



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Charlotte Gavin: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**June 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	16
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	20

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

**Teacher:** Ms Charlotte Gavin  
**Teacher ref number:** 0457396  
**Teacher date of birth:** 13 March 1983  
**TRA reference:** 23143  
**Date of determination:** 5 June 2026  
**Former employer:** Thomas Middlecott Academy, Boston

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 3 to 5 June 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Gavin.

The panel members were Mr Alan Wells (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Francis Ekengwu (teacher panellist) and Mr Neil Green (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Tom Philips, of QEB Hollis Whiteman Chambers instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Ms Gavin was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 6 February 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Gavin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed as an Assistant Principal at Corby Business Academy (“the Academy”):

1. Between 15 July 2022 and 2 September 2022, she did not inform the Academy that:
  - a) She had been arrested on 15 July 2022 for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in her breath/blood was above the prescribed limit.
  - b) She had attended Northamptonshire Magistrates’ Court on 2 September 2022 where she was convicted for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in her breath/blood was above the prescribed limit.
2. On 5 October 2023 she attended the Academy and brought with her an open bottle of wine onto Academy premises.

She is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst applying for a role as a Teacher of English at Abbeyfield School (the School):

3. Between 17 December 2023 and 11 January 2024, she did not inform the School that:
  - a) She had been arrested on 17 December 2023 for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in her breath/blood was above the prescribed limit
  - b) She was due to attend Northamptonshire Magistrates’ Court on 15 January 2024 for the offence of being in charge of a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in her breath/blood was above the prescribed limit.
4. Her conduct at paragraphs 1(a) and/or 1(b) and 3(a) and/or 3(b) was;
  - a) Dishonest;
  - b) Lacked integrity.

She has been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

5. On or around 2 September 2022 she was convicted of the offence of driving a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in her breath/blood being above the prescribed limit, contrary to section 5 (1) (a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.

6. On or around 15 January 2024 she was convicted of the offence of being in charge of a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in her breath/blood being above the prescribed limit, contrary to section 5 (1) (b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.

[REDACTED].

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by Ms Gavin on 26 May 2026, she admitted allegations 1(a), 1(b), and 4(a) and 4(b), but only insofar as they relate to allegations 1(a) and 1(b).

Ms Gavin denied allegations 2, 3(a) and 3(b), and also denied allegations 4(a) and 4(b) insofar as they relate to allegations 3(a) and 3(b).

Ms Gavin also admitted that she had been convicted of the two offences, subject to the correction of the wording of the second offence.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and Key Person List – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of Hearing and Response – pages 7 to 11

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency Witness Statements – pages 12 to 29

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 30 to 169

In addition, the panel received:

Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 169 to 174

The panel also received supplementary bundles regarding preliminary applications, together with additional material relating to those applications, on the first day of the hearing.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all documents provided in advance of the hearing. In addition, the panel members confirmed that they had read the additional material relating to the preliminary applications prior to hearing the preliminary applications.

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

## **Witnesses**

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]; and

Witness B – [REDACTED]

The panel also had in the bundle written evidence from Witness C – [REDACTED] at the relevant time.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Ms Gavin was employed by the Corby Business Academy ("the Academy") as an Assistant Principal from January 2019 until December 2023, following her resignation on 9 October 2023.

Ms Gavin applied to Abbeyfield School ("the School") and was interviewed for the role of English teacher on 14 November 2023. During the interview process she informed the School of her first conviction (2 September 2022). References were obtained, including by Witness C and Witness A and Ms Gavin was offered employment on 10 December 2023, although no start date was confirmed pending further checks, including DBS clearance.

The School received information about the second offence from 17 December 2023 (at that stage, an upcoming Court appearance) by email from a third party on 12 January 2024. A telephone call then took place between Ms Gavin and Witness B during which Ms Gavin provided information regarding the second offence. The School subsequently withdrew its offer of employment by letter dated 19 January 2024.

The School referred the matter to the TRA on 1 February 2024.

The Academy referred the matter to the TRA on 7 March 2024.

## **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. Between 15 July 2022 and 2 September 2022, you did not inform the Academy that:**

**a) You had been arrested on 15 July 2022 for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in your breath/blood was above the prescribed limit.**

**b) You had attended Northamptonshire Magistrates' Court on 2 September 2022 where you were convicted for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in your breath/blood was above the prescribed limit.**

Ms Gavin admitted this allegation in the signed Statement of Agreed Facts dated 26 May 2026.

The panel also noted Ms Gavin's statement sent to the TRA on 17 February 2026 in which she stated: "*It has been suggested that nobody knew of my conviction in the Academy. This is incorrect. A screenshot of my conviction from the newspaper was leaked to members of staff.*" The panel found that this did not establish that Ms Gavin had informed the Academy herself. The panel also further noted from the same statement: "*I adore my role in the classroom and I am deeply regretful that I did not disclose this at the time.*"

The panel further considered the written evidence of Witness C, who stated that he was unaware of the conviction until February 2024, when informed by the LADO and the Academy was required to make a referral to the TRA.

The panel also considered an email from Individual A, [REDACTED], which stated that: "*No one in the academy or the trust has any knowledge of this offence.*"

On the balance of probabilities, the panel was satisfied that Ms Gavin did not inform the Academy of her arrest or conviction. Accordingly, it found allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proven.

**3. Between 17 December 2023 and 11 January 2024, you did not inform the School that:**

**a) You had been arrested on 17 December 2023 for the offence of being in charge of a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in your breath/blood was above the prescribed limit**

**b) You were due to attend Northamptonshire Magistrates' Court on 15 January 2024 for the offence of being in charge of a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in your breath/blood was above the prescribed limit.**

Ms Gavin did not admit this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, noting that the offence had been incorrectly described as “*driving*” a motor vehicle rather than “*being in charge*” of a motor vehicle.

The panel considered Ms Gavin’s statement dated 17 February 2026, in which she stated: “*The reason I did not declare this to the new school was because I was still [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. I also decided that I was not going to take the position as I wanted to start a new life out of [REDACTED] and a break from teaching.*”

The panel also considered the oral and written evidence of Witness B, who stated that Ms Gavin did not inform her or the School of the arrest or the upcoming Court appearance. Witness B became aware of the matter only after receiving an email on 12 January 2024 containing a newspaper extract indicating that Ms Gavin had been charged with the offence and was due to appear in Court.

Witness B stated that she subsequently spoke with Ms Gavin by telephone, during which Ms Gavin confirmed the offence. Following this, the offer of employment was withdrawn by letter on 19 January 2024.

Witness B further stated that she was disappointed and would have expected the disclosure to come from Ms Gavin. Witness B confirmed that Ms Gavin had disclosed her earlier conviction during the interview process and she offered her the role with knowledge of the first conviction. However, no start date had been agreed, as DBS checks were outstanding, and Ms Gavin was not yet an employee of the School. Witness B also confirmed in oral evidence that Ms Gavin would have been required to complete a declaration prior to commencing employment in which she would be expected to disclose this conviction.

The panel found, based on the evidence of Witness B and Ms Gavin’s own admissions, that Ms Gavin did not inform the School of her arrest or upcoming Court appearance. Accordingly, the panel found allegations 3(a) and 3(b) proven.

#### **4. Your conduct at paragraphs 1(a) and/or 1(b) was;**

**a) Dishonest;**

**b) Lacked integrity.**

Ms Gavin admitted both allegations in the signed Statement of Agreed Facts.

The panel considered the findings it had made in respect of allegations 1(a) and 1(b), and whether that conduct was, firstly, dishonest and, secondly, lacking in integrity.

#### **Dishonesty**

The panel applied the test for dishonesty as set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos*, which requires the decision-maker to consider:

- a) the teacher's knowledge or belief as to the facts, and
- b) whether the conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel found that Ms Gavin was part of the Senior Leadership Team. She had held a senior position at the Academy for a number of years as an Assistant Principal and had previously held similar senior roles.

The panel considered the evidence before it, including an email from Individual A, which confirmed that a safeguarding update took place each September and included the relevant school policies. Individual A stated that Ms Gavin was present at those updates. The policy was also referred to in the evidence of Witness C, and the panel had sight of the policy itself. The policy states:

*"Adults are required to notify the School immediately of any allegations of misconduct that are of a safeguarding nature made against them (or implicating them), by a child or adult in relation to any outside work or interest (whether paid or unpaid), and of any arrest or criminal charge, whether child-related or not."*

The panel considered this policy alongside Ms Gavin's senior position within the Academy. The panel found that, given her experience and role, Ms Gavin must have known that she was required to disclose her arrest and conviction, and that failing to do so was dishonest.

The panel also found that ordinary decent people would consider this conduct to be dishonest.

### **Lack of integrity**

The panel found that the ethical standards expected of an Assistant Principal were not upheld by Ms Gavin's failure to disclose her arrest and conviction to the Academy. The panel further considered that Ms Gavin's conduct was in breach of the Academy's policy and procedures and also in breach of the ethical standards of a teacher.

Accordingly, the panel found that Ms Gavin's conduct lacked integrity in failing to disclose that information to the Academy.

The panel therefore found allegation 4(a) and 4(b) proven, only in relation to allegations 1(a) and 1(b).

**5. On or around 2 September 2022 you were convicted of the offence of driving a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in your breath/blood being above the**

**prescribed limit, contrary to section 5 (1) (a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.**

The panel considered the certificate of conviction confirming Ms Gavin's conviction of the alleged offence. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

The certificate of conviction showed that Ms Gavin pleaded guilty at Northampton Magistrates' Court on 2 September 2022 and was therefore convicted of the following offence:

*"On 15/07/2022 at [REDACTED], you drove a motor vehicle, namely [redacted], on a road, namely [REDACTED], [REDACTED], after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 59 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. Contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988."*

Northampton Magistrates' Court sentenced Ms Gavin to a financial penalty of £646, together with a victim surcharge of £258, and she was ordered to pay £85 in prosecution costs. She was also disqualified from driving for 16 months.

The panel also noted that, in the signed Statement of Agreed Facts, Ms Gavin admitted this offence.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

**6. On or around 15 January 2024 you were convicted of the offence of being in charge of a motor vehicle with the alcohol concentration in your breath/blood being above the prescribed limit, contrary to section 5 (1) (b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.**

The panel considered the certificate of conviction confirming Ms Gavin's conviction of the alleged offence. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

The certificate of conviction showed that Ms Gavin pleaded guilty at Northampton Magistrates' Court on 15 January 2024 and was therefore convicted of the following offence:

*"On 17/12/2023 at Rushden, you were in charge of a motor vehicle, namely [redacted], in a public place, namely Rushden Lakes Car Park, after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 112 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. Contrary to section 5(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988."*

Northampton Magistrates' Court sentenced Ms Gavin to a community order for 12 months, including a [REDACTED] requirement for six months and up to 20 rehabilitation activity requirement days. She was also ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £114 and prosecution costs of £85. Her licence was endorsed with 10 penalty points.

The panel also noted that, in the signed Statement of Agreed Facts, Ms Gavin admitted this offence.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

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

**2. On 5 October 2023 you attended the Academy and brought with you an open bottle of wine onto Academy premises.**

Ms Gavin denied this allegation in the signed Statement of Agreed Facts and in her statement to the TRA.

In her statement, Ms Gavin said: "*The bottle of wine was sealed and was kept in my locked office – no access for students unless accompanied. I forgot the bottle of wine was in my bag.*"

Although not part of the allegation, Ms Gavin maintained that she had not consumed alcohol on school premises. Both Witness C and Witness A confirmed that Ms Gavin did not smell of alcohol, did not appear to be under the influence of alcohol, and there was no evidence to suggest that she had consumed alcohol on school premises.

The panel considered the witness statement of Witness C in which he stated: "*I went into Charlotte Gavin's office to talk to her about a work related matter, she was not there at the time. However, when I was in her office I saw that there was a bottle of wine in her handbag*"

Witness C further stated: "*I cannot confirm if the wine bottle was open or closed, as I did not go into Charlotte Gavin's bag, I just saw the bottle poking [sic] out of the top of her handbag.*"

Witness C referred to the Academy's policy, which states that alcohol is not permitted on school premises. However, he also stated that during Christmas he would gift bottles of wine to staff. This practice was also confirmed by Witness A as something done by both Witness C and other members of staff for occasions such as birthdays and Christmas. Ms Gavin also referred to in her statement to occasions when staff had bottles of wine in their offices, mostly as gifts.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness A, who confirmed that she did not see the bottle herself, but stated that Ms Gavin informed her at the end of the day that the bottle of wine was unopened.

The panel also considered an email from Individual A, obtained during the TRA investigation, in which he stated:

*"[REDACTED], Witness C, went to talk to CG in her office (5/10/2023). She was not present, but he noticed an open bag and an opened bottle of wine."*

The panel noted that Individual A did not witness this himself and that this was information relayed to him by Witness C. As Witness C himself stated that he could not confirm whether the bottle was open, the panel did not place any weight on Individual A evidence.

The panel therefore concluded that on the evidence before it the TRA had not proven on the balance of probabilities that Ms Gavin brought an open bottle of wine with her onto the Academy's premises. Accordingly, the panel found this allegation not proven.

#### **4. Your conduct at paragraphs 3(a) and/or 3(b) was;**

##### **a) Dishonest;**

##### **b) Lacked integrity.**

This allegation was denied by Ms Gavin in the signed Statement of Agreed Facts.

The panel considered its findings in respect of allegations 3(a) and 3(b), together with the chronology of Ms Gavin's application, interview, and subsequent arrest.

The panel noted that the interview at the School took place in November 2023, prior to Ms Gavin's arrest on 17 December 2023. The panel further noted that Ms Gavin was awaiting a start date at the School, and that she was therefore not yet an employee of the School.

The panel also noted that Ms Gavin would have been required to complete a further declaration prior to commencing employment, and that DBS checks were outstanding.

While the panel considered that it would have been good practice for Ms Gavin to inform the prospective employer of her arrest and upcoming Court appearance during the specified time, there was no evidence of a requirement by the School for Ms Gavin to inform the School at that stage. The panel also took into account the circumstances at the time. This included the relatively short period between the arrest and the Court hearing, the intervening Christmas holidays, and Ms Gavin's [REDACTED] all of which contributed to the reduced opportunity for Ms Gavin to inform the School.

The panel also noted that the failure to disclose a conviction would have been a more significant omission. However, at the relevant time, Ms Gavin had not yet been convicted, as the Court hearing took place on 15 January 2024.

The panel applied the test for dishonesty set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos* and did not find that Ms Gavin's knowledge or belief as to the facts was dishonest, nor that ordinary decent people would consider her conduct to be dishonest.

In relation to integrity, the panel reached the same conclusion and did not consider that the conduct lacked integrity, for the reasons set out above.

Accordingly, the panel did not find allegation 4(a) or 4(b) proven in relation to allegations 3(a) or 3(b).

### **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence**

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 and/or conviction of a relevant offence.

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 Ms Gavin, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Gavin 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
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law...
- 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 not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Gavin in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

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

The panel also considered whether Ms Gavin'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 serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs, were relevant. However, these are considered separately below as relevant offences, as the present allegations concern Ms Gavin's failure to disclose those matters.

The panel noted that the allegations relating to Ms Gavin's failure to inform the Academy of her arrest and conviction, which the panel found to lack integrity and be dishonest, as well as her failure to inform the School of her arrest and upcoming Court hearing. The panel found that this conduct did not affect the way in which Ms Gavin carried out her teaching role, nor did it expose pupils to, or influence pupils by, that behaviour in a harmful way.

The panel considered the dishonesty and lack of integrity to be of a serious nature but did not find that it fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The panel also noted that Ms Gavin expressed regret and remorse for her failure to disclose her arrest and conviction to the Academy and further considered Ms Gavin's account of her difficult personal circumstances at the time.

The panel did not find Ms Gavin not sharing the information of her arrest or upcoming hearing with the School as misconduct of a serious nature.

The panel was therefore, not satisfied that any of the allegations it found proven, amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was not satisfied that Ms Gavin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Gavin's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Ms Gavin'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 Ms Gavin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs was relevant, but it is considered separately below as a relevant offence and the allegations relate to Ms Gavin failing to disclose those arrests and/or convictions.

The panel found that the allegations it had found proven at allegations 4(a) and 4(b), together with the underlying allegations 1(a) and 1(b), were serious, and that the conduct found would be likely to have a negative impact on Ms Gavin's status as a teacher. The panel also found that such conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of the profession, in circumstances where teachers fail to disclose arrests and/or convictions to their employer.

The panel did not consider the findings at allegations 3(a) and 3(b) to amount to serious misconduct. Accordingly, it did not find that the conduct in relation to those allegations would be likely to have a negative impact on Ms Gavin's status as a teacher or that it would damage the public perception of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel found that Ms Gavin's actions, in respect of allegations 1(a) and 1(b) and 4(a) and 4(b), constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In relation to the panel's findings of the two convictions, the panel noted that Ms Gavin's actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in commission of the first offence only, could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public.

The panel considered that both of Ms Gavin's convictions would affect public confidence in the teaching profession if she was allowed to continue teaching. The panel noted that Ms Gavin's behaviour did not lead to sentences of imprisonment.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning offences involving serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol. The panel found that both offences fell within this category, albeit that the first offence was more serious as it involved Ms Gavin driving, whereas the second involved her being in charge of a motor vehicle rather than driving it.

The panel took into account the evidence it heard from Witness A regarding Ms Gavin's positive record as a teacher.

The panel also took into consideration Ms Gavin's account provided in her statement to the TRA of the [REDACTED] she was experiencing at the relevant time, including the [REDACTED]. Ms Gavin stated in her statement that "*the convictions of drink driving were due to [REDACTED]*". She further stated, "*I did not contact the police as I was naïve in believing things would change and that is was my fault*".

However, the panel did not have independent supporting evidence of these matters and this account was not clearly supported by the evidence contained in the police officers' statements relating to the two incidents. In relation to the first offence, there was no reference in the police evidence to Ms Gavin [REDACTED]. Instead, the account recorded that Ms Gavin stated, "*I know I drove the car but [REDACTED]*". The second offence occurred in a cinema car park after Ms Gavin had been at the cinema [REDACTED].

Ms Gavin also stated in her statement sent to the TRA on 17 February 2026 that since the offending, she has moved on from past difficulties, secured new employment, and adopted a healthier lifestyle. She emphasised that she has learned from her experience, remains deeply committed to the profession, and wants the opportunity to rebuild her career and move forward.

Although the panel accepted that Ms Gavin's account of her [REDACTED] at the time of the offending were a relevant mitigating factor, it considered the seriousness of the conduct, namely two separate alcohol-related convictions, separated by a significant period, the first in July 2022 and the second in December 2023, which demonstrated a pattern of behaviour. The panel therefore found the offending relevant to Ms Gavin's ongoing suitability to teach.

The panel therefore considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary in order to reaffirm clear standards of conduct and to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and 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 Ms Gavin, which included lack of integrity, dishonesty, and convictions for two relevant offences, there was a strong public interest in safeguarding pupils and protecting the wider public. This arose from the circumstances of her first conviction for drink driving and her second conviction for being in charge of a motor vehicle while over the prescribed alcohol limit.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Gavin 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 Ms Gavin in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Ms Gavin had ability as an educator and made a contribution to the Academy during her employment, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations outweigh any interest in retaining Ms Gavin in the profession, since her 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 Ms Gavin.

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:

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 disclosures;

- actions or behaviours that ... undermine ... the rule of law ...

- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions ...

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

The panel found that there was no evidence that Ms Gavin's actions were not deliberate. The panel further found that Ms Gavin's dishonesty and lack of integrity in failing to inform the Academy was deliberate; the behaviour involved in the two offences was also deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Gavin was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation

The panel accepted that Ms Gavin had a previous good history as a teacher and was an experienced practitioner who had made a contribution to the Academy. However, the panel had no evidence that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct, nor made a significant contribution to the education sector more broadly.

The panel was unable to accept that the incidents were out of character. It had before it evidence of two relevant convictions, separated by a significant period of time, both involving alcohol. This was in addition to the finding that Ms Gavin's conduct was dishonest and lacked integrity.

Ms Gavin did not provide any character statements attesting to her character or teaching ability. The panel did, however, have the statement of Witness A, who spoke positively of Ms Gavin's character and professional conduct. Witness A described her as *"always been a professional and hard-working member of staff. She has always been very caring in relation to the children that she teaches, and has taken on a number of additional responsibilities in her role as Assistant Principal. I wholeheartedly supported her for her new role, based on my knowledge of how Charlotte Gavin worked. I therefore recommended her for the new role as I had no issues or concerns in relation to her conduct and felt that the new role as a Class Teacher would suit her well."*

In oral evidence, Witness A reiterated that Ms Gavin had been a strong practitioner. She noted that she had improved outcomes at the Academy significantly, was supportive of colleagues, and demonstrated commitment to pupils' wellbeing. Witness A stated that Ms Gavin's conduct came as a shock and was *"not in her character"*.

The panel further considered Ms Gavin's statement to the TRA, sent by email on 17 February 2026, which set out her mitigation. In that statement, Ms Gavin explained that

she left the teaching profession in October 2023 and had since sought to rebuild her life. She referred to experiencing [REDACTED], including [REDACTED], which she said contributed to the circumstances surrounding her convictions. She expressed regret for her actions and stated that she did not seek to excuse her behaviour.

In relation to the first conviction on 2 September 2022, and allegations 1(a), 1(b), 4(a) and 4(b), Ms Gavin stated that she had been experiencing [REDACTED] and that the Academy felt like a place of safety. She accepted that she had failed to inform the Academy and acknowledged that this was wrong.

In relation to the second conviction on 15 January 2024, Ms Gavin stated: "*I stupidly jumped into my car to escape due to [REDACTED]. I was not thinking straight, [REDACTED] was still being affected. I was frightened that I was going to be [REDACTED]. I do not condone my behaviour at the time and seriously regret my actions.*"

However, the panel noted that no supporting evidence was provided in respect of these matters. There were no police records, [REDACTED] evidence, or independent material to support the mitigation. More significantly, there was no evidence or explanation of steps taken to address Ms Gavin's behaviour, including any rehabilitation, management of her use of alcohol, or treatment to [REDACTED] and reduce the risk of repetition of such behaviour.

The panel found that while Ms Gavin made admissions and expressed remorse, which indicated some degree of insight, however, this was undermined by further information before the panel. In particular, the panel noted [REDACTED], as set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts signed by Ms Gavin on 26 May 2026. This recorded that: [REDACTED].

In light of [REDACTED], together with the absence of an explanation and supporting evidence demonstrating remediation, the panel found that Ms Gavin's evidence of remorse, insight, and reduced risk of repetition was limited.

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 Ms Gavin 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 Ms Gavin. The two relevant convictions and findings of dishonesty and lack of integrity were 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 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 considered that Ms Gavin had demonstrated remorse and some understanding of the seriousness of her conduct. It also considered that she has the capacity to reflect on and further learn from her actions during a review period. The panel concluded that a review period of two years would provide Ms Gavin with sufficient time to reflect, undertake and evidence remediation, insight, and a reduced risk of repetition.

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 of two years.

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

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

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

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or a relevant conviction.

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including allegation 2). The panel has also found that the proven allegations did not amount to unacceptable professional conduct and that allegations 3a and 3b did not amount to conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Gavin is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law...
- 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 Ms Gavin fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include convictions for driving offences involving alcohol.

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 conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, 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 Ms Gavin, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed that “there was a strong public interest in safeguarding pupils and protecting the wider public. This arose from the circumstances of her first conviction for drink driving and her second conviction for being in charge of a motor vehicle while over the prescribed alcohol limit.” 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. The panel has found that “Ms Gavin made admissions and expressed remorse, which indicated some degree of insight” but that “Ms Gavin’s evidence of remorse, insight, and reduced risk of repetition was limited.” In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse 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 that “both of Ms Gavin’s convictions would affect public confidence in the teaching profession if she was allowed to continue teaching.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of 2 convictions for motoring offences involving 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 conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, 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 Ms Gavin herself. The panel has observed that “Ms Gavin had a previous good history as a teacher and was an experienced practitioner who had made a contribution to the Academy. However, the panel had no evidence that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct, nor made a significant contribution to the education sector more broadly.”

The panel noted that that the written statement of Witness A “spoke positively of Ms Gavin’s character and professional conduct” and in oral evidence Witness A said that Ms Gavin “had improved outcomes at the Academy significantly, was supportive of colleagues, and demonstrated commitment to pupils’ wellbeing.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Gavin 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 serious nature of the convictions for motoring offences and the dishonest conduct. The panel has said that although it "accepted that Ms Gavin's account of her[REDACTED] at the time of the offending were a relevant mitigating factor, it considered the seriousness of the conduct, namely two separate alcohol-related convictions, separated by a significant period, the first in July 2022 and the second in December 2023, which demonstrated a pattern of behaviour." The panel has also said that "Ms Gavin's dishonesty and lack of integrity in failing to inform the Academy was deliberate; the behaviour involved in the two offences was also deliberate." I have noted the panel's view that "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Gavin were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's finding that there was only limited evidence of Ms Gavin's insight into and remorse for her conduct.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Ms Gavin 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 evidence of full insight and remorse, 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 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments: "The panel considered that Ms Gavin had demonstrated remorse and some understanding of the seriousness of her conduct. It also considered that she has the capacity to reflect on and further learn from her actions during a review period. The panel concluded that a review period of two years would provide Ms Gavin with sufficient time to reflect, undertake and evidence remediation, insight, and a reduced risk of repetition."

I have considered whether 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. In this case, factors mean that I agree with the panel that allowing a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the

profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found as well as the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse and the risk this creates of repetition.

**This means that Ms Charlotte Gavin is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 15 June 2028, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Ms Gavin remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Charlotte Gavin has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she 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: 8 June 2026**

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