



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Beverley Miller: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

August 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	8
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
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: Mrs Beverley Miller

TRA reference: 22129

Date of determination: 6 August 2025

Former employer: Broadstone Middle School, Dorset

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 5 to 6 August 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mrs Beverley Miller.

The panel members were Mr Paul Millett (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Monique Clark (teacher panellist) and Mrs Julie Wells (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Callum Haywood of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mrs Miller 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 hearing dated 8 April 2025.

It was alleged that Mrs Miller was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

1. Whilst employed as a class teacher at Broadstone Middle School ('the School') she acted in an inappropriate and/or unprofessional manner, by;
 - a) attending the School's premises after consuming alcohol and/or smelling of alcohol on or around 2 February 2023;
 - b) driving her vehicle to the School's premises after consuming alcohol on or around 2 February 2023;
 - c) leaving [REDACTED] unsupervised, in her vehicle, on school premises on or around 2 February 2023;
2. Her conduct as found proven at;
 - a) Allegation 1a and/or 1b above was notwithstanding that she had previously been provided with support and/or advice from the school.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of hearing – pages 4 to 17

Section 2: TRA witness statements – pages 19 to 38

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 40 to 117

Section 4: Teacher response – pages 119 to 137

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Letter signed by Mrs Miller dated 28 July 2025 - page 138

Unsigned letter of Mrs Miller dated 28 September 2025 – page 139

Fresh copy of a letter of 19 February 2024 from [REDACTED] - page 140

Findings of Case Management Hearing of 30 July 2025 – page 141 to 152

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.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the Procedures.

Witnesses

No witnesses attended for the TRA or Mrs Miller and Mrs Miller did not give evidence.

The panel considered the written witness evidence of:

Witness A: [REDACTED]

Witness B: [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.

Mrs Miller was employed at Broadstone Middle School (“the School”) from 9 September 2022 as a teacher.

It was alleged that, prior to February 2023, Mrs Miller was given support and/or advice by the School.

It was alleged that, on 2 February 2023 Mrs Miller drove [REDACTED] to the School having consumed alcohol and, having left [REDACTED] unsupervised in the car, entered into the School’s premises smelling of alcohol.

Mrs Miller was subsequently suspended on 6 February 2023 and resigned from her position by letter of 8 February 2023. Her employment ended on 28 February 2023.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 7 June 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel scrutinised the entire bundle including the TRA’s documents concerning the investigations and meetings of the School and those of the various authorities, including [REDACTED], surrounding the matters with which these allegations were concerned.

The panel noted that the evidence within a lot of these documents was hearsay but considered that they were relevant and formed part of the official investigations. The panel therefore admitted them but determined that the evidence would be considered carefully and cautiously including in relation to the limited weight placed on it.

The panel was conscious that it had been invited by the presenting officer to consider the case solely on the documents provided. The panel noted that the TRA had intended to call two witnesses but neither was attending and the panel had been invited to continue to consider their witness statements, which were within the bundle, as hearsay.

The panel agreed that these documents were hearsay, but as they represented the direct position of the two key witnesses to the allegations, other than the teacher, the panel, after careful consideration, decided, in each case, that it was in the interests of justice, and was fair, that they be admitted and considered. The panel noted that the teacher had had sight of these documents.

In assessing weight the panel carefully considered the legal advice it had received including section 4 of the Civil Evidence Act 1995. The panel made a determination to place moderate weight on these witnesses' evidence as it would not have the opportunity to test the evidence. The panel determined that it would seek to establish in its deliberations the extent to which the evidence within the witness statements was consistent with the other evidence which it had been provided.

The panel separately considered the issue of the various documents within the bundle, including the two documents which it had decided to admit that day, which sought to set out Mrs Miller's position and evidence in relation to the allegations. The panel noted that these documents were also hearsay, but as they represented the only evidence provided by Mrs Miller the panel decided that it was in the interests of justice that they be admitted and considered. The panel placed moderate weight on this evidence as it would not have the opportunity to test the evidence. The panel determined that it would seek to establish in its deliberations the extent to which the evidence within these documents was consistent with the other evidence which it had sight of.

The panel was conscious that Mrs Miller had chosen to absent herself from proceedings and from the opportunity to put her evidence in response to the allegations and had chosen not to be represented at the proceedings albeit that she had asserted that it was for ill health reasons, although she had provided insufficient evidence of this.

Though the panel noted that Mrs Miller had in her recent correspondence directly admitted the entirety of Allegation 1 the panel nevertheless proceeded to reach their own findings on the basis of all the evidence before it.

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

- 1. Whilst employed as a class teacher at Broadstone Middle School ('the School') you acted in an inappropriate and/or unprofessional manner, by;**
 - a) Attending the School's premises after consuming alcohol and/or smelling of alcohol on or around 2 February 2023;**
 - b) Driving your vehicle to the School's premises after consuming alcohol on or around 2 February 2023;**
 - c) Leaving [REDACTED] unsupervised, in your vehicle, on school premises on or around 2 February 2023;**

The panel considered the written statement of Witness A, who stated that on 2 February 2023 she was called to Witness B's office and was advised that Mrs Miller was visibly intoxicated and appeared to be [REDACTED]. She stated that she had been made aware that Mrs Miller had driven to the School having drunk a quantity of wine and that Mrs Miller wanted to drive [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] after Mrs Miller's first period of teaching.

Witness A submitted that she referred the matter to Social Services and that she contacted the police. She stated that she presumed Mrs Miller to be under the influence of alcohol as, at that stage, she could smell alcohol coming from her and told her she would not be able to drive [REDACTED] to school.

Witness A indicated that Mrs Miller stated to her that her personal situation was all too much and that she had [REDACTED]. Witness A understood this to be related to her [REDACTED].

Witness A stated that Witness B and another member of staff had driven [REDACTED] to her school.

Witness A stated that Mrs Miller confirmed she had only had two small glasses of wine. She stated that Mrs Miller's car remained parked at the School and [REDACTED] later came to remove it. Witness A stated that Mrs Miller [REDACTED] was not coherent in her chain of thought.

The panel considered the written statement of Witness B, who stated that, on 2 February 2023, she attended the daily staff briefing and Mrs Miller was unexpectedly absent.

Witness B stated that Mrs Miller arrived at School whilst Witness B was supervising pupils in the school hall prior to the school day commencing, and Mrs Miller approached her as she moved through the school hall and asked if she (Mrs Miller) could take [REDACTED] to school after her first period of teaching. Witness B stated that Mrs Miller told her that her [REDACTED] was still in the car and [REDACTED].

Witness B submitted that Mrs Miller did not seem out of character but that she could smell a strong smell of alcohol on her breath, which became more noticeable after she invited her to join her in her office. She stated that she challenged Mrs Miller on the fact she could smell alcohol and Mrs Miller advised her that she had drunk one glass of wine prior to driving to the School. Witness B said that Mrs Miller lived [REDACTED] away from the School by car.

Witness B stated that she asked Mrs Miller how long [REDACTED] had been in the car and she explained [REDACTED] had been there as long as Mrs Miller had been in the School. She stated that Mrs Miller was keen to express that she could drive [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], but Witness B did not allow her to do so. Witness B stated that it was around this time Mrs Miller stated she had drunk two glasses of wine that morning before driving to work.

Witness B stated that she accompanied Mrs Miller to speak with [REDACTED] who they found in Mrs Miller's car. Witness B stated that [REDACTED] appeared [REDACTED].

Witness B stated that she left Mrs Miller with Witness A and transported [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] alongside another member of staff.

The panel considered a document described by Witness A as a full contemporaneous chronology of the events. The panel noted that this evidence was again hearsay but proceeded to consider it carefully attaching limited weight to it. The panel noted that it had no further information as to when this document was written or by whom. The panel noted that the document appeared to support that which was stated within the apparently more recent witness statements of Witness A and Witness B.

The panel considered the minutes of a LADO meeting of 7 February 2023. The panel noted that this evidence was again hearsay but proceeded to consider it carefully attaching only limited weight to it. The panel again noted that those minutes were consistent with the contents of the witness statements of Witness A and Witness B.

The panel again carefully considered the new documents which had recently been provided by Mrs Miller. The panel noted that within these documents Mrs Miller stated "I accept the allegations 1a, 1b and 1c." and "I hereby accept the allegations 1a 1b and 1c taking full responsibility and deep regret for these actions".

The panel further noted that Mrs Miller's evidence was that on the morning in question she was [REDACTED] and had come to the School seeking help after several hours [REDACTED]. The panel noted that Mrs Miller's evidence was that she was not over the legal alcohol limit but had taken two small shot glasses of white wine [REDACTED].

The panel noted a letter of 15 March 2024 from Mrs Miller to the presenting officer's firm. The panel noted that within that letter Mrs Miller acknowledged that she consumed two small shot glasses of wine before leaving for school but stated that she had no intention

to teach students after having consumed alcohol. She indicated that she believed she was below the legal drink driving limit.

The panel carefully considered all the evidence and was satisfied that Mrs Miller had driven to School on 2 February 2023 with [REDACTED], having consumed alcohol and then entered into the School's premises smelling of alcohol, leaving [REDACTED] unattended in the car.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that the facts stated within allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) were proved.

Having found the facts within allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) proven the panel then went on to consider whether the facts as found proven amounted to Mrs Miller acting in an inappropriate and/or unprofessional manner, as alleged. The panel used its own extensive experience in reaching its determinations in this regard and again noted Mrs Miller's admissions.

The panel concluded that the actions it had found proven in relation to 1(a) and 1(b), in driving [REDACTED] to the School and entering into the School having consumed alcohol and smelling of alcohol would be considered by any objective observer, and were considered by the panel, to be unprofessional and inappropriate.

In relation to allegation 1(c) though, the panel noted that the seemingly uncontested evidence was that [REDACTED].

Further the panel noted that [REDACTED] had been left in a safe location, the School, and the panel's experience was that [REDACTED]. The panel was not satisfied that it had been proven that the act of leaving [REDACTED] unsupervised on the School's premises was, of itself, an act which was unprofessional or inappropriate.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proven and 1(c) unproven.

2. Your conduct as found proven at;

a) Allegation 1a and/or 1b above was notwithstanding you had previously been provided with support and/or advice from the school.

The panel again considered the written statement of Witness A, who stated that Mrs Miller had welcomed informal support from the senior leadership team in respect of her learning and teaching.

Witness A stated that she was aware that Mrs Miller had [REDACTED]. She stated that after an incident was raised to the School in December 2022, [REDACTED], the School offered to support Mrs Miller by [REDACTED].

Witness A stated that Mrs Miller had not attended the School the following day and a welfare check had been made but Mrs Miller did not answer the door.

The panel considered the written statement of Witness B, who stated that there were some concerns around Mrs Miller's planning and lesson delivery which resulted in Mrs Miller being put on a support plan which she was open to and responded well to.

The panel considered a document described by Witness A as a File Note. The panel noted that this evidence was again hearsay but proceeded to consider it carefully, placing limited weight on it. The panel noted that it had no information as to when this document was written or by whom.

The panel observed that the file note provided that, on 5 December 2022, Mrs Miller was taken off timetable and instructed to [REDACTED].

The panel noted that it had limited evidence from Mrs Miller on this subject but Mrs Miller had not directly accepted this allegation and it proceeded in its consideration of the evidence on this basis.

The panel noted that, within the recent document which it had admitted from Mrs Miller, wrongly dated 29 September 2025, Mrs Miller stated that the School had afforded her time to try and [REDACTED].

The panel carefully considered all the evidence and reached a decision. The panel had found evidence that, to a limited extent, support and advice had previously been provided by the School to Mrs Miller.

The panel found allegation 2(a) proven.

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

Having found a number 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 Mrs Miller, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Miller 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, 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 not satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Miller, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel also considered whether Mrs Miller'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 noted that it had been referred by the presenting officer to the behaviour of "serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs/ serious offences involving alcohol" but, after careful consideration, found that neither this, nor any of the other offences, were relevant. The panel noted that it had no evidence that Mrs Miller was over the legal driving limit for alcohol.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the allegations which it had found proven. The panel had established that Mrs Miller had driven to her place of work with [REDACTED] in the car having had at least two alcoholic drinks that morning before leaving. The panel had no basis to establish the size of those drinks though noted that Mrs Miller herself had indicated that her intention in drinking them had been to feel a different emotion which it took to include that she intended that those drinks would have a direct influence on her perception.

The panel had established that Mrs Miller had attended her place of work and had gone into the School smelling of alcohol and having consumed alcohol. The panel noted that Mrs Miller's position was that she had no intention of teaching that morning and had gone there for support. The panel also noted though that the other witness evidence was inconsistent with this, indicating that Mrs Miller had intended to teach at least her first lesson. The panel could conceive of no reason why Mrs Miller would have attended the School at all that day had she not been intending to teach the first period.

The panel drew on its own knowledge and experience and noted the elements of the Teacher's Standards which it had found breached. The panel was firmly of the view that Mrs Miller driving her vehicle to the School having consumed alcohol and then attending the School's premises having consumed, and smelling of, alcohol were, as it had found, inappropriate and unprofessional activities falling way below the standards it would expect of a teacher.

The panel carefully considered carefully the mitigating circumstances which Mrs Miller had provided. The panel again considered the written information provided by Mrs Miller, who stated that [REDACTED] and that, around the time of 2 February 2023 [REDACTED].

Whilst entirely sympathetic to these wider circumstances, the panel was not satisfied that the events were such as to exonerate Mrs Miller in respect of her misconduct or the seriousness of her actions.

The panel noted some of the actions it had found proven in connection with allegation 1(b) took place, to some extent, outside the education setting. The panel concluded that Mrs Miller's conduct as found proven under allegation 1(b) was conduct which affected the way Mrs Miller fulfilled her teaching role and may have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way. The panel made this finding noting that Mrs Miller had exposed [REDACTED], both to direct risk and the risk of being influenced by her behaviour in a harmful way.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Miller was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mrs Miller's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, which the panel then went on to consider, 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 Mrs Miller'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 Mrs Miller was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel considered that the general public would expect that no teacher would drive to school with [REDACTED], or attend school premises first thing in the morning, under the influence of alcohol and that the public would view these actions by someone who had responsibility for the safeguarding of children to be wholly unacceptable.

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

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mrs Miller's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Accordingly, the panel found Mrs Miller's conduct, as found proven in allegations 1 (a) and 1 (b), to be unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered its findings in relation to allegation 2 (a) carefully but did not find that those findings evidenced unacceptable professional conduct or 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. The panel appreciated that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have a punitive effect.

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

In light of the panel's findings against Mrs Miller, which involved a finding that she had driven [REDACTED] to work, and attended the School's premises, having consumed alcohol, the panel considered that a public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public was engaged.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Miller was not treated with seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against the teacher 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 noted that the evidence was that Mrs Miller had been engaged in the teaching profession for 42 years and it had no evidence of any previous disciplinary concerns having been raised during that time.

The panel noted that, whilst it had no evidence as to Mrs Miller's abilities as an educator and / or whether she would be able to make a valuable ongoing contribution to the profession, it concluded that it had no reason to think that Mrs Miller would not be able to contribute valuably to the profession in the future.

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 Mrs Miller.

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; and
- 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 could be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel saw no evidence that Mrs Miller's actions were not deliberate.

The panel saw little evidence that Mrs Miller was acting under extreme duress or that Mrs Miller had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that the Advice provided that the list referred to at page 43 was not intended to be an exhaustive list of mitigation factors and that each case needed to be considered on its own merits. The panel further noted that the Advice provided that the panel should also consider and determine what weight should be given to any other mitigating factors such as the level of insight and remorse.

The panel carefully considered the evidence provided by Mrs Miller in relation to mitigation including the new (misdated) letter which it had admitted which sought to address these specific issues. The panel noted that the TRA did not seek to contest the evidence given by Mrs Miller in relation to these matters and, indeed, the TRA appeared to accept that there were certain extenuating circumstances in this case.

The panel noted that Mrs Miller had been suffering from the ongoing consequences of [REDACTED]. Mrs Miller's evidence was that she was [REDACTED] and that, with hindsight, she recognised that [REDACTED].

The panel had also heard that Mrs Miller had [REDACTED] who found that she was [REDACTED].

The panel found evidence of insight and remorse within Mrs Miller's evidence noting her statement that she took full responsibility for, and had deep regret for, her actions. The panel noted that Mrs Miller stated she had fully accepted her previous issues and addressed those with the signposted organisations. Mrs Miller's evidence was that those organisations were unanimous in their view that she posed no current or future harm to vulnerable groups including children and young people.

The panel noted the letter from [REDACTED] which clarified that Mrs Miller [REDACTED]. The panel noted the letter from [REDACTED] of 19 February 2024 which provided that Mrs Miller had [REDACTED] and that it had been told she was in a supportive relationship.

The panel noted and considered all the above carefully.

The panel also noted that the facts it had found proven concerned a one-off incident in February 2023 and that it had no evidence of any comparable safeguarding incidents having occurred. The panel noted that it was not made aware of any disciplinary issue having been raised concerning Mrs Miller in her 42 years' of service. The panel noted there was no evidence that Mrs Miller was over the legal drink driving limit on 2 February 2023.

The panel considered that the evidence was that Mrs Miller had [REDACTED] had developed insight into her actions and their impact. The panel was satisfied that Mrs Miller had understood that what she had done was serious and wrong and had made sufficient efforts to ameliorate that. The panel considered, on the evidence, that the likelihood of Mrs Miller repeating the actions which it had found proven was low and it saw no evidence for ongoing safeguarding concerns.

The panel 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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour, whilst serious, was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having very carefully considered the mitigation factors that were present which were significant factors in its decision, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case.

The panel considered that a prohibition order here would serve little purpose in all the circumstances and that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that no prohibition order should be imposed.

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 sanction.

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

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found one of the allegations not proven (Allegation 1(c)). I have therefore put that matter entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Beverley Miller should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession

into disrepute should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Miller 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, 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 finds that the conduct of Mrs Miller fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 Mrs Miller, 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:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mrs Miller, which involved a finding that she had driven [REDACTED] to work, and attended the School’s premises, having consumed alcohol, the panel considered that a public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public was engaged.”

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:

“The panel found evidence of insight and remorse within Mrs Miller’s evidence noting her statement that she took full responsibility for, and had deep regret for, her actions. The panel noted that Mrs Miller stated she had fully accepted her previous issues and addressed those with the signposted organisations. Mrs Miller’s evidence was that those organisations were unanimous in their view that she posed no current or future harm to vulnerable groups including children and young people.”

I have therefore given this element some 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:

“Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Miller was not treated with seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher attending school premises after consuming alcohol 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 Mrs Miller herself. The panel has commented:

“The panel noted that, whilst it had no evidence as to Mrs Miller’s abilities as an educator and / or whether she would be able to make a valuable ongoing contribution to the profession, it concluded that it had no reason to think that Mrs Miller would not be able to contribute valuably to the profession in the future.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Miller from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of her 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 mitigating factors including:

“The panel noted the letter from [REDACTED] which clarified that Mrs Miller [REDACTED]. The panel noted the letter from [REDACTED] of 19 February 2024 which provided that Mrs Miller had [REDACTED] and that it had been told she was in a supportive relationship.”

I have noted the panel’s comments that this was an isolated incident:

“The panel also noted that the facts it had found proven concerned a one-off incident in February 2023 and that it had no evidence of any comparable safeguarding incidents having occurred. The panel noted that it was not made aware of any disciplinary issue having been raised concerning Mrs Miller in her 42 years’ of service. The panel noted there was no evidence that Mrs Miller was over the legal drink driving limit on 2 February 2023.”

I have also taken into account of the panel’s findings that Mrs Miller had developed insight and taken steps to avoid a repetition of the behaviour:

“The panel considered that the evidence was that Mrs Miller had [REDACTED] had developed insight into her actions and their impact. The panel was satisfied that Mrs Miller had understood that what she had done was serious and wrong and had made sufficient efforts to ameliorate that. The panel considered, on the evidence, that the likelihood of Mrs Miller repeating the actions which it had found proven was low and it saw no evidence for ongoing safeguarding concerns.”

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 7 August 2025

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