled by Witness 2 for the disciplinary report.

The video log contains details of a video created on 22 January 2021 of Pupil A's face merging into George Harrison's face and a video created on the same day merging into an unknown male's face.

The videos located on Mr Ledwidge's 'Showbie' account were provided to the Police by Witness 2 to assist with their investigation. Witness 2 provided a witness statement to the police in which she detailed the videos that she had reviewed on the account.

Witness 2 described the search of Mr Ledwidge's Showbie account in her witness statement to the Police. She stated that she saw six unprofessional and inappropriate interactions that Mr Ledwidge had with Pupil A. This included a video of Pupil A's school photo that had been edited to move the eyes and mouth. In Witness 2's opinion the eyes and mouth were moving suggestively.

The panel was provided with and reviewed video recordings created by Mr Ledwidge which were consistent with the descriptions above.

The panel concluded that Mr Ledwidge had created more than one video using a photograph of Pupil A. The panel then considered whether creating the video was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship. The panel concluded that it was both. There was no educational purpose for making the video of Pupil A and it was clear from Pupil A's statement that she was uncomfortable with the content.

The panel found allegation 2.c proven.

d. Demonstrating a karate kick and kicking Pupil A on her bottom;

In the notes of an interview with Pupil A as part of the School's investigation, one of the concerns outlined by Pupil A was that Mr Ledwidge asked if he could show her a trick and then kicked her "on the bum".

In the Police investigation, Mr Ledwidge admitted to kicking Pupil A on the bottom but that this was a "Marx Brothers gag" and not for sexual gratification. Mr Ledwidge repeated this explanation in a statement sent to the TRA on 20 August 2024. Whilst the note of Pupil A's account was hearsay, the panel was able to place weight upon it given that Mr Ledwidge had not disputed her account.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Ledwidge had kicked Pupil A on her bottom. As such the panel went on to consider whether this was appropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship. The panel was unable to see any circumstance where a teacher demonstrating a karate kick on a pupil would be appropriate outside of physical education lessons and why it was necessary in the circumstances for Mr Ledwidge to touch Pupil A at all. The panel found that the conduct was inappropriate and a failure to maintain a professional relationship.

The panel found allegation 2d. proven.

e. Making and/or using customised wrapping paper containing the face of Pupil A;

In the notes of an interview with Pupil A as part of the School's investigation, one of the concerns outlined by Pupil A was that Mr Ledwidge had given her gifts that were, at times, wrapped in paper with images of her face.

The panel was provided with a photograph of the wrapping paper. Although Pupil A's face was blurred to protect her identity, the panel was satisfied that the wrapping paper contained an image.

When asked about the wrapping paper in his Police interview, Mr Ledwidge said that the wrapping paper was "only A4 printed paper with Pupil A's face on" Mr Ledwidge also admitted that he had taken Pupil A's photo from the class list, agreeing that this was "creepy" due to his age and position.

The panel was satisfied that based on Pupil A's account and Mr Ledwidge's admission; Mr Ledwidge used a photograph of Pupil A taken from the class list and printed this onto A4 paper which he used to wrap a gift.

The panel found that the conduct of was inappropriate and a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 2e. proven.

f. Storing photographs and/or personal information relating to Pupil A on his personal computer/electronic device/mobile phone;

As part of their investigation, the Police seized a number of electronic devices (including mobile phone, laptops and storage devices) from Mr Ledwidge at his home address following his arrest. The officer in the case reviewed the download data and browsing history on the devices on 7 August 2021. A summary of the data extracted from Mr Ledwidge's device including his internet search history was produced as part of the MG5 Police report and provided to the panel.

The downloads included photographs of Pupil A, including her school photograph, and Pupil A in a leather skirt [REDACTED] and personal information relating to Pupil A, such as Pupil A's address. Mr Ledwidge was asked questions by the Police regarding his devices and searches made regarding Pupil A and her address. Mr Ledwidge answered no comment to all questions.

The panel placed weight on the information provided by the Police following the search of Mr Ledwidge's devices. The devices were seized from Mr Ledwidge's home address and therefore the panel did not doubt that they belonged to Mr Ledwidge and the device data was reviewed by the officer in the case. The police ascertained that the information

belonged to Pupil A as the Police were aware of Pupil A's address and the Police had interviewed Pupil A as part of their investigation so were able to establish that it was her in the photographs.

The panel concluded that Mr Ledwidge had stored photographs and personal information relating to Pupil A on his mobile phone.

When considering whether the conduct was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship, the panel heard witness evidence from Witness 1 and Witness 2 regarding access to personal information at the School. Whilst personal information could be accessed by teachers using SIMS (School Information Management System), teachers were not permitted to store personal pupil information on their personal devices. There was no legitimate reason for Mr Ledwidge to access or store Pupil A's data on his device and therefore his conduct was inappropriate and a failure to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 2.f proven.

g. Conducting one or more internet searches in respect of Pupil A including as set out within Schedule 2.

As outlined above, the panel reviewed the police summary of data extracted from Mr Ledwidge's devices including his internet search history. The searches took place over a 1 month period and the summary included several searches for Pupil A's social media accounts, Google Maps searches of Pupil A's home address, Zoopla searches of images of Pupil A's home and Pupil A's [REDACTED]. Mr Ledwidge had also searched for Pupil A's photograph on the School's social media page. Mr Ledwidge had searched for a news article regarding Pupil A's [REDACTED].

The panel placed weight on the information provided by the Police following the search of Mr Ledwidge's devices. The devices were seized from Mr Ledwidge's home address and therefore the panel did not doubt that they belonged to Mr Ledwidge and the device data was reviewed by the officer in the case.

The panel concluded that the conduct was inappropriate and represented a failure to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil A. There was no apparent legitimate reason for Mr Ledwidge to carry out the internet searches, which were conducted within a short timeframe and all related to the same pupil.

The panel found allegation 2g. to be proven.

3. Between October 2019 and May 2021, passed handwritten notes to Pupil A which contained one or more comments, that were inappropriate, as set out within Schedule 3;

Pupil A provided several handwritten notes that she was given by Mr Ledwidge to Witness 2 who disclosed them to the Police. The panel was provided with photographs of the notes.

The panel reviewed the notes in conjunction with Schedule 3 and concluded that the content was consistent with the contents of Schedule 3.

Mr Ledwidge was asked about the notes during his Police interview. He admitted to sending the notes but stated that he had no romantic intentions in sending the notes. He said that the notes were intended to make Pupil A laugh but that he “could see how it looks” and “how Pupil A would feel”.

The panel was satisfied that the notes had been sent by Mr Ledwidge as he had not disputed sending them when he was interviewed by the police.

The panel went on to consider in turn whether the notes were inappropriate.

When discussing the notes in his Police interview, Mr Ledwidge accepted that the sending of handwritten notes to pupils was not appropriate contact. Mr Ledwidge stated that [REDACTED]. It was established as part of Witness 1’s witness evidence that there was not a system of [REDACTED] available to teachers in the School and it would not be deemed appropriate to ask pupils to [REDACTED].

With regards to Schedule 3 (a) and (b) the panel considered that Mr Ledwidge referring to Pupil A as his friend was inappropriate and a blurring of professional boundaries. The panel also considered that the adapted Elton John song lyrics “I hope you don’t mind that I put down in words, how wonderful life is now you’re in the class” were inappropriate and show favouritism and adoration of the pupil. With regards to Schedule 3 (c) the panel considered that this note appeared to be an ill-judged joke by Mr Ledwidge but indicated that he wanted Pupil A to know that he had noticed her, which was inappropriate. The note also suggested that Mr Ledwidge was aware that he should not be sending notes to the Pupil but he did so anyway. With regards to Schedule 3 (d), the panel considered that this was inappropriate and a blurring of professional boundaries. Schedule 3 (e) refers to a note on a mirror bought for Pupil A by Mr Ledwidge. The panel consider the comment was inappropriate and was suggesting that Pupil A was “lovely” which had a romantic undertone.

The panel found allegation 3 to be proven.

4. In or around September 2020, supplied mock exam questions to Pupil A, in advance of the exam, without providing the questions to any other pupil;

The panel was provided with an email from Mr Ledwidge to Pupil A dated 9 September 2020 containing mock exam questions for an ethics examination. Mr Ledwidge said in the

email that he was sending this to Pupil A because she was “his favourite” and asked her not to tell anyone about the contents of the email.

The panel was also provided with a photograph of a note from Mr Ledwidge to Pupil A which was provided to the School by Pupil A and later disclosed to the Police. The panel considered that this note could have also been the answer to an exam question however this could not be established without further context.

Mr Ledwidge was asked about supplying the mock exam questions to Pupil A in his first Police interview. Mr Ledwidge admitted to sending the email to Pupil A and admitted that this was wrong and asking Pupil A not to tell anyone was “not ethically correct”. Mr Ledwidge said that he was trying to give Pupil A extra help because [REDACTED].

The panel regarded the email and admission from Mr Ledwidge during his Police interview as evidence that it was more probable than not that Mr Ledwidge had provided Pupil A with the mock exam questions in advance of the exam, in breach of the School’s policies. The panel did not accept Mr Ledwidge’s explanation that he was trying to help Pupil A because [REDACTED]. The School had a detailed plan in place to safeguard Pupil A [REDACTED] and if Mr Ledwidge was concerned about Pupil A’s ability to perform in the exam, he should have reported this to the appropriate member of the safeguarding team. The panel found no indication that any other pupil had received the mock exam questions prior to the examination and the panel inferred from Mr Ledwidge asking Pupil A not to tell anyone about the contents of the email that, on the balance of probabilities, the mock examination questions were not sent to any other pupil.

The panel found allegation 4 to be proven.

5. Between 29 April 2020 and 15 July 2021, downloaded and/or stored one or more photographs of Pupil A on your personal device

As outlined above, the panel reviewed the police summary of data extracted from Mr Ledwidge’s devices including his internet search history. The downloads included photographs of Pupil A taken from the School’s social media page, her school photograph and a photograph of her [REDACTED]. Pupil A was asked by the Police about the photograph taken from her [REDACTED] and confirmed that the account belonged to her, which was confirmed in the MG5 police report.

Mr Ledwidge did not provide representations in response to this allegation.

The panel placed weight on the information provided by the Police following the search of Mr Ledwidge’s devices. The devices were seized from Mr Ledwidge’s home address and therefore the panel did not doubt that they belonged to Mr Ledwidge and the device data was reviewed by the officer in the case and concluded that it was more likely than not that Mr Ledwidge had stored photographs of Pupil A on his mobile phone.

The panel found allegation 5 to be proven.

6. Between October 2019 and May 2020, engaged in conduct that was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil B by:-

a. Making customised wrapping paper containing the face of Pupil B;

In the notes of an interview with Pupil A as part of the School's investigation, one of the concerns raised by Pupil A was that Mr Ledwidge had approached Pupil B after school and given her a wrapped gift. Pupil A stated in the interview that the wrapping paper had images of Pupil B's face on it.

In the witness statement from Pupil B to the Police, Pupil B stated that Mr Ledwidge stopped her in school and gave her an item wrapped in wrapping paper with her face on it. She said it was "like a collage of things related to her".

Mr Ledwidge was asked about the gift that he gave to Pupil B during his Police interview but was not asked specifically whether he had made customised wrapping paper containing Pupil B's face.

A photograph of the wrapping paper was produced and whilst Pupil B's face had been blurred to protect her identity, it was clear that an image had been printed onto the paper.

The panel considered that on the balance of probabilities, it was satisfied that Mr Ledwidge had made customised wrapping paper containing the face of Pupil B.

The panel found that the conduct was inappropriate and a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil B.

The panel found allegation 6.a. to be proven.

b. Sending/giving an unwanted gift to Pupil B, namely a pair of black and red stockings;

In the notes of an interview with Pupil A as part of the School's investigation, one of her concerns was that she had been informed by Pupil B that the gift contained within the customised wrapping paper referred to in allegation 6.a above that she received from Mr Ledwidge contained stockings and that Mr Ledwidge had asked Pupil B not to tell anyone.

In the witness statement from Pupil B to the Police, she stated that inside the wrapping paper there was a pair of stockings with a photograph on the front of the packaging of a woman's body from the waist down wearing a pair of black and red stripey stockings with a red bow at the top. Pupil B stated that the stockings were suited to a burlesque cabaret or sexual activity rather than daily wear.

A photograph of the stockings was produced in the Police exhibits which matched Pupil B's description from her witness statement.

Pupil B also confirmed in her witness statement to the Police that Pupil A and Pupil C were present when he gave her the gift and that she had shown them the stockings and they had found it "really weird". Pupil B said that they had joked about this as a coping mechanism. This was corroborated by Pupil A and Pupil C in their witness statements to the Police. Pupil D also made reference to the gift in their witness statement.

In his interview with the Police on 20 July 2021, Mr Ledwidge was asked about and admitted to gifting the stockings to Pupil B. Mr Ledwidge accepted that it was inappropriate and that he ought to have known that Pupil B would have been caused alarm and distress.

In light of the evidence of Pupil B given to the police, which was corroborated by Pupil A and Pupil C and given Mr Ledwidge had admitted gifting the stockings to Pupil B, the panel were satisfied that Mr Ledwidge gave the gift to Pupil B.

When considering whether the gift was unwanted, the panel considered the effect of the gift on Pupil B who said that it had shocked her and she had found it "very weird". The panel considered that, in the circumstances, the gift appeared to have been unprompted by Pupil B since it had shocked her and was, therefore, unwanted.

Witness 1's witness statement outlines the Schools' position on sending gifts to pupils. The giving of a gift must be approved by the Headteacher, Senior Management and the pupil's parent and the gift must be recorded. The sending of gifts outside of this process was not in keeping with the professional boundaries set by the School.

The panel considered that Mr Ledwidge did not follow the School's policy and the giving of gifts could be construed as favouritism or preferential treatment and therefore was a failure to maintain a professional relationship. The panel also considered that the nature of the gift was highly inappropriate for a teacher to provide to a pupil.

The panel found allegation 6.b. to be proven.

c. Making inappropriate comment to Pupil B to the effect of, "I like your tights", and/or "I've found something at my house that made me think of your tights, I'll bring them in for you".

In the notes of an interview with Pupil A as part of the School's investigation, one of the concerns was that she had been informed by Pupil B that prior to Mr Ledwidge gifting her the stockings, Mr Ledwidge made a comment about her tights and that he had "found similar tights at home".

In the witness statement from Pupil B to the Police, she said that Mr Ledwidge said words to the effect of “I’ve found something at my house that made me think of your tights, I’ll bring them in for you”.

Mr Ledwidge was not asked specifically by the Police in his interview whether he made either of these comments to Pupil B before he gifted her the stockings. In a statement prepared by Mr Ledwidge sent to the TRA on 20 August 2024, Mr Ledwidge stated that Pupil B’s tights were pointed out to him by a pupil with her and that he responded offering a similar “Belle Epoque-style” pair if she were interested that he had “lying around at home”.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that the comment was more likely than not to have been made. This conclusion was reinforced by the subsequent act of gifting Pupil B a pair of stockings. Pupil A and Pupil B provided consistent accounts, and the panel found no reason to doubt their credibility. In his statement to the TRA Mr Ledwidge did not deny making the comment save that he stated that another pupil made the initial comment regarding the tights. The panel considered that this was compatible with this having prompted Mr Ledwidge to have made the comment alleged.

The panel found allegation 6.c. to be proven

7. Between October 2019 and May 2021, engaged in conduct that was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil G, by:-

a. Creating one or more video(s), using photo images of Pupil G;

The police report confirmed that Pupil G had been visited by the police. Pupil G did not provide a witness statement but it was recorded in the Police report that during the visit they stated that they had contacted teachers, including Mr Ledwidge, for tuition in humanities subjects. According to Pupil G, Mr Ledwidge created a private session on ‘Showbie’ for this purpose and, within the ‘Showbie’ chat, altered her school photograph into a video.

In Mr Ledwidge’s representations dated 20 August 2024, Mr Ledwidge did not deny that he made the video using photo images of Pupil G. Mr Ledwidge says that this was “once” and it was “a morphing of 2 faces in a class, that were mentioned to have been similar and shown once in class”. Mr Ledwidge says that this was “unprofessional perhaps, but taken as intended...as a playful last lesson ‘funny’”.

Considering the above, the panel found that Mr Ledwidge admitted to creating the video using photographs of Pupil G. The panel then considered whether this constituted inappropriate behaviour and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil G. While Mr Ledwidge accepted that the video was unprofessional, he did not agree that

it was inappropriate. The panel did not regard the video itself as inherently inappropriate; however, it concluded that using Pupil G's photograph was unjustified and there was no educational purpose for doing so in the context of the subject that Mr Ledwidge taught. The panel therefore concluded that the conduct was inappropriate. The panel considered that creating the video did amount to a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil G.

The panel found allegation 7.a. proven.

b. Conducting internet searches in respect of Pupil G.

As outlined above, the panel reviewed the police summary of data extracted from Mr Ledwidge's devices including his internet search history. From the search of Mr Ledwidge's phone, the police located two searches for Pupil G, using their name, on 23 April 2020 and 29 April 2020.

The panel determined that the Police evidence was credible as the search had been conducted by the officer in the case as part of the investigation. The panel had no reason to doubt that the devices belonged to Mr Ledwidge as the devices were seized from his home address during his arrest. The panel therefore concluded that, on the balance of probabilities, Mr Ledwidge conducted the internet searches in respect of Pupil G.

The panel went on to consider whether this was inappropriate and/or a failure to maintain a professional relationship towards Pupil G. The panel concluded that this action was inappropriate, as there were official channels within the School through which Mr Ledwidge could have obtained information about Pupil G for any legitimate purpose. Furthermore, there was no reasonable justification for conducting these internet searches on his personal device. The panel also considered that this conduct was a failure to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil G.

The panel found allegation 7.b. proven.

8. Between October 2019 and May 2021, on one or more occasions, recorded videos of Pupil A, and/or Pupil C, and/or Pupil E, on your mobile phone, without their consent;

A search of Mr Ledwidge's computer was conducted by the School's IT team and reviewed by Witness 2 during the School's investigation. This search revealed several videos in Mr Ledwidge's deleted inbox, which had been sent from his private Yahoo account to his school email account. A video log was compiled as part of the disciplinary report, detailing covertly recorded videos of Pupil A between 5 and 15 May 2021.

Witness 2 identified other pupils in the videos, including Pupil E and Year 9 students. There was no mention of Pupil C directly in the video log. The videos were disclosed to the Police by Witness 2 as part of their investigation.

In her witness statement, Witness 2 confirmed the School's policy on recording pupils: if a teacher was required to record pupils, both the Headteacher and the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) had to be informed, and consent was required from the pupils and their parents. Recording without consent was prohibited, and covert recording was forbidden under the School's Staff Code of Conduct.

In Mr Ledwidge's statement to the TRA dated 20 August 2024, Mr Ledwidge accepted that that he recorded a video "once, accidentally" and that he was trying to do "something" on his phone.

During the police interview on 20 July 2021, Mr Ledwidge was questioned about the videos he had recorded of Pupil A, which were played to him. Mr Ledwidge admitted filming Pupil A without her knowledge, stating that he "instinctively thought, oh I'll video her, I don't know, maybe as a memento, a memory, I don't know". When asked why he needed a memento of Pupil A, Mr Ledwidge explained that he was creating a character based on Pupil A for his book and that "you don't get photos at the end". He was further asked why the filming was done discreetly, to which he denied deriving any sexual gratification from the videos. When questioned about why the videos were sent to his school email account, Mr Ledwidge said he did not know why he had done so.

The panel did not accept Mr Ledwidge's claim that there was only one video and that it had been filmed accidentally. This account was contradicted by the video log produced during the disciplinary process, as well as by footage shown to Mr Ledwidge by the police, which included multiple videos. With regards to consent, the police report confirmed that all individuals featured in the videos appeared to be unaware they were being filmed. Pupil A stated in her witness statement that she was not aware of the videos until informed by the police, a fact corroborated by Person V in their statement.

The panel found allegation 8 to be proven.

10. Between 22 January 2021 and 17 May 2021 sent videos from your personal email address to his work email address depicting scenes of violence and of a sexual nature;

The School Staff Code of Conduct provides guidance about how teachers should protect themselves when using ICT and how to use it responsibly as per the School's E-safety policy. Witness 1 gave evidence that teachers are not permitted to send emails from their personal email address to their work email address and that the documents had not been picked up by the firewall and filtering because Mr Ledwidge was not accessing the internet, however it is unclear whether this was deliberate.

A video log was compiled by Witness 2 as part of the disciplinary report. The video log contains details of three videos sent from Mr Ledwidge's personal email account to his school email account of women being attacked, which Witness 2 considered suggested

“inevitable rape”. Witness 2 confirmed this in her witness statement to the Police however said that the scene was likely to lead to the woman being “sexually assaulted”.

Witness 2 gave evidence of the content that she reviewed as part of the School disciplinary investigation. She said that it was upsetting and disturbing to see the content that Mr Ledwidge had shared with himself during the school day.

In Mr Ledwidge’s statement to the TRA dated 20 August 2024, Mr Ledwidge stated that the videos sent were from “Hitchcock films” and that he was breaking up scenes frame by frame for a piece that he was writing at the time. Mr Ledwidge accepted that this conduct was unacceptable and unprofessional. Mr Ledwidge admitted that the videos sent were of a sexual nature.

In his Police interview, Mr Ledwidge was asked about the videos sent to his school email address, Mr Ledwidge gave the same explanation as above and denied searching for “rape porn” at school.

The panel considered the video log and admissions from Mr Ledwidge as considerable evidence that videos of a sexual and violent nature were sent from Mr Ledwidge’s personal email account to his school email account. The panel also took into account the first hand witness evidence provided by Witness 2 as to the nature of the videos that she reviewed as part of the investigation and the impact that reviewing the videos had on her.

The panel found allegation 10 to be proven.

11. The Conduct as set out at any or all of paragraphs (1) – (10) above was sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature.

The panel considered whether the conduct found proven at allegations 1-8 and allegation 10 was sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature.

The panel first considered whether the conduct found proven was of a sexual nature.

With regards to the allegations relating to Pupil A, the panel considered that there was sufficient evidence that Mr Ledwidge’s conduct was of a sexual nature, save for allegation 4. In reaching this conclusion, the panel considered the nature of the email correspondence from Mr Ledwidge to Pupil A. Specifically, “Pupil A have this dance?”, “Like the moon: her splendour when visible, her attraction when invisible”, “Pupil A – all the glory of the world? Yes you did, and all that glory should be mine, you said...and it is”. The panel also considered the nature of the clip from Love Actually that Mr Ledwidge sent to Pupil A which was sexual in nature in the context of the film, and the YouTube link to “My Fair Lady” which Mr Ledwidge asked Pupil A to substitute the lyrics so that it related to school. The panel also considered the internet searches conducted by Mr Ledwidge for Pupil A’s [REDACTED] and the storing of a photograph of Pupil A in a leather skirt. The panel concluded that this was conduct of a sexual nature.

With regards to the allegations relating to Pupil B, the panel considered that there was sufficient evidence that Mr Ledwidge's conduct was of a sexual nature. The panel took into account the photograph of the stockings exhibited by the Police and concluded that they were sexual in nature.

With regards to the allegations relating to Pupil G at allegation 7, the panel did not consider, on the evidence provided, that Mr Ledwidge's conduct was sexual in nature.

Overall, the panel considered that all allegations against Mr Ledwidge save for allegation 4 and allegation 7 were sexual in nature.

The panel went on to consider sexual motivation and whether, even in the absence of any direct evidence, sexual motivation should be inferred from all of the circumstances of the case.

The panel considered that there was sufficient evidence that Mr Ledwidge's conduct towards Pupil A and Pupil B was sexually motivated. Although there was no direct evidence of Mr Ledwidge's conduct being for sexual gratification, there was evidence of apparent stepping stones on the way to a sexual relationship.

Specifically, the panel considered that Mr Ledwidge sent frequent emails to Pupil A containing inappropriate content, which he admitted during his police interview was wrong and something he should not have done. He also confirmed that he did not behave like this with any other pupil. Mr Ledwidge also admitted that Pupil A was his favourite to the Police.

The evidence recovered from the searches of Mr Ledwidge's devices indicate an infatuation with Pupil A with Mr Ledwidge accepting the Police's characterisation of this behaviour as "obsessive" about her when interviewed by the Police. Mr Ledwidge had stored photographs from the internet of Pupil A which he informed the Police in his interview that he had done because he wanted a "memento" of her. He had also accessed her social media accounts and looked up her home address on several occasions with the searches increasing around the time that Pupil A left the School.

The panel did not consider that Mr Ledwidge sending the mock exam questions to Pupil A was sexual in nature; however, the panel looked at the potential motivation behind the conduct and determined that this was a clear example of Mr Ledwidge showing preferential treatment towards Pupil A. When combined with evidence of preferential treatment and inappropriate correspondence, the conduct demonstrates a pattern of blurring appropriate boundaries and goes beyond professional obligations. Such conduct suggests an intention to create dependency or emotional closeness, which, in the context of a teacher-pupil dynamic, can be indicative of sexual motivation. Mr Ledwidge had also asked Pupil A not to tell anyone that he had provided the mock exam questions which the

panel further considered indicated an intention to pursue a future sexual relationship with Pupil A.

The panel therefore considered that there was sufficient evidence to suggest that Mr Ledwidge's combined conduct towards Pupil A was sexually motivated.

With regards to Mr Ledwidge's conduct towards Pupil B, the panel concluded that the gifting of stockings was sexually motivated. Stockings are widely recognised as an item of clothing associated with adult sexuality rather than an educational or professional gift. The giving of such a gift falls outside the appropriate boundaries of a teacher-pupil relationship. The nature of the item and the imbalance of power between Mr Ledwidge and Pupil B creates an inference that giving the gift was intended to convey sexual interest and therefore points to there being a sexual motivation from Mr Ledwidge.

To summarise, the panel found that Mr Ledwidge's conduct in allegations 1 – 6 and 8 and 10 to be sexually motivated. The panel did not consider allegation 7 and Mr Ledwidge's conduct towards Pupil G to be sexually motivated. The panel instead thought that this was an ill-judged attempt from Mr Ledwidge to impress Pupil G to choose him as her tutor.

The panel found allegation 11 proven.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

9. On 18 May 2021 followed Pupil A, Pupil E, and Pupil F in their vehicle whilst they were driving;

In Pupil A's crime report it is stated that there were concerns that Mr Ledwidge had followed her in the car as Pupil A and her friends had become aware of a white car behind them on the way home. It was alleged that Mr Ledwidge said to Pupil A and a friend "I saw you all in a car last night" the next day. Pupil A shared these concerns with Person V who referred to Mr Ledwidge following Pupil A in a vehicle in her statement.

Pupil E in their Police statement detailed that they were giving Pupil A and their friend a lift home from school and they noticed that a white car had been following them for 15 to 20 minutes. Pupil E told the Police that Pupil A had jokingly said that they wondered whether it was Mr Ledwidge. Pupil E states that Mr Ledwidge said the following day that he had seen them in the car and followed them as he had seen Pupil A in the back.

Mr Ledwidge in his statement to the TRA dated 20 August 2024 denied that he followed Pupil A, Pupil E and Pupil F in their vehicle. Mr Ledwidge stated that he was briefly and purely coincidentally behind the car until he turned off to go home. Mr Ledwidge also denied following the vehicle in his Police interview.

Mr Ledwidge has repeatedly asked for CCTV footage and has stated that this would disprove that he was following Pupil A, Pupil E and Pupil F.

The panel was not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the car behind the pupils was driven by Mr Ledwidge. The accounts provided by Pupil A and Pupil E were not inconsistent with Mr Ledwidge's explanation that he was coincidentally behind the vehicle for a short part of his route. Furthermore, the pupils were uncertain in their statements that it was Mr Ledwidge in the car. The panel also noted that, as Pupil A, Pupil E and Pupil F did not attend as witnesses, it was unable to test their evidence on this allegation, and there was an absence of compelling evidence based on the alleged comment by Mr Ledwidge the following day alone.

The panel found allegation 9 not proven.

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

Having found 10 of the 11 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", which is referred to as "the Advice".

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Ledwidge 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.

- 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 Ledwidge, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Mr Ledwidge was in breach of the following provisions: to safeguard and promote the welfare of children; to consider what was in the best interests of the child and to prevent the impairment of children’s mental health and development.

The panel considered the impact of Mr Ledwidge’s conduct on Pupil A, who was known to be vulnerable [REDACTED]. As Pupil A’s teacher, Mr Ledwidge had a duty to [REDACTED]. However, the panel concluded that his actions had the opposite effect, [REDACTED] the potential harm to Pupil A.

Mr Ledwidge mentioned a belief that he has [REDACTED] and provided evidence of his recent diagnosis of [REDACTED]. The panel considered this when determining whether his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct. However, the panel noted that there was no medical evidence provided to support a diagnosis of [REDACTED] and no medical evidence has been provided to demonstrate any impact of the diagnosis of [REDACTED] on Mr Ledwidge’s behaviour.

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

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offences of sexual communication with a child and harassment/ stalking were relevant.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ledwidge amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

In relation to whether Mr Ledwidge’s actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It 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.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Ledwidge's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Ledwidge was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offences of sexual communication with a child and stalking/ harassment were relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Ledwidge's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Ledwidge's actions constituted 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. 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; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of failing to maintain professional relationships with pupils and engaging in sexually motivated conduct towards two pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ledwidge 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 Ledwidge 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 Ledwidge in the profession. Whilst there was some evidence that Mr Ledwidge had ability as an educator (in that no concerns were raised regarding Mr Ledwidge prior to the allegations), the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Ledwidge in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

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 noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Ledwidge.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. 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;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- ...concealment including...concealing inappropriate actions.

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

The panel considered that Mr Ledwidge's actions were deliberate in that he chose to engage in the conduct without taking any measures to ensure boundaries were maintained. Mr Ledwidge was aware of Pupil A's vulnerabilities following [REDACTED] but failed to safeguard her wellbeing.

There was no evidence that Mr Ledwidge was acting under extreme duress e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. The panel had regard to [REDACTED] referred to by Mr Ledwidge in mitigation. Throughout the Police investigation, Mr Ledwidge referred to thinking that he had [REDACTED] however the panel has not seen any evidence to support such a diagnosis. The panel has received and reviewed evidence of a subsequent [REDACTED] diagnosis. However no evidence has been produced to show how the condition affected Mr Ledwidge's behaviour in any way that could amount to mitigation on the proven facts.

The panel heard evidence from Witness 1 and Witness 2 that Mr Ledwidge had previously good history and there were no prior concerns regarding his conduct. The panel was not however provided with any evidence to demonstrate that Mr Ledwidge had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct nor that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Mr Ledwidge did not provide any character references for inclusion in the hearing bundle.

With regard to insight and remorse, the panel saw some evidence of remorse and a degree of insight shown by Mr Ledwidge in statements sent to the TRA and in his Police interview for example apologising for certain aspects of his behaviour and the impact on the pupils and admitting to some of the allegations. The panel was concerned that this insight and remorse was limited and selective for example in Mr Ledwidge's email dated 20 August 2024, Mr Ledwidge provided explanations for some his behaviour which even if true in themselves, did not in any way render the behaviour less inappropriate. The panel also considered that Mr Ledwidge had not participated in the School's disciplinary procedure. Weighing up the evidence available, the panel did not consider that the level of insight and remorse demonstrated by Mr Ledwidge carried significant weight in mitigation.

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, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Ledwidge of prohibition. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case.

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 Ledwidge. It was important in the interests of upholding proper standards in the profession that engaging in the conduct found proven warranted a prohibition order, and that this outweighed the interests of Mr Ledwidge. 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 two 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. One of these cases include serious sexual misconduct which includes where the act was sexually motivated. Whilst Mr Ledwidge's conduct was serious, the panel did not however consider that it was at the most serious end of the possible spectrum.

Nevertheless, given the seriousness, the panel considered that the conduct found proven warranted a longer review period. The panel was concerned at the risk of repetition given that there were instances of sexually motivated conduct towards two pupils and that there were deficiencies in the level of insight demonstrated. The panel also continuing effect of the conduct on Pupil A. The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period after five years.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found allegation 9 not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Ledwidge should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Ledwidge 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Ledwidge, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding that his conduct towards Pupil A was sexually motivated.

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 likely to 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 Ledwidge and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, *"...that Mr Ledwidge's actions were deliberate in that he chose to engage in the conduct without taking any measures to ensure boundaries were maintained. Mr Ledwidge was aware of Pupil A's vulnerabilities following [REDACTED] but failed to safeguard her wellbeing"*. 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 saw some evidence of remorse and a degree of insight shown by Mr Ledwidge in statements sent to the TRA and in his Police interview for example apologising for certain aspects of his behaviour and the impact on the pupils and admitting to some of the allegations"*. The panel has also commented that *"The panel was concerned that this insight and remorse was limited and selective"*. In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *"...the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ledwidge were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession"*. I am particularly mindful of the finding of 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 and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Ledwidge himself. The panel comment *"The panel was not however provided with any evidence to demonstrate that Mr Ledwidge had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct nor that he had contributed significantly to the education sector"*.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Ledwidge 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 lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, *"Weighing up the evidence available, the panel did not consider that the level of insight and remorse demonstrated by Mr Ledwidge carried significant weight in mitigation"*.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Ledwidge's conduct was found to be sexually motivated.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Ledwidge 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 remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a five year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments *"...given the seriousness, the panel considered that the conduct found proven warranted a longer review period. The panel was concerned at the risk of repetition given that there were instances of sexually motivated conduct towards two pupils and that there were deficiencies in the level of insight demonstrated"*.

I have considered whether a five year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

I have considered the Advice. As the panel note, *"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. One of these cases include serious sexual misconduct which includes where the act was sexually motivated"*.

In light of the panel's findings that *"...insight and remorse was limited and selective for example in Mr Ledwidge's email dated 20 August 2024, Mr Ledwidge provided explanations for some his behaviour which even if true in themselves, did not in any way render the behaviour less inappropriate"*. The panel further note *"the panel did not consider that the level of insight and remorse demonstrated by Mr Ledwidge carried significant weight in mitigation"*.

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 sexually motivated behaviour towards two pupils was sexually motivated, the risk of repetition and the lack of full insight and remorse.

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

This means that Mr Peter Ledwidge 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 Ledwidge 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 Ledwidge 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 'S. Blomfield', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 29 January 2026

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