



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Bianca Beaudoin: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome**

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

**November 2024**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	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	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

**Teacher:** Ms Bianca Beaudoin

**Teacher ref number:** 3844138

**Teacher date of birth:** 29 November 1981

**TRA reference:** 18909

**Date of determination:** 22 November 2024

**Former employer:** Withernsea High School, Near Hull

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 21 and 22 November by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Bianca Beaudoin.

The panel members were Ms Jasmin Choudhury (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Maxine Cole (lay panellist) and Ms Gill Lyon (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Ben Schofield of Blake Morgan LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Kiera Riddy of Browne Jacobson LLP.

Ms Beaudoin 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 28 August 2024.

It was alleged that Ms Beaudoin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed:

1. During the 2018/19 academic year, in respect of the VTCT qualification examination(s), she amended the work of one or more pupils work;
2. Her conduct as may be found proven at 1 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest, in that she;
  - a. made amendments when she knew or should have known that this constituted an improper level of assistance;
  - b. amended the work intending to submit it as the pupils' own work and/or to secure a mark/grade which was higher than the pupil would have achieved for their own work.

## Preliminary applications

### Application to proceed in the absence of Ms Beaudoin

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Ms Beaudoin.

The panel accepted the legal advice provided in relation to this application and took account of the various factors referred to it, as derived from the guidance set down in the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1 (as considered and applied in subsequent cases, particularly *GMC v Adeogba*; *GMC v Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162).

Before the panel was a copy of the Notice dated 28 August 2024, along with a Royal Mail Special Delivery tracking ticket, setting out proof of delivery to Ms Beaudoin's address on 30 August 2024. This included an image of the package and the signature of the recipient at the address.

The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings ("the Notice") had been sent in accordance with Rules 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession 2018 ("the Procedures") and that the requirements for service had been satisfied.

Also before the panel was a number of other communications sent to Ms Beaudoin, including letters sent by recorded delivery. The presenting officer submitted to the panel

that Ms Beaudoin had not engaged in any of the TRA's processes including its investigation and preparations for this hearing.

The panel was satisfied that proactive and persistent efforts had been made to bring the hearing to Ms Beaudoin's attention.

The panel went on to consider whether to proceed in Ms Beaudoin's absence or to adjourn, in accordance with Rule 4.29 of the Procedures.

The panel had regard to the fact that its discretion to continue in the absence of a teacher should be exercised with great caution and with close regard to the overall fairness of the proceedings. The panel gave careful consideration to the fact that Ms Beaudoin is not in attendance and will not be represented at this hearing, should it proceed, and the extent of the disadvantage to her as a consequence.

On balance, the panel decided that the hearing should continue in the absence of Ms Beaudoin for the following reasons:

- Ms Beaudoin had not sought an adjournment and there was no medical evidence before the panel which indicated that Ms Beaudoin was unfit to attend the hearing due to ill-health.
- The panel was satisfied that Ms Beaudoin's absence was voluntary and she had waived her right to attend.
- Given Ms Beaudoin's non-engagement, there was no indication that she might attend at a future date such that no purpose would be served by an adjournment.
- There is a public interest in hearings taking place within a reasonable time.
- There is a burden on all professionals who are subject to a regulatory regime to engage with their regulator.
- There is a witness present to give evidence to the panel who would be significantly inconvenienced were the hearing to be adjourned.

Having decided that it is appropriate to proceed, the panel were mindful to ensure that the proceedings were as fair as possible in the circumstances, bearing in mind that Ms Beaudoin was not present nor represented.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 7 to 8

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 39

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 40 to 124

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 125 to 440

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 document Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession 2018, (the “Procedures”).

## **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A who was called by the TRA. No witnesses were called by the teacher.

## **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 Beaudoin was employed by Withernsea High School (the “School”) from November 2016 as a teacher in the hairdressing section of the School’s Hair and Beauty Department. Ms Beaudoin did not hold ‘qualified teacher status’, she was employed by the School as an unqualified teacher and instructor. Ms Beaudoin was also a qualified assessor for City and Guilds and taught the VTCT Level 2 VRQ Hair and Beauty Course to pupils in Year 9 to Year 13.

Following a concern being raised about potential assessment malpractice being raised by a colleague on 26 March 2019, the School undertook an investigation, in line with the School’s local authority processes. Following the conclusion of the Local Authority’s disciplinary process, they made a referral to the TRA on 12 November 2019, which has resulted in this hearing.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

**1. During the 2018/19 academic year, in respect of the VTCT qualification examination(s), you amended the work of one or more pupils work;**

## **Evidence of Witness A**

Witness A gave evidence before the panel at the hearing. Witness A's evidence was that he is the [REDACTED] at the School and had been appointed to that position in September 2018. Previously to that, he had been in the School's senior leadership team since 2006.

On the morning of 27 March 2019, Witness A explained that he met with Person A, who had contacted him to talk about an issue. Person A explained that another teacher (Witness B) had approached him the previous day with a concern that Ms Beaudoin was seen editing pupils' assessment work the day before.

An investigation was undertaken. The pupils' work which had been electronically submitted to Ms Beaudoin, could no longer be accessed by those pupils once submitted to her. The versions of the pupils' work found on Ms Beaudoin's account were checked. It showed Ms Beaudoin was recorded as the last user to save the pupils' documents and the dates and times were consistent with what Witness B and Person B had reported. Additionally, the versions of work the pupils originally submitted was also separately recovered from the pupils' own accounts.

During the investigation these two versions were compared and a number of significant differences were noted between them. As part of the investigation it was found that four pupils' work had been edited post submission. These four pupils were ones that had previously failed the assessment and this work was their second attempt at the assessment.

Ms Beaudoin was interviewed during the investigation by Witness A. Her explanation was that she accepted making the amendments to the pupils' work. However, there were still 12 days until the submission deadline at that point (on 26 March), and it was her intention to go back to the pupils to help them consider revisions to their work prior to the final submission date. Ms Beaudoin further explained she was going to use her amended versions as examples to show the pupils.

## **Evidence of Witness B**

In a previous case management hearing, the panel granted an application by the TRA to adduce the evidence of Witness B as hearsay evidence.

Witness B had provided a statement to the TRA. In that statement she explained that she was a [REDACTED] at the School since 2010. [REDACTED].

She stated that on 26 March 2019, she was walking down the corridor and as she was passing the salon, she looked through a glass window on the door. Inside, she saw the pupils for that lesson and that they were not undertaking any work. She could also see Ms Beaudoin sat at the computer and on the screen she could see her editing a pupil's

PowerPoint slide for an upcoming assessment. Witness B stated she was able to recognise it as a pupil's piece of work because she could see the pupil's name, and knew it was work from a particular assignment on the slide.

Immediately following this, she went to report the issue to the Head of House, but they were not in the office. The nearest office was Person B's who she went to speak to about it. Person B was able to remotely access Ms Beaudoin's computer and was able to further see the work she was undertaking on the pupil's slides, which was recorded on video using a mobile phone. Following this discovery, Person B reported the issue to Person A [REDACTED], and line manager for the hair and beauty department.

### **Other evidence**

Before the panel were copies of the pupils' original versions of the slides and the versions that Ms Beaudoin had amended. A transcript from the hearing in the disciplinary proceedings in which Ms Beaudoin's account was given was also available to the panel.

### **Panel findings**

The panel noted that much of the significant evidence before it was hearsay evidence and Witness A himself was not a direct witness to the material events. Importantly, the panel noted that Ms Beaudoin had consistently accepted that she did make the amendments in question to the pupils' work. There was therefore no dispute as to the material facts and on that basis, the panel was prepared to place significant weight on this consistent hearsay evidence.

The panel itself reviewed the individual slides and compared the changes that Ms Beaudoin had made. Whilst some edits were very minor in nature, such as correcting capitalisation and removing slide backgrounds, there were also other more significant edits made to the contents of the slides. These included amendments to the substantive text, such as adding entirely new sentences, some of which introduced a more technical use of language and sophisticated vocabulary. In one instance, an entirely new slide with new content was added to a pupil's work.

Taking this evidence into account, the panel was satisfied that on the balance of probabilities, Ms Beaudoin had amended the work of four pupils who were on the relevant course. Therefore the panel found this allegation proved.

## **2. Your conduct as may be found proven at 1 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest, in that you;**

- a. made amendments when you knew or should have known that this constituted an improper level of assistance;**



**b. amended the work intending to submit it as the pupils' own work and/or to secure a mark/grade which was higher than the pupil would have achieved for their own work.**

In regard to assessing the question of dishonesty, the panel firstly considered Ms Beaudoin's state of mind.

The panel took into account that although Ms Beaudoin did not hold qualified teacher status, she was a qualified assessor. Although no evidence of her assessor qualification was presented to the panel, it considered it was inherently probable that Ms Beaudoin would have sufficient working knowledge around assessment regulations. Additionally, she had already been at the School for a number of years and would have gained an understanding of the assessment requirements and the School's policies around assessments. Throughout the disciplinary process, Ms Beaudoin herself recognised that her actions were, at the least, the wrong thing to do.

The panel also noted that Ms Beaudoin was aware that these four pupils had already failed the assessment once. In the disciplinary hearings, Ms Beaudoin explained that she just wanted to do the best for these pupils, in getting the best results they could.

The panel also took into account Ms Beaudoin's explanation that she was going to return to the pupils to help them with revised versions. The panel noted that there were only 12 days left at that time, before the submission deadline, and that there were no further lessons timetabled for these particular pupils, in which to provide such feedback. Also Ms Beaudoin was working part-time, so did not have 12 full days available to her to undertake these further sessions with the pupils. Furthermore, Ms Beaudoin had not in any way recorded the substantial changes she had made to each of the pupils' slides, nor marked them as feedback or amendments. Accordingly the panel considered this alternative explanation as lacking in credibility.

The panel was therefore satisfied that it was more likely than not that Ms Beaudoin's actions were done with an intention to make the pupils' work appear better than it was, when it was submitted as their own work.

The panel then considered if the ordinary decent person would consider such actions as dishonest. The panel concluded that any such person would recognise the behaviour for what it was – cheating the exam system and giving pupils an unnecessary and unfair advantage. Cheating is universally accepted as a form of dishonesty.

Accordingly, the panel found that Ms Beaudoin had acted dishonestly. Furthermore the panel recognised that a finding of dishonesty necessitated a finding of a lack of integrity and therefore the panel found this allegation proved in full.

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

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Beaudoin, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Beaudoin 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
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 also considered whether Ms Beaudoin’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed in 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 offences regarding ‘fraud or serious dishonesty’ was relevant.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Beaudoin amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. Dishonesty involving formal assessments is misconduct which is inherently serious. This could not be considered a momentary lapse as it involved a number of pupils and its potential impact could have been wide ranging.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Beaudoin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Beaudoin’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. The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

Whilst the panel recognised that Ms Beaudoin was simply trying to help the pupils and she had stated she wanted the best for them, it was plainly dishonest. Furthermore, such assistance was misplaced. Having work amended, which was not their own amendments, could have made things difficult for these pupils in the future, if they wanted to seek courses or positions that relied on these qualifications and they were not of the required standard.

The public place a significant amount of reliance on teachers to robustly manage exams and formal assessments. The trust placed in teachers' involvement with these important processes would be significantly eroded if such conduct was not considered serious and deplorable.

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

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

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

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Beaudoin, which involved serious assessment malpractice, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Beaudoin were

not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. Similarly, 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 Beaudoin was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 Beaudoin.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Ms Beaudoin. 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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (or deliberate collusion in or deliberate concealment of such action) particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment;

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. Taking into account the factors at page 18 of the Advice, the panel considered that Ms Beaudoin's actions were not inadvertent or done under duress.

The panel took into account that Ms Beaudoin did not have any previous findings against her and that she was an unqualified teacher. Unfortunately, in the absence of Ms Beaudoin's engagement in these proceedings, there was no other mitigating evidence presented to the panel or that was identifiable from the existing evidence.

Furthermore, as Ms Beaudoin had denied aspects of the allegations during the School's internal investigation, there was nothing in the evidence available which suggested to the panel that Ms Beaudoin had any remorse for her actions or had developed any insight

following the event. Accordingly the panel was not able to identify any evidence which would suggest that such a reoccurrence would not happen in the future.

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 Beaudoin 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 Beaudoin. The high standards that teachers must be held to regarding the administration of exams and formal assessments was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice also indicates that where a case involves certain other characteristics, it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. One of these include 'fraud or serious dishonesty'. The panel has taken into account the time it has taken to resolve these allegations, since the referral to the TRA in 2019. It considered that on the possible spectrum of dishonest behaviour, Ms Beaudoin's actions could fairly be considered as not at the top-end. For those reasons, the panel was satisfied that as a matter of proportionality, the wider public interest factors of maintaining public confidence, and upholding and declaring proper standards would still be achieved with a two year review period.

The panel therefore recommended that a prohibition order be imposed with a two year review period.

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

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Beaudoin 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
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 Ms Beaudoin fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of dishonest conduct in amending pupils' work in contravention of assessment requirements.

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 or 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 Ms Beaudoin, 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, “Having work amended, which was not their own amendments, could have made things difficult for these pupils in the future, if they wanted to seek courses or positions that relied on these qualifications and they were not of the required standard.” 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 commented that “...as Ms Beaudoin had denied aspects of the allegations during the School’s internal investigation, there was nothing in the evidence available which suggested to the panel that Ms Beaudoin had any remorse for her actions or had developed any insight following the event. Accordingly the panel was not able to identify any evidence which would suggest that such a reoccurrence would not happen in the future.” In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse 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 has observed, “The public place a significant amount of reliance on teachers to robustly manage exams and formal assessments. The trust placed in teachers’ involvement with these important processes would be significantly eroded if such conduct was not considered serious and deplorable.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty and assessment malpractice 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 or 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 Ms Beaudoin herself. The panel has commented that it “...took into account that Ms Beaudoin did not have any previous findings against her and that she was an unqualified teacher. Unfortunately, in the absence of Ms Beaudoin’s engagement in these proceedings, there was no other mitigating evidence presented to the panel or that was identifiable from the existing evidence.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Beaudoin 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 lack of evidence of insight or remorse. I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comment about the "...high standards that teachers must be held to regarding the administration of exams and formal assessments..."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Ms Beaudoin 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 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 that although the Advice indicates that in cases involving fraud or serious dishonesty it is likely the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period, it "...considered that on the possible spectrum of dishonest behaviour, Ms Beaudoin's actions could fairly be considered as not at the top-end." I have also taken account of the panel's comments about the lack of evidence of insight and remorse and the risk of reoccurrence.

In this case, I have agreed with the panel's recommendation and have decided that a 2-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings, provides sufficient time for Ms Beaudoin to demonstrate insight and remorse, and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Ms Bianca Beaudoin 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 02 December 2026, 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 Beaudoin remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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



Ms Beaudoin has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she given notice of this order.

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

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 25 November 2024**

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