



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Andrew Peacock: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

February 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	16
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	20

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

Teacher: Mr Andrew Peacock

Teacher ref number: 0007871

Teacher date of birth: 21 May 1977

TRA reference: 24526

Date of determination: 6 February 2026

Former employer: Hetton Academy, County Durham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 5 to 6 February 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Andrew Peacock.

The panel members were Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Suhel Ahmed (teacher panellist) and Mrs Bev Williams (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Leah Redden of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Peacock was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 18 November 2025

It was alleged that Mr Peacock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed as the deputy department head in mathematics at the Heddon Academy between 2022 and 2024:

1. He engaged in inappropriate behaviour in that he was undressed and/or wore no clothing in a residential area on or around 11 November 2023;
2. He failed to inform the School of his arrest on or around 11 November 2023;
3. His conduct as referred to at 1 above constituted a criminal offence, for which he accepted a caution on or around 5 May 2024;
4. His conduct as may be found at 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

In the absence of Mr Peacock, the allegations were taken to have been not admitted.

Mr Peacock had indicated in his response to the notice of proceedings that he admitted the allegations but did not admit that he 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: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 5 to 18

Section 2: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 19 to 20

Section 3: Draft statement of agreed facts – pages 21 to 25

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 26 to 73

Section 5: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 74 to 177

Section 6: Teacher documents - pages 178 to 192

The panel was also provided with a recording of Mr Peacock's police interview provided by Mr Peacock.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

An aerial map of the locality of the events referred to in allegation 1.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle and had listened to the recording of Mr Peacock's police interview, in advance of the hearing. The panel had also seen the additional document 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 – [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Peacock was employed at the School from April 2013 as a mathematics teacher and on 1 September 2022 became the deputy department head in mathematics. On 19 May 2024, Mr Peacock resigned from his position at the School.

On 28 June 2024, a disciplinary hearing was held.

On 3 October 2024, Mr Peacock was referred to the Teaching Regulation Agency.

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:

Whilst employed as the deputy department head in mathematics at the Heddon Academy between 2022 and 2024:

- 1. You engaged in inappropriate behaviour in that you were undressed and/or wore no clothing in a residential area on or around 11 November 2023;**

The panel was provided with a witness statement given to the police of an individual who was “out with my friends” [REDACTED]. He described their friend having seen a male coming from the gates by the water edge. He stated that they all turned to look and the male was walking towards them. The witness stated that he noticed that the male was fully naked. He stated that the male noticed them and turned the other way. The witness stated that he went towards the male who ran and the witness saw him getting into a car. He stated that the male drove up and down the street three times and the witness’s friend had called the police. He stated that he felt concerned about seeing the “naked man, late at night, wearing no clothes”.

The individual who called the police also provided a statement to the police. She stated she had been “out drinking with a few mates”. She referred to having been stood at the end of [REDACTED], where it meets [REDACTED]. She stated that she had seen a naked man after her friend had remarked “Is he naked?”. She stated that as they walked down [REDACTED] towards him, the man ran away and jumped in his car. She stated that the male had been about 80m from them when they saw him naked, that there was street lighting and nothing obscuring her view. She also described the male driving up and down the street after he returned to his car. She stated that she had felt [REDACTED] because she did not know what he was planning on doing. She stated that it made her [REDACTED].

The police report states that, at the time Mr Peacock was stopped in his car by the police, the police officer noticed that Mr Peacock had a grey hoody placed over his lap and his bare legs were showing.

The panel considered that it could attach some weight to the evidence of the police officer and the two witnesses. There was no apparent reason for them to have fabricated their evidence. The two witnesses recorded their evidence in a witness statement given to the police, bearing a statement of truth, and having declared they would be liable to prosecution if they had wilfully stated anything in it that they knew to be false or did not believe to be true. In all respects material to the allegations their evidence tallied with Mr Peacock’s own accounts that he subsequently gave.

The panel was provided with a recording of Mr Peacock’s police interview. In this interview, Mr Peacock confirmed that he had been naked in a public place at between 11:30pm and midnight. He referred to being a naturist and taking naked walks [REDACTED]. He stated that he had been fully naked save for wearing trainers but had taken reasonable steps beforehand to ensure he was not seen. He stated that he had been out of his car for around 30 seconds to a minute. He stated that when he heard voices he returned to his car so as not to cause any offence. He stated that, after driving away, he had returned to ascertain whether the area was a viable place for him to return to walk near the river in the future without causing offence to anyone. He was asked if he intended for anyone to see him naked and no response could be heard. He was asked if he had obtained any sexual gratification from people seeing him walk in public naked and he

answered “no”. He was asked if he intended for anyone who would have or may have seen him to feel alarm or distressed, and answered “no” but understood that some people could feel that way.

The panel noted that Mr Peacock had provided a copy of the recording to evidence that he had responded “no” to the question of whether he intended for anyone to see him naked, as the police summary of the interview stated Mr Peacock had remained silent in response to this question. The panel heard Mr Peacock’s answer, quietly, “no” to the question and that he was later asked questions following on from him having said that he did not intend to be seen.

The panel was provided with an out of court disposal acceptance form. The form provided a description of the s5 Public Order offence committed which stated “Suspect has been identified as walking naked in a public street, where he has been sighted by three witnesses”. Mr Peacock signed the form to confirm that he had been interviewed in relation to the offence described on the form, that he had fully admitted the offence and that he understood the police may decide to issue a simple caution should the police decide that this was an appropriate outcome for the offences detailed. A police sergeant signed the form to confirm that he authorised a simple caution or a conditional caution to be administered. Given that the form contained a clear admission of guilt, the panel placed significant weight upon it.

For the School’s investigation, Mr Peacock prepared a statement which stated “I am a Naturist and [REDACTED] from being naked in the fresh air.” He stated that on that evening, he had been delivering food (in his second job as a delivery driver) and he decided that he wanted to go for a walk by the river. He stated “I figured that there might be a place by the river where I could walk naked away from the public gaze.” He stated that he parked up and removed his clothing within the car. He stated that he was only out of the car, naked, for less than a minute before he thought he heard voices so he quickly returned to his vehicle and drove away from the area. He stated that he “put a T-shirt on and covered his lower body with a hoody”.

In the notes of Mr Peacock’s interview as part of the School’s investigation, he referred to being a naturist and that he would, ordinarily, practise his naturism in places which are quite rural, and usually within a controlled environment. He stated that, on this particular occasion, although the area was classed as a residential area, it was on the fringes of it and next to a river. He referred to the area as being a fairly small housing estate with some scrub land to one side of it. He stated that he had not gone into the countryside because it was late and dark so had sought to find somewhere that was “very quiet” and where “I was unlikely to be seen” but where there was some lighting so he could see what he was doing.

He stated that he had sat in his car for about 10 minutes or so beforehand with the window down to listen out for any voices or any noise, and had looked to see if there was

anyone around. He stated that there did not appear to be anyone and he had tried to assess the area as best as he could.

In the notes of Mr Peacock's disciplinary hearing, Mr Peacock stated that he had been out of his car for 30 seconds, maybe less than a minute. He stated that the area had been as close to rural as he could get with some form of lighting so that he could see, rather than tripping over his feet. In that hearing, Mr Peacock was asked why he removed his clothes in the car, rather than next to the river and Mr Peacock stated that was because he would then have to carry them. He described the river as having been 5 to 10 metres from his car and indicated the location of the car on an aerial map of the area.

Witness A had been in attendance at the disciplinary hearing. She gave oral evidence and was asked to point out, on an aerial map, where Mr Peacock had pointed to the location of where his car had been parked. She pointed to an area opposite the junction between [REDACTED]. From the aerial map provided to the panel, it was apparent that here were at least 7 houses between the location that Witness A had identified and the river.

In representations to the TRA, Mr Peacock stated that he has been a naturist intermittently for several years. He explained that it has been a therapeutic activity. [REDACTED]. On the evening in question, he stated that [REDACTED] and sought a quiet, isolated location for personal reflection. I ended up in the [REDACTED] by the river, a place I deemed quiet and suitable for solitude. Before exiting my car, I took considerable care to ensure the area was empty and free of passersby, waiting for approximately 10 minutes with the window open to confirm its seclusion. After leaving the car, I walked briefly towards the river. Upon hearing distant voices, I immediately returned to my vehicle and drove away, taking care to ensure I was covered and would not be seen. I would estimate that I had been out of the car for no longer than approximately thirty seconds. At no point did I intend to cause alarm or distress to anyone, and to my knowledge, I had not encountered or been seen by anyone."

In Mr Peacock's response to the notice of proceedings form completed by him on 18 November 2025, he admitted all of the allegations, save that he did not admit that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In light of the evidence available to the panel, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Peacock was undressed and/or wore no clothing on or around 11 November 2023. The panel was satisfied that he did this in a residential area, having been provided with an aerial map of the area and noting that there were houses. The panel also noted that Mr Peacock and one of the witnesses referred to the presence of street lighting. The panel was satisfied that Mr Peacock had engaged in inappropriate behaviour, having been undressed in a residential area, given the risk of being seen.

The panel found this allegation proven.

2. You failed to inform the School of your arrest on or around 11 November 2023;

Witness A was the [REDACTED] around the time of Mr Peacock's arrest. In her witness statement, she stated that on 21 November 2023, she received a telephone call from the Local Authority Designated Officer ("LADO") who asked her if Mr Peacock worked at the School. Witness A stated that she confirmed this and the LADO asked her if Mr Peacock had made any disclosures. She stated that he had not and was then asked if she knew that Mr Peacock had been arrested on 11 November 2023. Witness A stated that she confirmed that she was not aware of this. She stated that the LADO then disclosed that Mr Peacock had been naked in a residential area, leading to his arrest.

Witness A stated that Mr Peacock had not informed her, or anyone at the School, prior to her call with the LADO that he had been arrested. She stated that when a teacher is arrested, she expected that "in line with Section 13 of the Code of Conduct" she would be informed as soon as possible of the arrest.

Section 13 of the School's Code of Conduct stated "employees have a duty to immediately disclose to the nominated officer...or during the course of their employment, any change in their circumstances or any information which may affect or is likely to affect the suitability of the employee to undertake their job role or work with students. Should an employee be unclear about whether it is appropriate to disclose a matter they are encouraged to seek guidance from their nominated officer at the earliest opportunity."

Witness A stated that she subsequently met with Mr Peacock and asked if he had anything he needed to tell her. She stated that he answered "no", and she informed him of the conversation she had had with the LADO. She stated that Mr Peacock confirmed he had been arrested, but that he did not see it as an issue, nor did he feel he needed to disclose it as he was a naturist and that his actions were not illegal.

In the notes of Mr Peacock's interview as part of the School's investigation, he admitted he had not informed the School that he had been interviewed by the police. However, he referred to having asked the police about the need to inform his employer, and the police had told him that the School would probably be informed but that Mr Peacock would be told before that happened. Mr Peacock explained that he had not been charged and since he did not know what was to happen, had mistakenly thought he was due to return to the police station within a week or two, and that he expected, on the advice of his solicitor, that the matter would be resolved.

At Mr Peacock's interview there was some confusion whether he had been arrested or not, and the interview proceeded on the basis that he had been interviewed by the police. In the disciplinary hearing, Mr Peacock confirmed that he had been arrested.

In Mr Peacock's response to a draft statement of agreed facts prepared by the TRA, he stated that he had been unaware of the need to inform the School himself, and the police had told him that he would be informed in advance if they were going to need to inform the School. He stated that as he was highly distressed at this time, he misunderstood a return date for bail, expecting to have a response within about a week or so of the arrest as to next steps at which point he would be able to give the School a fuller picture. He stated that, at the time, he did not consider that the allegations should have affected his suitability for employment.

In further representations to the TRA on 17 March 2025, Mr Peacock re-iterated the above explanation and added that he had decided he would wait until he returned to answer to his bail to find out what the outcome was likely to be before discussing the matter with the School, unless he heard in the meantime that the School would be informed anyway, in which case he would have spoken with them sooner. He stated that as he had not been charged, and did not know what the charge would have been, he was unaware that it would have been anything that would have compromised his employment. He stated that wording within the School's policies did not specify arrest as a reason to inform the School and his interpretation of the wording did not lead him to think that he had to inform the School at that point.

The police report confirmed that Mr Peacock had been arrested.

In oral evidence, Witness A confirmed that she had seen Mr Peacock on multiple occasions between 11 November 2023 and 21 November 2023 so he had the opportunity to inform her on any of these occasions. She referred to the School having an open door policy. Despite this, Mr Peacock had not informed her of his arrest.

In Mr Peacock's response to the notice of proceedings form completed by him on 18 November 2025, he admitted all of the allegations, save that he did not admit that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered that, in light of the above evidence, Mr Peacock had failed to inform the School of his arrest. There was a clear expectation that he inform them under the Code of Conduct. Although the Code of Conduct was not explicit that an arrest should be disclosed, it referred to "any information which may affect or is likely to affect the suitability of the employee to undertake their job role or work with students" (emphasis added). As an experienced teacher, Mr Peacock would have been familiar with the requirements around safeguarding, and ought to have known that his arrest may have had such an impact upon his suitability to work with students. If he had been in any

doubt about whether it was appropriate to disclose a matter, the Code of Conduct encouraged staff to seek guidance from their nominated officer at the earliest opportunity. Witness A confirmed in oral evidence that she was the nominated officer to whom such a disclosure should have been made.

The panel found this allegation proven.

3. Your conduct as referred to at 1 above constituted a criminal offence, for which you accepted a caution on or around 5 May 2024;

In the notes of the School's disciplinary hearing, Mr Peacock referred to a simple caution having been offered to him for a section 5 public order offence. He stated that he discussed this with his solicitor who advised that the case would come to nothing, but that if it went to court, it could be reported upon. He stated that the potential media exposure for the School and the Academy Trust influenced his decision to accept the caution.

As referred to above, the panel was provided with an out of court disposal acceptance form dated 5 May 2024. The form provided a description of the s5 Public Order offence committed which stated "Suspect has been identified as walking naked in a public street, where he has been sighted by three witnesses". The form notified Mr Peacock that he would be considered for an out of court disposal which would likely require his participation in an intervention activity focused on either the offence committed or to support him going forward. Mr Peacock signed the form to confirm that he had been interviewed in relation to the offence described on the form that he had fully admitted the offence and that he understood the police may decide to issue a simple caution should the police decide that this was an appropriate outcome for the offences detailed. A police sergeant signed the form on 5 May 2024 to confirm that he authorised a simple caution or a conditional caution to be administered.

In Mr Peacock's representations to the TRA in December 2024 he stated that he had been placed on bail for nearly six months before being offered a simple caution under section 5 of the Public Order Act. He stated that his solicitor had advised that the case could be strongly contested and likely dismissed in court but cautioned that pursuing that route could attract media attention. He stated that he accepted the caution to protect the reputation of the School and to avoid unnecessary publicity.

In Mr Peacock's response to the notice of proceedings form completed by him on 18 November 2025, he admitted all of the allegations, save that he did not admit that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In light of Mr Peacock having signed the out of court disposal acceptance form to confirm that he fully admitted the offence set out on the form, the panel was satisfied that Mr Peacock's conduct as referred to in allegation 1 above constituted a criminal offence for which he accepted a caution on or around 5 May 2024.

The panel found this allegation proven.

4. Your conduct as may be found at 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

In the notes of Mr Peacock's interview as part of the School's investigation, he admitted he had not informed the School that he had been interviewed by the police. However, he referred to having asked the police about the need to inform his employer, and the police had told him that the School would probably be informed but that Mr Peacock would be told before that happened. Mr Peacock explained that he had not been charged and since he did not know what was to happen and because he had mistakenly thought he would hear within a week or two, and that he expected, on the advice of his solicitor that the matter would be resolved. He stated that he had not seen any particular wording in the Code of Conduct about a duty to disclose an arrest, but he would not have paid a "huge notice" to it as he never expected to have any involvement with the police.

In the School's disciplinary hearing, he referred to his understanding that he would be informed first before the police informed his employer, and his belief that he was due to return to the police station within two weeks. He stated that "My interpretation of the code of conduct was that I was not required to inform the school immediately of my involvement with the police, particularly as I had not been charged with anything. Perhaps due to naivety in this area, uncertainty and fear of exactly what would happen with the police, and also advice from [REDACTED], it was still my intention to inform the school but I was looking to wait until I had a clearer idea of what was going to happen with the police so that I could give a more informed account of the issue." He also referred to being "extremely upset and confused by the whole situation". Mr Peacock stated to his solicitor having informed him that action should not have been taken by the police as Mr Peacock's actions were not unlawful. He referred to this being backed up by the College of Policing guidelines and in press articles regarding similar incidents. He stated that he was a naturist and had committed no crime.

In Mr Peacock's response to a draft statement of agreed facts prepared by the TRA, he stated that he "would expect that ordinary decent teachers would regard that my initial reactions to my first ever negative experience with the police would be understandable and was not intentionally dishonest as I had expected to inform the school of my arrest when I had a better understanding of the situation".

As referred to above, in further representations to the TRA on 17 March 2025, Mr Peacock re-iterated the above explanation and added that he had decided he would wait until he returned to answer to his bail to find out what the outcome was likely to be before discussing the matter with the School, unless he heard in the meantime that the School would be informed anyway, in which case he would have spoken with them sooner. He stated that as he had not been charged, and did not know what the charge would have been, he was unaware that it would have been anything that would have compromised his employment. He stated that wording with the School's policies did not specify arrest as a reason to inform the School and his interpretation of the wording did not lead him to think that he had to inform the School at that point. Later in those representations, Mr Peacock stated "I also regret not having informed the School sooner of the arrest, but I was fearful and anxious as to the outcomes of the police investigation and also the impact it could have had on my career".

In Mr Peacock's response to the notice of proceedings form completed by him on 18 November 2025, he admitted all of the allegations, save that he did not admit that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered that Mr Peacock had given several explanations for not having informed the school:

1. He had been waiting to hear from the police as to what would happen next;
2. He didn't consider his actions to have been unlawful;
3. He had not seen any particular wording in the Code of Conduct about a duty to disclose an arrest, but he would not have paid a "huge notice" to it as he never expected to have any involvement with the police; and
4. He was fearful and anxious as to the outcomes of the police investigation and the impact it could have had on his career.

In oral evidence, Witness A confirmed that Mr Peacock had declared that he had a second job as a delivery driver and completed the relevant form required under the Code of Conduct. The panel considered that Mr Peacock had thereby demonstrated his awareness of the Code of Conduct. He was also aware of having been arrested. His knowledge of safeguarding, derived from being an experienced teacher would have meant that he was aware of the need to disclose anything that may impact on his suitability to work with children. The panel considered that Mr Peacock had known that he should have disclosed his arrest, and that he did not do so, in the hope that the matter would be resolved without the School becoming aware of it. The panel also considered that an ordinary honest person would consider this to be dishonest.

The panel recognised that teachers are not expected to act as paragons of virtue, However, the panel considered that the ethical standards of the profession require teachers to act with honesty in order that appropriate safeguarding measures can be put

into place. In failing to disclose his arrest, Mr Peacock jeopardised the School's ability to respond appropriately and Mr Peacock's conduct therefore lacked integrity.

The panel found this allegation proven.

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

Having found all 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 Peacock, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Peacock was in breach of the Preamble requiring teachers to act with honesty and integrity. The panel also considered that Mr Peacock had breached the following requirements:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including ...the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- 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 Peacock, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE"). Mr Peacock failed to have regard to the School's Code of Conduct in failing to disclose his arrest. He thereby also failed to have regard to his safeguarding responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Peacock, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Mr Peacock'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 offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant. The panel noted that Mr Peacock had pleaded guilty to an offence under s5 Public Order Act 1986 which relates to the use of threatening or abusive words or behaviour, or disorderly behaviour ...within the hearing or sight of a person likely to be caused harassment, alarm or distress thereby. The panel noted that behaviours associated with harassment was also therefore relevant.

Given Mr Peacock's explanation for why he decided to take a walk, naked, alongside the river, the panel considered whether his behaviour could be considered to be morally reprehensible. However, the panel noted that there was no medical evidence available to the panel that his actions were driven by [REDACTED].

The panel noted that the allegations 1 and 2 took place outside the education setting. Mr Peacock's actions may have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way given that his conduct took place in a residential setting. The location was the same distance from the School, as other pupils lived, albeit none lived in the vicinity. Nevertheless, Mr Peacock risked being seen by pupils of the School.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Peacock 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 Peacock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Peacock'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 Peacock'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 Peacock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offences of serious dishonesty and harassment were relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Peacock'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 protection of other members of the public; 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 and the protection of other members of the public given the impact Mr Peacock's actions had on those that had seen him naked and the risk that he could have been seen by pupils. He failed to disclose information that would have informed the School's safeguarding decisions.

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

Whilst there is evidence that Mr Peacock had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Peacock 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 Peacock.

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;
- 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);
- actions or behaviours that ...undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect ...;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions...; and
- collusion or 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.

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

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Peacock was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. [REDACTED]. On the evening in question, he stated that [REDACTED] and sought a quiet, isolated location for personal

reflection. No medical evidence was adduced as to Mr Peacock's [REDACTED] or to any impact of his [REDACTED] on his conduct. [REDACTED].

Mr Peacock had a previous good history, but did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Mr Peacock did not provide any testimonial statements to the panel as to his character or his ability as a teacher.

Witness A stated in oral evidence that Mr Peacock had worked at the School for a long time, and there had never been any concerns about his conduct within the School or about his relationships with others. She described Mr Peacock as "ok" in terms of his teaching ability.

The panel noted that Mr Peacock had made admissions as to the facts alleged. He also expressed remorse. He stated that he had been unaware any alarm had been caused to anyone by his actions, until he received the witness statements included within the bundle prepared for these misconduct proceedings. He stated that "Upon reflection, I deeply regret any unintended distress caused by my actions." The panel also noted that Mr Peacock has stated that, since the incident, he has refrained from naturist activities entirely, out of an abundance of caution and "a desire to prevent any future misunderstandings". He has also stated that he had made an error of judgment given his role as a teacher.

Nevertheless, the panel considered Mr Peacock's insight to be limited. He has maintained that he took adequate precautions in waiting to hear if anyone was in the vicinity, and that he had not intended to cause alarm or distress to anyone. He has also sought to rely upon the short time period in which he was naked, but of course, that was because his walk was curtailed when he heard voices. He ought to have appreciated the risks of being seen by those to whom he might cause alarm given that he was in a residential area, and it might be expected that, as a naturist, he would have had a heightened awareness of the risks involved.

Whilst Mr Peacock has expressed regret for any unintended alarm or distress, the panel noted that Mr Peacock's representations focussed more upon the impact of the police investigation and School's investigation upon [REDACTED].

The panel noted that Mr Peacock has maintained that his actions were lawful, despite having accepted a caution admitting a Public Order offence (and despite admitting allegation 3), stating that he had accepted the caution to avoid causing reputational damage to the School and to avoid unnecessary publicity.

Whilst Mr Peacock has admitted dishonesty, he has also continuously sought to justify his decision not to inform the School. The panel noted that, whilst Mr Peacock admitted

the facts of the allegations, he did not admit that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, indicating that he did not consider his conduct to be serious, particularly having made a comment that “the behaviour itself was not inappropriate” and that the “incident has no direct impact on my ability to teach, nor does it pose a safeguarding risk”. Furthermore, Mr Peacock has not demonstrated any understanding of why it was important to inform the School of his arrest.

The panel also noted that Mr Peacock requested that a professional conduct panel meeting be convened, and he did not attend this professional conduct panel hearing. He similarly accepted a caution so as to avoid “any media attention it might bring to the school and to my family – trying to protect the school and trust’s reputation, and that of my own” and the panel was concerned that he had thereby sought to avoid attendance at a public hearing, and, had he done so, his level of insight and remorse could have been tested.

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 Peacock 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 Peacock, particularly given Mr Peacock’s insight was limited, and therefore there was a risk of repetition. 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.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel’s findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel recognised that Mr Peacock had shown limited insight, but insufficient to demonstrate that he understood the potential risk of harm. He has said that he has refrained from naturist activities subsequently, and if he were to continue with naturism, "it would never be anything that I would bring into the school or within the local area. That has always been the case." In making this statement, he failed to appreciate that he had conducted such activities in the local area, and the panel was therefore concerned at the risk of repetition. Nevertheless, whilst the conduct found proven in this case was sufficiently serious to warrant prohibition, the panel recognised that it was not as serious as those types of cases where the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of no review period, or a longer review period.

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 two 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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Peacock is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including ...the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...

- 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 Peacock involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance ‘Keeping children safe in education’.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a teacher both accepting a police caution for a criminal offence and exhibiting behaviour that was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In assessing that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Peacock, 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 makes this observation:

“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public given the impact Mr Peacock’s actions had on those that had seen him naked and the risk that he could have been seen by pupils. He failed to disclose information that would have informed the School’s safeguarding decisions.”

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 it sets out as follows:

“The panel noted that Mr Peacock had made admissions as to the facts alleged. He also expressed remorse. He stated that he had been unaware any alarm had been caused to anyone by his actions, until he received the witness statements included within the bundle prepared for these misconduct proceedings. He stated that “Upon reflection, I deeply regret any unintended distress caused by my actions.” The panel also noted that Mr Peacock has stated that, since the incident, he has refrained from naturist activities entirely, out of an abundance of caution and “a desire to prevent any future misunderstandings”. He has also stated that he had made an error of judgment given his role as a teacher.

Nevertheless, the panel considered Mr Peacock’s insight to be limited. He has maintained that he took adequate precautions in waiting to hear if anyone was in the vicinity, and that he had not intended to cause alarm or distress to anyone. He has also sought to rely upon the short time period in which he was naked, but of course, that was because his walk was curtailed when he heard voices. He ought to have appreciated the risks of being seen by those to whom he might cause alarm given that he was in a residential area, and it might be expected that, as a naturist, he would have had a heightened awareness of the risks involved.

Whilst Mr Peacock has expressed regret for any unintended alarm or distress, the panel noted that Mr Peacock’s representations focussed more upon the impact of the police investigation and School’s investigation upon [REDACTED].

The panel noted that Mr Peacock has maintained that his actions were lawful, despite having accepted a caution admitting a Public Order offence (and despite admitting allegation 3), stating that he had accepted the caution to avoid causing reputational damage to the School and to avoid unnecessary publicity.

Whilst Mr Peacock has admitted dishonesty, he has also continuously sought to justify his decision not to inform the School. The panel noted that, whilst Mr Peacock admitted the facts of the allegations, he did not admit that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, indicating that he did not consider his conduct to be serious, particularly having made a comment that “the behaviour itself was not inappropriate” and that the “incident has no direct impact on my ability to teacher, nor does it pose a safeguarding risk”. Furthermore, Mr Peacock has not demonstrated any understanding of why it was important to inform the School of his arrest.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence that Mr Peacock has developed full insight into his actions 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 comments as follows:

“The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual’s status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Peacock’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding in this case of a teacher accepting a police caution for an offence which involved being undressed in a residential area and the negative impact that such a finding may have 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 Peacock himself. The panel notes the following:

“Mr Peacock had a previous good history, but did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Mr Peacock did not provide any testimonial statements to the panel as to his character or his ability as a teacher.

Witness A stated in oral evidence that Mr Peacock had worked at the School for a long time, and there had never been any concerns about his conduct within the School or about his relationships with others. She described Mr Peacock as “*ok*” in terms of his teaching ability.”

I have also noted the panel’s comments regarding the mitigating evidence put forward by Mr Peacock.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Peacock 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 serious nature of the misconduct found, which resulted in a police caution, the likely damage to the reputation of the profession, and the lack of evidence of Mr Peacock's insight. I have also placed weight on the dishonesty exhibited by Mr Peacock.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Peacock 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 and 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 two-year review period.

In doing so, the panel has made reference to the Advice as follows:

"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.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings."

I have considered the panel's concluding comments:

"The panel recognised that Mr Peacock had shown limited insight, but insufficient to demonstrate that he understood the potential risk of harm. He has said that he has refrained from naturist activities subsequently, and if he were to continue with naturism, "it would never be anything that I would bring into the school or within the local area. That has always been the case." In making this statement, he failed to appreciate that he had conducted such activities in the local area, and the panel was therefore concerned at the risk of repetition. Nevertheless, whilst the conduct found proven in this case was sufficiently serious to warrant prohibition, the panel recognised that it was not as serious as those types of cases where the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of no review period, or a longer review period.

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 two years.”

I have considered whether a two-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. In this case, factors mean that in my judgment allowing such a review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found, the likely injury done to the reputation of the profession, as well as the lack of evidence of full insight and associated risk of repetition.

I agree with the panel therefore that a two-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession. Such a review period will also afford Mr Peacock, should he wish to return to teaching, the time to develop full insight into his behaviour and its possible impacts and in doing so provide assurance that the risk of any repetition is limited.

This means that Mr Andrew Peacock is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 16 February 2028, two years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Peacock remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Peacock 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 'M. Cavey', enclosed within a hand-drawn oval border.

Decision maker: Marc Cavey

Date: 16 February 2026

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