



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Charles Hatfield: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**August 2023**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Charles Hatfield
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	3971450
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	6 August 1991
<b>TRA reference:</b>	20233
<b>Date of determination:</b>	7 August 2023
<b>Former employer:</b>	Charles Warren Academy, Buckinghamshire

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 7 August 2023, to consider the case of Mr Charles Hatfield (“Mr Hatfield”).

The panel members were Mr Ronan Tyrer (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Joanna Hurren (teacher panellist), Ms Rachel Kruger (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Carly Hagedorn of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Holly Quirk of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Hatfield was present and was not represented.

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

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 24 May 2023.

It was alleged that Mr Hatfield was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a Classroom Teacher at the Charles Warren Academy, he:

1. On or around 14 December 2020, brought drugs, namely the class B drug, Ketamine onto the school's premises;
2. As a result of the conduct above at Allegation 1, on or around 15 August 2021, he received a conditional caution, with the condition to complete a drugs course by 26 September 2021.

Mr Hatfield admitted the facts of allegations 1 and 2 and also that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## Preliminary applications

### Additional Documents

Mr Hatfield applied to admit a bundle of teacher documents, which consisted of Mr Hatfield's witness statement, letters from his [redacted] and character references.

The aforementioned documents were not served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.37 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession May 2020 ("the Procedures"), and as such the panel was required to decide whether those documents should be admitted under paragraph 5.34 of the Procedures at the discretion of the panel.

The panel took into account the representations from Mr Hatfield and presenting officer in respect of this application. Mr Hatfield explained that two character references were on annual leave and so there was difficulty in contacting them. The panel considered that Mr Hatfield was not represented at the hearing. No objection was raised by the presenting officer to Mr Hatfield's application.

Under paragraph 5.33 of the Procedures, the panel may admit any evidence, where it is fair to do so, which may reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case.

The panel was satisfied that all of the documents were relevant to the case. The panel acknowledged that the witness statement was relevant to address Mr Hatfield's position in respect of the allegations. The panel noted that there was nothing in Mr Hatfield's

witness statement that conflicted with the Statement of Agreed Facts. The character references and letters from Mr Hatfield's [redacted] would be particularly relevant, in the event that the case proceeds to consider a recommendation to the Secretary of State.

With regard to the overall question of fairness, the panel noted that if the witness statement of Mr Hatfield was admitted, the presenting officer would have the opportunity to ask Mr Hatfield questions in respect of his recent witness statement and other documents.

The panel concluded that it would be fair, by the reasons outlined above to admit the documents.

The panel decided to admit each of the documents and these were paginated as follows:

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 169 to 186

- Witness Statement of Mr Hatfield dated 12 July 2023 – pages 169 – 176
- Letters from [redacted] dated 25 July 2023 – pages 176 – 179
- Character References – pages 180 – 186

### Excluding the Public

The panel considered whether to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11 of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012 (the "Regulations") and paragraph 5.85 of the Procedures to exclude the public from all or part of the hearing. This followed a request by the teacher that any part of the hearing pertaining to his [redacted] should be heard in private.

The panel determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11(3)(b) of the Regulations under the second limb of paragraph 5.85 of the Procedures for the public to be excluded from this part of the hearing.

The panel took into account the general rule that hearings should be held in public and that this is generally desirable to maintain public confidence in the administration of these proceedings and also to maintain confidence in the teaching profession. On this occasion, however, the panel considered that the request by the teacher was a reasonable one given concerns about confidential matters relating to the teacher's [redacted] being placed in the public domain.

The panel did not consider that there were any steps short of excluding the public from these parts of the hearing that would serve the purpose of protecting the confidentiality of matters relating to the teacher's [redacted]. The panel took account of the letters from Mr Hatfield's [redacted].

The panel had regard to whether the teacher's request ran contrary to the public interest. The panel is required to announce its decisions in public as to whether the facts have been proven and whether those facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In the event that the case continues, any decision of the Secretary of State will also be in public. The panel considered that in the circumstances of this case that the public interest will be satisfied by these public announcements. Those public announcements will ensure that public confidence in these proceedings and in the standards of the profession are maintained.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology – page 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 13

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 15 to 17

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 168

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 169 to 185

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

### **Witnesses**

The TRA did not call any witnesses to give evidence at the hearing.

The panel heard oral evidence from Mr Hatfield during the hearing.

## **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 Hatfield was employed at Charles Warren Academy ("the School") between September 2019 and April 2021 as a teacher.

On or around 14 December 2020, a small package containing a white substance was found at the School by the Principal in the staff cubicles. The following day a staff meeting was held to inform staff members and to urge anyone with any information to come forward.

Following this meeting, Mr Hatfield confessed that the package was his and that it had accidentally fallen out of his wallet. Mr Hatfield confirmed that the drug was Ketamine. Mr Hatfield disclosed that he had not used the substance within the School.

Mr Hatfield was suspended from the School on 16 December 2020 pending further investigation. A disciplinary hearing took place on 22 April 2021 and he was dismissed for gross misconduct.

The package was subsequently tested by police and they confirmed that the substance was Ketamine, a Class B drug, and approximately 0.476 grams. The police provided a conditional caution to Mr Hatfield on 15 August 2021. As part of the caution, Mr Hatfield was required to complete a drugs course by 26 September 2021.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**1. On or around 14 December 2020, brought drugs, namely the class B drug, Ketamine onto the school's premises;**

Mr Hatfield admitted this allegation.

The panel had sight of the notes from the meeting between Mr Hatfield and the Principal on 15 December 2020 where Mr Hatfield confirmed that the substance found on the school premises, in the staff toilet, belonged to him and was Ketamine.

The panel considered Mr Hatfield's handwritten statement to the police on 14 February 2021, the Statement of Agreed Facts and Mr Hatfield's witness statement.

Mr Hatfield said *"As per the admission I made to the Principal of Charles Warren Academy, to the Police and to the Disciplinary Hearing Panel, I admit bringing Ketamine onto the school's premises."*

The panel noted that all of Mr Hatfield's accounts of the incident were consistent.

The panel also had sight of the Principal's statement to the police dated 17 December 2020, which corroborated Mr Hatfield's account.

The panel found allegation 1 proved.

**2. As a result of the conduct above at Allegation 1, on or around 15 August 2021, you received a conditional caution, with the condition to complete a drugs course by 26 September 2021.**

Mr Hatfield admitted this allegation.

The panel considered the Statement of Agreed Facts and Mr Hatfield's witness statement.

Mr Hatfield said in his witness statement *"As a result of my decision to bring Ketamine onto school premises and misplace it, I was given a conditional caution by the Police. The condition was the completion of a drugs course within a set a set time frame. This condition was adhered to and completed."*

The panel had sight of the conditional caution which stated *"On 15<sup>th</sup> December 2020 had in your possession 0.476 grams of Ketamine, a controlled drug of Class B in contravention of section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. Contrary to section 5(2) and Sedule [sic] to the Misuse Drugs Act 1971."*

The conditional caution contained a condition to complete a drugs course by 26 September 2021. Mr Hatfield confirmed during his oral evidence that he attended the course, which involved a group session.

The conditional caution was signed by Mr Hatfield on 15 August 2021.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

**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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hatfield, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Hatfield 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions



- 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hatfield, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”). The panel considered that Mr Hatfield was in breach of the following provisions:

- Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone’s responsibility. Everyone who comes into contact with children and their families has a role to play. In order to fulfil this responsibility effectively, all practitioners should make sure their approach is child-centred. This means that they should consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child.
- All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn.
- All staff should have an awareness of safeguarding issues that can put children at risk of harm. Behaviours linked to issues such as drug taking.... put children in danger.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hatfield, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children. The panel considered that Mr Hatfield was in breach of the following provision:

- Everyone who works with children has a responsibility for keeping them safe.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hatfield fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.

The panel also considered whether Mr Hatfield’s conduct which led to a conditional caution displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

The panel noted that the offence of possession (including for personal use), was listed in respect of any class A drugs, rather than a class B drug.

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 noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be unacceptable professional conduct. The panel was of the view that possession of a class B drug on school premises was misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. The panel noted the serious risks and consequences that could have arisen if a

child had found the Ketamine belonging to Mr Hatfield. The panel noted the significant safeguarding risks and potential consequences on pupils.

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

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others, the responsibilities and duties of teachers in relation to the safeguarding and welfare of pupils and 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.

The panel also considered whether Mr Hatfield's conduct which led to the conditional caution displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

Again, the panel noted that the offence of possession (including for personal use), was listed in respect of any class A drugs, rather than a class B drug.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel noted the serious risks and consequences if a child had found the Ketamine on the School's premises. The panel also noted the significant safeguarding risks and potential consequences on pupils. The panel considered the impact this would have had on the pupils, parents, staff and wider community. Mr Hatfield's actions could have caused significant reputational damage to the School and the teaching profession as a whole.

The panel took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave. The panel was of the view that the very nature of Mr Hatfield's conduct was in direct conflict with the way in which pupils must be able to view teachers.

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

The panel therefore found that Mr Hatfield's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 1 and 2 proved, the panel further found that Mr Hatfield's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and 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 is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Hatfield and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, 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 Hatfield which involved bringing the class B drug, Ketamine onto the School's premises, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious risks and consequences associated with his conduct.

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

Whilst there was some evidence that Mr Hatfield had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Hatfield in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, those that were relevant in this case were:

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

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

The panel considered that Mr Hatfield's conduct in possession of the Ketamine was deliberate. The panel was of the view that Mr Hatfield was culpable in that he brought the class B drug, Ketamine, onto the School premises in his wallet.

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

The panel did not see evidence that showed Mr Hatfield was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings and/or warnings.

The panel considered the character references that were admitted as late evidence at the outset of the hearing. The panel noted that Mr Hatfield did not call the referees to give evidence attesting to his character at the hearing.

Two references were provided from the same individual; Mr Hatfield's former and current line manager. The recent reference from his line manager provided the following information:

*"I am aware of the allegations against Charlie but I do not think he should be judged by this. He is a conscientious, caring person who I would have no issues looking after my children (aged 4 and 5).*

*At work, Charlie is hard working, professional and always working towards being the best*

*that he can be in a work environment. He is a very liked member of the team and agency and a pleasure to work with."*

The panel noted that the other character references were provided as part of the School's disciplinary hearing in 2021:

Mr Hatfield's university tutor described him as *"very professional in his approach to his work. He established very good working relationships with colleagues and also with the children in his care. He put much thought and effort into his teaching and taught lessons that were good and by the end of which the majority of children had made good progress whenever I observed him."*

A family member described Mr Hatfield as a *"very gentle, kind and thoughtful person."*

The panel noted that apart from the character statement dated 15 April 2021 from Mr Hatfield's university tutor, which was provided as part of the School's disciplinary hearing, there was no further evidence to attest to Mr Hatfield's ability as a teacher.

The panel considered the letters from his [redacted].

The panel noted that at the time of Mr Hatfield's misconduct, he was [redacted]

The panel noted that Mr Hatfield made the decision on his own volition [redacted]. The panel noted that the Covid-19 pandemic was ongoing at the time of the incident and that this was a particularly stressful time for those working within the teaching profession.

The panel recognised that Mr Hatfield owned up to his conduct immediately after the incident and has admitted the allegations as part of these proceedings.

The panel considered that Mr Hatfield demonstrated a great deal of insight and remorse for his conduct.

Mr Hatfield recognised the serious risks involved by his conduct. He said *"Perhaps more pertinent, is the risk that the incident presented to children. While the incident took place in the staff toilets, outside of school hours with no pupils on the premises, given it was an accident, it could feasibly have taken place at another time or another setting. The fact alone that I was in possession of Ketamine presented a clear risk to the pupils – whom I was supposed to protect. I fully accept the gravity of this and the potential risk it posed."*

Mr Hatfield also said that the impact of his conduct *"has been and still is wide-reaching. First of all, it affected the learning of my class. They lost their teacher, their routines, and their learning was greatly disrupted. There is no way I can remediate for this and it greatly saddens me to have impacted their education in such a way."*

The panel considered Mr Hatfield to be honest and compelling when giving oral evidence at the hearing and noted that his account of events had been consistent from the time of the misconduct up until this hearing.

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 Hatfield 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 Hatfield. The deliberate act of bringing the class B drug, Ketamine, onto the School premises was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. One of these cases include possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug. The panel noted that Mr Hatfield was in possession of a class B drug, rather than a class A drug. The panel noted that being in possession of a class B drug on the School's premises was still very serious misconduct, given the risks and potential consequences that could have arisen had the drug been misplaced in a pupil area.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Hatfield was remorseful in respect of his conduct. The panel noted that Mr Hatfield showed considerable insight, by recognising the risks and potential consequences as a result of his misconduct. The panel was of the view that Mr Hatfield is on the right path to rebuild his life by seeking help from professionals and being open about his [redacted]. Mr Hatfield said that he had not [redacted]. Mr Hatfield explained that he has a network around him to gain the support from family and friends if needed. The panel acknowledged that Mr Hatfield was trying his best to rebuild his life from his previous [redacted] and misconduct by putting these positive steps in place. The panel was of the view that Mr Hatfield should continue to adopt these positive steps going forward to avoid any risk of [redacted].

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 provision for a 2 year review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Charles Hatfield should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Hatfield 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hatfield involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of possession of a class B drug on school premises.

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 Hatfield, 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 the serious risks and consequences that could have arisen if a child had found the Ketamine belonging to Mr Hatfield. The panel noted the significant safeguarding risks and potential consequences on pupils." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows:

"The panel recognised that Mr Hatfield owned up to his conduct immediately after the incident and has admitted the allegations as part of these proceedings."

"The panel considered that Mr Hatfield demonstrated a great deal of insight and remorse for his conduct."

"Mr Hatfield recognised the serious risks involved by his conduct."

I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Hatfield was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding that Mr Hatfield brought a class B drug on to school premises 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 Hatfield himself. The panel comment, “Whilst there was some evidence that Mr Hatfield had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Hatfield in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher”.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Hatfield 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 finding of the panel that “the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Hatfield. The deliberate act of bringing the class B drug, Ketamine, onto the School premises was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

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

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 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments, “The panel acknowledged that Mr Hatfield was remorseful in respect of his conduct. The panel noted that Mr Hatfield showed considerable insight, by recognising the risks and potential consequences as a result of his misconduct. The panel was of the view that Mr Hatfield is on the right path to rebuild his life by seeking help from professionals”. The panel has also said “it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a 2 year review period.”

I have decided that a 2 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.

**This means that Mr Charles Hatfield 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 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 Hatfield remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Hatfield has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 10 August 2023**

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