



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Andrew Winkworth: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

March 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher:	Mr Andrew Winkworth
Teacher ref number:	0240622
Teacher date of birth:	17 October 1980
TRA reference:	21216
Date of determination:	24 March 2026
Former employer:	Worlingham CEVC Primary School, Beccles

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 24 March 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Andrew Winkworth.

The panel members were Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shelley Barlow-Ward (teacher panellist) and Mr Jonathan Wettreich (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Rebecca Hughes of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Winkworth that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Winkworth provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Emma Dowd of Capsticks LLP, Mr Winkworth or any representative for Mr Winkworth.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 15 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Winkworth was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Worlingham CEVC Primary School (“the School”):

1. On one or more occasions, he filmed in public the bottoms and/or legs of female members of the public;
2. As may be proven at allegation 1, he filmed them without their knowledge and/or consent; and/or
3. As may be proven at allegation 1, his conduct was sexually motivated.

Mr Winkworth admitted the facts of allegation 1, and that those admitted facts amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the response to the notice of referral signed by Mr Winkworth on 24 January 2024. Mr Winkworth also admitted the facts of allegations 1, 2 and 3 in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Winkworth on 19 October 2025.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 6 to 31

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 32 to 36

Section 4: TRA documents (which included the videos allegedly found on the School server exhibited separately) – pages 37 to 306

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 307 to 314

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Winkworth on 19 October 2025 and subsequently by the presenting officer on 20 October 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to Mr Winkworth's request that the allegations be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Winkworth was employed as a class teacher at the School from 1 September 2012 until his dismissal on 12 September 2022.

On 23 March 2022, the headteacher of the School was informed of potential safeguarding issues concerning Mr Winkworth's laptop, which had synced with the School server. The records allegedly showed videos from a smartphone following women around Norwich between August 2020 and 19 January 2022.

Suffolk police's safeguarding team conducted an investigation on 24 March 2022, and no evidence of criminality was found. A LADO meeting was conducted, and Mr Winkworth was suspended pending investigation. Mr Winkworth was later dismissed on 12 July 2022.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 14 October 2022.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On one or more occasions, you filmed in public the bottoms and/or legs of female members of the public.**

The panel noted that Mr Winkworth admitted allegation 1, as set out in the response to the notice of referral signed by Mr Winkworth on 24 January 2024 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Winkworth on 19 October 2025. Mr Winkworth admitted that he filmed females on the street in public from behind. He also admitted he focused the filming on their bottoms and/or legs. Mr Winkworth further admitted that this amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered the witness statement of Individual A, [REDACTED] at the School. Individual A explained that the School used an anti-virus system called Sophos, which identified suspicious activity such as “*malicious files, programs, worms, trojans, and ransomware*”. Sophos also monitored malicious activity caused by websites with content such as alcohol, gambling and pornography through a central management console in the cloud. Individual A explained that all Windows devices at the School had Sophos installed.

Individual A stated that, during Mr Winkworth’s employment, the School issued him with three laptops and an iPad. Mr Winkworth’s laptops were connected to his School Google Drive, and Individual A confirmed that it would have been possible for Mr Winkworth to access his personal Google Drive on his laptops by using the web browser.

In his statement, Individual A stated that he was searching the School server on 23 March 2022, for a Snape performance video made a week prior. Mr Winkworth was absent during this time [REDACTED] but had told the School office that the video was on the server. Individual A explained that, as he could not find the video on the server, he looked at Mr Winkworth’s account and found graphic videos in his downloads folder. Individual A stated that, from the videos, it appeared he had filmed women walking on the streets of Norwich. He could tell from the metadata that the dates for these videos were between 6 August 2020 and 29 January 2022. He contacted the headteacher and reported the videos.

Individual A stated that Mr Winkworth returned his laptops to Individual A on 1 April 2022. He found that Mr Winkworth had downloaded files from a USB stick and had recently opened them. During Individual A’s inspection of Mr Winkworth’s iPads, he found that Mr Winkworth had linked his personal Google account to the iPads with his personal email address. Individual A identified inappropriate videos from thumbnail images that matched those he had found on the School server. The videos were filmed in Norwich and featured groups and lone women, with some focusing on their bottoms. These videos had been saved onto the School server from Mr Winkworth’s personal Google Drive. The videos could be accessed and viewed through the Drive app, which was installed on the iPad. When Individual A looked through the iPad, the videos appeared but then disappeared, indicating that Mr Winkworth had deleted them. Individual A stated that he

did not find anything inappropriate stored on Mr Winkworth's iPads, but believed he used them to access graphic content from his personal Google Drive.

Individual A stated that he believed much of the material found on the devices and linked to his account would not be classed as "*really bad*", but he was concerned because the content was graphic and worried about pupils at the School seeing it.

Individual A stated that he was aware that staff members at the School were subject to the Online Safety policy, the ICT Acceptable Use Policy, and the Employee Handbook, which contains the Code of Conduct.

The panel also considered the Log of Investigation detailing Individual A's IT procedures, the 'Deleted Files' recovery information from the teacher's laptops, and screenshots of videos located in the 'Downloads' folder on the School server. The panel noted that the thumbnails depicted repeated images of women's bottoms and legs, with women wearing leggings or trousers.

The panel also considered the record of a meeting held on 18 May 2022 between Individual B and Individual C, [REDACTED]. That record noted that videos showed women being followed around Norwich, with the focus on their bottoms. The record stated that Individual C stated that they were confident the videos had been created by Mr Winkworth, as they were located on his laptop, showed footwear he was known to wear, and included the legs of an adult athletic male.

In addition, the panel viewed 31 videos, noting that some were duplicates. Having done so, the panel found it proved that, on more than one occasion, Mr Winkworth filmed female members of the public in public places, focusing on both their bottoms and their legs.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

2. As may be proven at allegation 1, you filmed them without their knowledge and/or consent.

The panel noted that Mr Winkworth admitted allegation 2, as set out in the response to the notice of referral signed by Mr Winkworth on 24 January 2024 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Winkworth on 19 October 2025. Mr Winkworth admitted that he filmed females on the street in public without their knowledge and/or consent. Mr Winkworth further admitted that this amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel also considered the record of a meeting held on 18 May 2022 between Individual B and Individual C. That record noted that videos showed women being followed around Norwich, with the focus on their bottoms.

The meeting record further noted that in at least one video, the individual filming appeared to increase his pace to catch up with a woman, then slowed to maintain a set distance behind her while continuing to film. In four videos in particular, it was recorded that the same woman appeared to have been followed for approximately ten minutes in total. The videos were viewed sequentially and were recognised as having been filmed in the centre of Norwich.

The panel also viewed the videos itself. Having done so, the panel concluded that the women had been filmed in public without their knowledge or consent. The panel found no evidence to suggest that any of the women were aware of the filming or had consented to it.

The panel found allegation 2 proven.

3. As may be proven at allegation 1, your conduct was sexually motivated.

The panel noted that Mr Winkworth admitted allegation 3, as set out in the response to the notice of referral signed by Mr Winkworth on 24 January 2024 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Winkworth on 19 October 2025. Mr Winkworth admitted that his conduct was for sexual gratification. Mr Winkworth further admitted that this amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered whether the conduct was sexually motivated. It noted guidance from *Basson* that: “A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship”.

The panel noted that the women filmed were wearing tight clothing. The panel further noted that this had been done on more than one occasion over a period of time.

The panel considered that the act of filming women, focusing on their bottom and legs, was done on the balance of probabilities, in pursuit of sexual gratification and had clear sexual motivation.

The panel found allegation 3 proven.

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

Having found 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 Winkworth, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Winkworth 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including...mutual respect
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel considered the Teachers’ Standards, which require teachers to uphold high standards of ethics and behaviour both within and outside the school environment, including treating others with dignity and respecting the rights of others. The panel considered that this included respect for the rights and dignity of women.

The panel also had regard to Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSIE), which makes clear that safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone’s responsibility. All practitioners who come into contact with children are expected to adopt a child-centred approach and to consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child.

The panel noted that some of the videos showed women who appeared to be accompanied by children, including footage of a woman walking with a young child and footage of a young girl walking alongside an adult. The panel also noted that in some videos, the individuals filmed appeared to be young females.

The panel considered that Mr Winkworth, as a teacher, would have been aware of safeguarding principles and the need to exercise appropriate judgment when children are present. The panel considered that filming women in a sexually motivated manner in public places, including in circumstances where children were present, was inappropriate and demonstrated a lack of regard for the standards expected of a teacher.

However, the panel carefully considered whether the conduct amounted to a safeguarding breach within the meaning of KCSIE. While the panel identified concerns arising from the nature of the behaviour and Mr Winkworth’s professional role, it

concluded that there was insufficient evidence to establish a specific safeguarding breach as defined by KCSIE.

The panel considered the School's ICT and Online Safety Policy. In particular, the panel noted provisions which made clear that staff must not install unauthorised software, must not use school devices in a way that breaches the terms of acceptable use, must not access inappropriate material when using School ICT systems or work devices, and must not use such systems in a way that could harm the School's reputation.

The panel considered the record of the meeting held on 18 May 2022 between Individual B and Individual C. That record confirmed that every member of staff was issued with and required to sign the Acceptable Use Policy, and that staff received regular safeguarding and prevent training. It also recorded that online safety training had been delivered to all staff in January 2022 by the School's Online Safety Lead, and that expectations regarding appropriate conduct and the use of technology were clearly communicated.

The panel also considered whether Mr Winkworth'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 voyeurism was relevant, as the conduct found proven amounted to clandestine watching of women for sexual gratification.

While the panel found that there had been sexual motivation, the panel considered whether this amounted to "*sexual activity*". The panel concluded this had not amounted to an activity; rather, it concluded that the behaviours involved persistent filming of women without their knowledge or consent, with a sexual motivation.

The panel considered whether the behaviour amounted to stalking but concluded that, although the conduct involved following individuals and was persistent on occasions, it did not meet the threshold for stalking. The panel also noted that the conduct did not amount to a criminal offence and did not meet the threshold of behaviours associated with such an offence.

The panel acknowledged that allegation 1 took place outside the education setting. However, it considered that the conduct nevertheless had a clear connection to Mr Winkworth's professional role. The conduct involved the use of School-issued devices and was in breach of the School's ICT and Online Safety policies. The panel considered that the School had clear policies and procedures in place, and that Mr Winkworth had received safeguarding and online safety training. The panel therefore concluded that Mr Winkworth should have been aware of the standards expected of him, irrespective of the fact that the conduct occurred outside the School environment.

The panel also took into account the hearsay witness evidence of Individual A that the School iPads, although rarely used by pupils, were capable of being accessed by them. However, the panel found that there was no evidence that pupils had accessed, or were able to access, the videos in question, and therefore no evidence of any risk of pupils being exposed to the material.

The panel considered the impact of the conduct on Mr Winkworth's role as a teacher. It noted that the behaviour was not an isolated incident but occurred over a period of time. The panel emphasised the uniquely influential position occupied by teachers and the expectation that they act as role models for pupils. The panel considered that conduct of this nature was inconsistent with the values teachers are expected to promote, including respect for others, being a role model and appropriate behaviour.

The panel found that the behaviour demonstrated poor judgement, failed to uphold the dignity and rights of others, and was inconsistent with the expectations placed on teachers as role models for children and young people.

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

In relation to whether Mr Winkworth'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 into account 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 Winkworth'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 Winkworth was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of voyeurism was 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 further considered that the conduct affected the way in which Mr Winkworth fulfilled his professional role and carried the potential to influence pupils in a harmful way, given the expectations placed on teachers to model appropriate behaviour.

The panel also considered that, if parents, colleagues or members of the wider public were aware that a teacher had engaged in the persistent filming of women without their knowledge or consent, this would be likely to cause significant concern and discomfort and could undermine confidence in the individual concerned and in the profession more generally.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Winkworth'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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and well-being 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.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Winkworth, which involved filming women in public without their consent, there was a strong public interest consideration as public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Winkworth was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present, as the conduct found against Mr Winkworth 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 the teacher in the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any

interest in retaining Mr Winkworth 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 Winkworth.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature...

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 Winkworth's actions were not deliberate. The panel noted the number of videos involved and the period over which they were taken.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Winkworth was acting under extreme duress.

Mr Winkworth did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that Mr Winkworth stated that he had been teaching for 19 years in total and had worked at the School for 10 years. He referred to his role as a class teacher for Years 5 and 6, his responsibilities as Head of PE, and his involvement in extra-curricular activities, including sports, music and school performances. The panel considered Mr Winkworth's submission statement dated 24 August 2022, in which he regarded his commitment to his role as a teacher at the School. He stated that he loved being a teacher and believed that he could continue to be a successful and well-regarded member of the profession. He described working long hours, often until 6.00 pm, undertaking tasks such as marking, preparing displays and organising tournaments. He referred to giving up lunchtimes to run clubs, including Sports Leader activities, and to introducing and hosting a number of sporting events, including cross-country, tchoukball, badminton and skittle ball.

Mr Winkworth expressed the hope that his commitment to the School would be recognised.

While the panel acknowledged Mr Winkworth's service and his involvement in a range of School activities, it did not consider that this demonstrated exceptionally high standards of personal and professional conduct, nor a level of contribution to the education sector that significantly mitigated the seriousness of the misconduct. There was no independent evidence before the panel, such as testimonials from pupils, parents or schools, to support a finding of exceptional professional standing.

The panel carefully considered Mr Winkworth's written and oral evidence, including the document entitled "My Case" dated 6 May 2022 and his subsequent submissions. The panel [REDACTED]. These matters were taken into account as mitigation.

[REDACTED]. The panel accepted that these steps demonstrated a degree of insight into his behaviour and an acknowledgment that his actions were inappropriate.

However, the panel noted that Mr Winkworth's representations focused predominantly on himself and his family. There was limited evidence of reflection on the impact of his behaviour on the women involved or on public confidence in the profession. The panel therefore concluded that, limited insight was present.

The panel accepted that there was no evidence before it to suggest that Mr Winkworth posed an ongoing risk to children. Nevertheless, the panel was concerned by the nature of the misconduct, which involved a sustained course of conduct over a period of time and the creation of multiple recordings. The panel considered that this behaviour was serious, involved sexual misconduct, and fell significantly below the standards expected of a teacher.

The panel noted a letter from Individual D dated 8 November 2023, which stated that Mr Winkworth acknowledged that his admitted behaviour required corrective action [REDACTED]. Mr Winkworth considered that his behaviour was out of character [REDACTED]. He described himself as a hardworking and dedicated teacher and [REDACTED].

[REDACTED].

[REDACTED].

The panel considered Mr Winkworth's submission statement dated 24 August 2022, in which he expressed remorse and stated that his actions were out of character [REDACTED], and accepted that he engaged in following and filming women in Norwich, which he described as unusual and unacceptable conduct. He stated that the filming took place several years previously, that he no longer engaged in such behaviour, and [REDACTED].

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Winkworth 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 Winkworth. The seriousness of the misconduct, including its persistent nature and sexual motivation, was a significant factor in the panel's assessment. 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 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.

Having considered the Advice and the findings in this case, the panel concluded that it would be proportionate to recommend a prohibition order with a review period, reflecting the mitigating factors present, [REDACTED] the absence of evidence of ongoing risk to children. The panel considered that a review period of 4 years was appropriate, given the seriousness and persistent nature of the misconduct.

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 Winkworth should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 4 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Winkworth 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including...mutual respect
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel has found that the conduct of Mr Winkworth fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexually motivated conduct filming the bottoms and legs of female members of the public without their knowledge or consent.

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 Winkworth, 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:

“The panel noted that some of the videos showed women who appeared to be accompanied by children, including footage of a woman walking with a young child and footage of a young girl walking alongside an adult. The panel also noted that in some videos, the individuals filmed appeared to be young females.

The panel considered that Mr Winkworth, as a teacher, would have been aware of safeguarding principles and the need to exercise appropriate judgment when children are present. The panel considered that filming women in a sexually motivated manner in public places, including in circumstances where children were present, was inappropriate and demonstrated a lack of regard for the standards expected of a teacher.”

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 has set out as follows:

“[REDACTED]. The panel accepted that these steps demonstrated a degree of insight into his behaviour and an acknowledgment that his actions were inappropriate.

However, the panel noted that Mr Winkworth’s representations focused predominantly on himself and his family. There was limited evidence of reflection on the impact of his behaviour on the women involved or on public confidence in the profession. The panel therefore concluded that, limited insight was present.”

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. 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 has observed:

“The panel also considered that, if parents, colleagues or members of the wider public were aware that a teacher had engaged in the persistent filming of women without their knowledge or consent, this would be likely to cause significant concern and discomfort and could undermine confidence in the individual concerned and in the profession more generally.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated filming of women without their consent 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 Winkworth himself. The panel has commented:

“While the panel acknowledged Mr Winkworth’s service and his involvement in a range of School activities, it did not consider that this demonstrated exceptionally high standards of personal and professional conduct, nor a level of contribution to the education sector that significantly mitigated the seriousness of the misconduct. There was no independent evidence before the panel, such as testimonials from pupils, parents or schools, to support a finding of exceptional professional standing.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Winkworth 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 serious nature of the misconduct which was both sexually motivated and persistent. The panel has found no evidence that Mr Winkworth’s actions were not deliberate, and no evidence to suggest that Mr Winkworth was acting under extreme duress. The panel has said:

“The panel accepted that there was no evidence before it to suggest that Mr Winkworth posed an ongoing risk to children. Nevertheless, the panel was concerned by the nature of the misconduct, which involved a sustained course of conduct over a period of time and the creation of multiple recordings. The panel considered that this behaviour was serious, involved sexual misconduct, and fell significantly below the standards expected of a teacher.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Winkworth had demonstrated only limited insight into his behaviour.

I have noted the panel's comments on the steps Mr Winkworth has taken to address his behaviour including seeking [REDACTED], and on the [REDACTED]. However, I agree with the panel that the seriousness of the misconduct in this case means that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Winkworth.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Winkworth has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight, 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 4-year review period.

I have noted that the Advice says that where a case involves serious sexual misconduct, including where the act was sexually motivated, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. However, in this case I have given weight to the panel's comments about the mitigating factors and absence of an on-going risk to children. The panel has said:

“Having considered the Advice and the findings in this case, the panel concluded that it would be proportionate to recommend a prohibition order with a review period, reflecting the mitigating factors present, [REDACTED] the absence of evidence of ongoing risk to children. The panel considered that a review period of 4 years was appropriate, given the seriousness and persistent nature of the misconduct.”

I have considered whether a 4-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 allowing a shorter review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found proven, the lack of full insight, and the potential damage to the public's perception of the teaching profession.

I consider therefore that a 4-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Andrew Winkworth 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 2 April 2030, 4 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 Winkworth remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Andrew Winkworth 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 'David Oatley', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 26 March 2026

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