



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Charles Richard Miles: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mr Charles Richard Miles

Teacher ref number: 8360486

Teacher date of birth: 18 September 1961

TRA reference: 25732

Date of determination: 6 August 2026

Former employer: Dwight School, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 August 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Charles Richard Miles.

The panel members were Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Adam Michie-Carr (teacher panellist) and Mr Philip Jolowicz (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Madison Taylor of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

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

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 20 May 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Miles was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a Teacher at Dwight School London:

1. On one or more occasions prior to 8 November 2024, he consumed a controlled drug of Class A, namely Crystal Methamphetamine.

Mr Miles admitted the facts of the allegation and further admitted that those admitted facts amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 13 December 2025 and further in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Mr Miles on 24 February 2026.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section A: Statement of agreed facts – pages 2 to 3;

Section B: Notice of proceedings – pages 4 to 12;

Section C: TRA documents – pages 13 to 132; and,

Section D: Presenting officer representations – pages 133 to 134.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing. The panel recognised that, by virtue of the proceedings being held by way of a meeting rather than a hearing, it would not have the opportunity to hear from live witnesses. As a result, it was alert to the fact that witness evidence within the bundle would constitute hearsay evidence, and the panel resolved to approach evidence of that type with appropriate caution assessing its weight carefully in each case.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a Statement of Agreed Facts which was signed by Mr Miles on 24 February 2026 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 25 February 2026.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Mr Miles commenced employment at Dwight School London ("the School") on 4 July 1985 as a primary school teacher.

On 8 November 2024, an allegation was received by the Local Authority Designated Officer ("LADO") in Barnet from the Safeguarding Adults Team of London Borough of Hackney. It was reported that Mr Miles was suffering from [REDACTED] due to Crystal Methylamphetamine usage on weekends. It was made clear there was no report of any harm towards any children.

A review of the LADO referral was conducted by the School, and a follow up meeting was held on the 20 January 2025 between Mr Miles, Individual A, and Individual B. It was accepted that Mr Miles was not in a fit state to carry out professional teaching duties safely due to issues related to drug use [REDACTED].

On 18 April 2025, the School received notice via text messages to Individual A of Mr Miles' intention to retire.

Subsequently, on 19 May 2025, the School sent a letter of acknowledgement in respect of Mr Miles' intention to retire and end his employment at the School, at the end of the school year.

On 23 June 2025, the School referred the matter to the TRA.

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:

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher at Dwight School London:

- 1. On one or more occasions prior to 8 November 2024 you consumed a controlled drug of Class A, namely Crystal Methamphetamine.**

The panel considered whether the TRA had proved, on the balance of probabilities, the allegation.

The panel recognised that Mr Miles had expressly admitted the factual aspects of the allegation. In his response to the Notice of Referral Form dated 13 December 2025 and in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed on 24 February 2026, Mr Miles admitted the substance of the allegation. Whilst those admissions were highly persuasive, the panel noted it was appropriate to proceed to make its own determination on the evidence before it.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Miles was employed as a teacher at Dwight School London during the relevant period. There was no dispute that Mr Miles had worked at the School since 4 July 1985, and the evidence confirmed that Mr Miles had worked as an EAL (English as an Additional Language) and Learning Support Teacher. The panel therefore found that the allegation related to conduct occurring whilst Mr Miles was working as a teacher in accordance with the Teacher's Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012.

The panel then considered the evidence relating to Mr Miles' use of crystal methamphetamine.

The panel considered the case summary report prepared by Barnet LADO which had been prepared following a referral on 8 November 2024 from the Safeguarding Adults Team of the London Borough of Hackney. That document recorded information arising from a police attendance at Mr Miles' home after he had reported concerns about "*water bulging*" in his flat. The report stated that it "*became clear that he [...] smokes crystal meth*" and referred to Mr Miles being "*impacted by ongoing class A drug use*".

The panel recognised that while the case summary report was not a direct eyewitness account of drug consumption, it recorded information obtained during safeguarding enquiries and indicated both use of crystal methamphetamine and concerns that such use was ongoing. The panel recognised the timing of this referral being made on 8 November 2024 necessarily indicated the alleged crystal methamphetamine usage as having taken place before that date.

The panel had sight of the notes of an informal capability meeting held with the School on 20 January 2025. During that meeting, Mr Miles discussed concerns regarding his wellbeing and substance use. The notes recorded Mr Miles saying: *"They're concerned about that crystal meth use but as I am trying to explain I am not addicted to it"*.

The notes further recorded Mr Miles description of his use of crystal methamphetamine as something he undertook to *"relax"*, and stating with respect to his use of the substance: *"I'm pretty controlled"*.

The panel considered these comments to be a clear acknowledgement by Mr Miles that he used crystal methamphetamine. Although he denied addiction, he did not deny consumption of the drug itself. Rather, his comments amounted to an admission of use.

The panel also considered correspondence from the School to Mr Miles dated 7 May 2025 concerning the allegation and steps being taken by the School. The letter referred expressly to *"Crystal Meth usage on weekends"*.

The panel found that this contemporaneous reference provided further support for the conclusion that concerns regarding crystal methamphetamine use had been identified and communicated to Mr Miles.

The panel noted that the allegation required proof of consumption of the relevant substance on *"one or more occasions"* and recognised that it was only required to establish a singular use of the substance in order to find the allegation proved. The panel was satisfied that such a finding had been made, and in fact the evidence went beyond proof of a single instance. References to *"usage on weekends"*, Mr Miles' own description of his crystal methylamphetamine usage, and the LADO's description of *"ongoing class A drug use"* all indicated repeated, rather than isolated, consumption.

The panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Miles consumed a Class A controlled drug, namely crystal methylamphetamine, on one or more occasions prior to 8 November 2024 whilst working as a teacher at Dwight School London.

Accordingly, the panel found the facts of the allegation proved.

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

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of that proved allegation 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 (2022), which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Miles, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Miles 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 recognised that the proven illegal drug use occurred outside school premises and outside working hours. However, applying the principles set out in *Beckwith v SRA [2020 EWHC 3231 (Admin)]*, the panel concluded that the conduct could not properly be viewed in isolation from its impact upon Mr Miles’ professional role. The evidence demonstrated concerns regarding Mr Miles’ presentation, wellbeing and professional functioning whilst at work. The panel concluded that his conduct as proven had a direct bearing upon his professional role and his ability to discharge his responsibilities as a teacher. The evidence before the panel demonstrated a clear connection between Mr Miles’ drug use and concerns regarding his fitness to teach and safeguard pupils.

The panel noted the evidence contained within the Barnet LADO case summary and the School’s safeguarding records. Those records referred to Mr Miles being “*impacted by ongoing class A drug use*” and recorded that concerns regarding his wellbeing had resulted in a risk assessment being undertaken by the School. The panel also noted evidence that senior leaders considered Mr Miles’ presentation and behaviour gave rise to safeguarding concerns and concerns regarding his ability to perform his teaching duties safely. An example of this was on 5 November 2024, when Mr Miles was “*asked to leave school and [REDACTED]*”.

The panel acknowledged that there was no evidence before it that any pupil suffered actual harm as a result of Mr Miles’ conduct. However, the panel considered that actual harm to a pupil was not required in order for safeguarding concerns to arise. The

evidence demonstrated that the School identified a “*high risk*” and found it necessary to undertake safeguarding and risk-management measures, and the panel were particularly mindful of Mr Miles’ role as an EAL and Learning Support Teacher of primary school children, where pupils may require a heightened level of engagement, responsiveness and professional judgement.

The panel had sight of the School's Employee Handbook, which set out that staff were required to “*maintain reasonable standards in their own behaviour to enable them to maintain an effective learning environment and also to uphold public trust and confidence*”. The Employee Handbook also specifically addressed substance-related concerns and reminded staff that they “*need to take a view about whether social activities undertaken in their own time could be detrimental to their professional role*”. The panel therefore considered that the findings it had made indicated that Mr Miles had acted in breach of the School’s ethos, policies and procedures.

The panel considered whether Mr Miles’ conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of “*possession (including for personal use) [...] of any class A drug*” was relevant.

The panel had regard to the Keeping Children Safe in Education document which was in effect at the relevant time. It considered the following excerpts to be applicable: “*All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn*” and “*The Teachers’ Standards 2012 state that teachers (which includes headteachers) should safeguard children’s wellbeing and maintain public trust in the teaching profession as part of their professional duties*”.

For these reasons, the panel found that the conduct of Mr Miles amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

In relation to whether Mr Miles’ actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role

that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Miles' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. The Advice provides that where a teacher is found to have displayed behaviours associated with one of the listed offence types, even in the absence of a criminal conviction, a panel is likely to conclude that such behaviour amounts to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Miles was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of "*possession (including for personal use) [...] of any class A drugs*" was relevant.

The panel recognised that the conduct had occurred outside the education setting. However, the nature and seriousness of the conduct meant that Mr Miles' ability to provide pupils with a safe learning environment was seriously compromised. This was capable of undermining public confidence in both Mr Miles and the teaching profession more generally.

The panel considered how an informed member of the public would view the conduct. It concluded that members of the public would expect teachers, particularly those working with primary-aged and potentially vulnerable pupils, to maintain standards of behaviour consistent with the trust placed in them. The panel found that knowledge of a teacher engaging in the consumption of crystal methamphetamine would likely diminish public confidence in that teacher's suitability to fulfil such a role.

The panel recognised that its findings above involved use of a class A drug and that the conduct underpinning that finding had given rise to safeguarding concerns within the School. In the panel's judgment, such conduct had the clear potential to damage the public perception of teachers and the profession as a whole.

Therefore, the panel was satisfied the findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Miles' status as a teacher. The panel considered that Mr Miles' conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Miles' actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and, that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Miles, which involved unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct, given the serious findings of use of a class A drug.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Miles was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Miles in the profession. Whilst the panel recognised that Mr Miles had completed 40 years' service at the School with an apparently unblemished record, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Miles in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Miles.

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,
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk.

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 as set out in the Advice. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

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

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

There was no evidence that Mr Miles demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had not been presented with evidence to demonstrate the incident was out of character.

In respect of Mr Miles' insight and remorse regarding the conduct, the panel considered it had only limited evidence available to consider. The panel had had sight of evidence in the bundle that Mr Miles' view had been that his drug use was a private matter, separate from his professional engagement as a teacher. The panel considered this demonstrated limited insight and/or remorse.

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

The panel considered the risk of repetition by Mr Miles. It had not seen any evidence in relation to action having been taken to address the conduct, such as treatment for, or

abstinence from, drug use. In the absence of such evidence, the panel was unable to conclude that the risk of repetition of such behaviours had been reduced.

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 Miles of prohibition.

The panel considered that members of the public would expect consequences to follow where a teacher has engaged in use of a class A drug and where that conduct had the potential to affect the teacher's ability to safely and effectively to carry out their professional responsibilities. The panel was satisfied that a prohibition order was necessary in order to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct.

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 two 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.

This included possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug, which was plainly relevant in this case.

The panel concluded that a longer review period would allow sufficient time for Mr Miles [REDACTED], and the development of genuine insight into the seriousness of his misconduct and its potential impact upon pupils, colleagues, the School and the wider profession.

The panel considered that a five-year review period would strike the appropriate balance. It would provide Mr Miles with a realistic opportunity to undertake any [REDACTED], whilst properly reflecting the seriousness of the misconduct and maintaining public confidence in the profession.

Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect, with provisions for a review period of five 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 the allegation 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 Richard Miles should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of Class A drug use by a teacher.

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 Miles, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed,

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Miles, which involved unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct, given the serious findings of use of a class A drug.”

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, *“In respect of Mr Miles’ insight and remorse regarding the conduct, the panel considered it had only limited evidence available to consider. The panel had had sight of evidence in the bundle that Mr Miles’ view had been that his drug use was a private matter, separate from his professional engagement as a teacher. The panel considered this demonstrated limited insight and/or remorse.”*

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *“...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Miles were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”*

I am particularly mindful of the finding of the use of Class A drugs in this case, and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Miles himself. The panel comment *“There was no evidence that Mr Miles demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had not been presented with evidence to demonstrate the incident was out of character.”*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Miles from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the risk of repetition. The panel has said, *“It had not seen any evidence in relation to action having been taken to address the conduct, such as treatment for, or abstinence from, drug use. In the absence of such evidence, the panel was unable to conclude that the risk of repetition of such behaviours had been reduced.”*

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Miles 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 remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a five-year review period.

The panel has identified that *“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.*

This included possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug, which was plainly relevant in this case.”

I have considered the panel’s comments *“...that a longer review period would allow sufficient time for Mr Miles [REDACTED], and the development of genuine insight into the seriousness of his misconduct and its potential impact upon pupils, colleagues, the School and the wider profession.”*

The panel has also said that a five-year review period would “...*strike the appropriate balance. It would provide Mr Miles with a realistic opportunity to undertake any [REDACTED], whilst properly reflecting the seriousness of the misconduct and maintaining public confidence in the profession.*”

The Advice sets out that a review period may not be less than two years I have first considered whether a two-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct and the limited insight and remorse shown by Mr Miles.

I agree with the panel that a five-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Charles Richard Miles 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 14 August 2031, five 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 Miles remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Miles has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 11 August 2026

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