



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Shatheia Zamzami: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

March 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
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: Ms Shatheia Zamzami

TRA reference: 21365

Date of determination: 20 March 2025

Former employer: Aysha Tuition Centre, Yorkshire (“ATC”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 19 March to 20 March by way of a virtual hearing to consider the case of Ms Zamzami.

The panel members were Mrs Emma Garrett (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Victoria Jackson (teacher panellist) and Mr Alan Wells (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Elizabeth Gilbert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Sherelle Appleby of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Ms Zamzami was present and was not represented.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 4 December 2024.

It was alleged that Ms Zamzami was guilty of having been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that on or around 5 January 2022 at the South Yorkshire Magistrates Court;

1. Ms Zamzami was convicted of conducting an independent education institution that was not registered between/around 6 September 2020 – 22 May 2021.

Ms Zamzami admitted the facts of allegation 1 but maintained that she had limited responsibility as to the status of ATC as an unregistered education institution. Ms Zamzami also admitted that her conviction amounted to a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

The panel considered the following preliminary applications:

Application to exclude the public from the hearing

The panel considered an application from Ms Zamzami to exclude the public from the hearing.

Ms Zamzami stated that she had [REDACTED] as a result of the allegation against her and that a public hearing would cause her further [REDACTED]. Ms Zamzami also submitted that she would be providing evidence in relation to her [REDACTED] which should remain confidential. Ms Zamzami further stated that a public hearing would likely impact on her ability to effectively provide her oral evidence at the hearing.

The panel heard submissions from the presenting officer who objected to the application to exclude the public from all of the hearing. The presenting officer submitted that she did not dispute that matters relating to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED] could be heard in private but not all matters to be heard would relate to this.

The panel considered whether to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11 of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012 (the "Regulations") and paragraph 5.85 of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession May 2020 (the "Procedures") to exclude the public from the hearing.

The panel took into account the general rule that hearings should be held in public and that this is generally desirable to maintain public confidence in the administration of these proceedings and also to maintain confidence in the teaching profession. The panel noted there were concerns about confidential matters relating to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED]

being placed in the public domain. The panel balanced the reasons why Ms Zamzami had requested that the public be excluded against the competing reasons for which a public hearing is required.

The panel noted that any departure from the general rule had to be no greater than the extent reasonably necessary and that interference for a limited period of the hearing was preferable to a permanent exclusion of the public. The panel therefore considered whether there were any steps short of excluding the public from all of the hearing that would serve the purpose of protecting the confidentiality of matters relating to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED] and would facilitate her participation in the proceedings.

The panel acknowledged that there were several references made to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED] in her own written statement. However, the panel was not provided with any further evidence to corroborate Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED], such as a [REDACTED].

The panel also noted that the TRA's case did not rely on anything related to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED].

On this occasion, the panel considered that it was reasonable for the public to be excluded from part of the hearing given the concerns about confidential matters relating to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED] being placed in the public domain. The panel did not consider that there were any steps short of excluding the public that would serve the purpose of protecting the confidentiality of matters relating to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED]. However, the panel found the request for the public to be excluded from all of the hearing was not justified and went beyond the extent reasonably necessary to protect Ms Zamzami's confidential [REDACTED] information. The panel noted it was experienced in dealing with the practicalities of having part of the hearing in private and that this would facilitate Ms Zamzami's effective participation in the hearing.

For the above reasons, the panel denied the application for the public to be excluded from all of the hearing, but agreed to matters relating to Ms Zamzami's [REDACTED] to be heard in private.

Application to admit late evidence

The presenting officer applied to admit a document not served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.36 of the Procedures. Similarly, Ms Zamzami applied to admit a document not submitted in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.37 of the Procedures.

As such, the panel was required to decide whether the documents should be admitted under paragraph 5.34 of the Procedures at the discretion of the panel.

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

The panel took into account the representations from the presenting officer and Ms Zamzami as to the admission of the documents.

In respect of the presenting officer's application, the presenting officer submitted that the wrong document had been inserted into the bundle where the memorandum of conviction document should have been. The presenting officer noted that, whilst the memorandum of conviction document was not included in the served bundle, Ms Zamzami had previously had sight of this document as it was enclosed with the Notice of Hearing dated 4 December 2024.

The panel considered an email chain between the presenting officer and Ms Zamzami dated 12 March 2025. The panel noted the presenting officer informed Ms Zamzami of the incorrect document and asked whether she was content for the presenting officer to apply for the memorandum of conviction to be admitted as evidence. Ms Zamzami subsequently confirmed the same day that she was happy for the memorandum of conviction to be viewed by the panel. Ms Zamzami also submitted at the hearing that she did not object to the admission of the memorandum of conviction.

The panel was satisfied that the memorandum of conviction was relevant to the case as it was evidence of Ms Zamzami's conviction as set out at allegation 1.

In respect of Ms Zamzami's application, she submitted that she had failed to submit a letter written by a consultant which outlined information relating to her duties at ATC. Ms Zamzami stated that this was inadvertently not provided to the presenting officer as evidence although this had been prepared on 3 March 2025 as shown by the date of the letter.

The presenting officer remained neutral on the admissibility of the letter, albeit the presenting officer stated that the letter was clearly relevant to the case.

The panel was satisfied that the letter referred to by Ms Zamzami was relevant to the case as it was context as to Ms Zamzami's role at ATC at the time of her offence as set out at allegation 1.

With regard to the overall question of fairness, the panel noted that the memorandum of conviction was not included in the bundle due to an admin error but was always intended to form part of the TRA's evidence as this document had previously been included as evidence with the Notice of Hearing. The panel noted that the presenting officer informed Ms Zamzami as soon as the admin error came to her attention and that Ms Zamzami had no objections to the document being adduced as evidence. The panel also noted that Ms Zamzami had admitted her conviction of the offence in any case. Similarly, the panel noted that it was fair for Ms Zamzami to provide the panel with context as to her role

within ATC at the relevant time and the TRA would not suffer any prejudice as a result of its admission.

By reason of the above, the panel decided to admit the memorandum of conviction and the letter. The memorandum of conviction was paginated as pages 88a to 88b and the letter was paginated as pages 124 to 126.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of Hearing – pages 4 to 15

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 17 to 72

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 74 to 88

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 90 to 123

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Memorandum of conviction – pages 88a to 88b
- Letter from consultant – pages 124 to 126

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 also had regard to the Procedures.

Witnesses

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

- Witness A ([REDACTED])

Ms Zamzami also gave oral evidence and called the following witness to give evidence in respect of her character:

- Witness B ([REDACTED])

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows.

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

Ms Zamzami was employed as a maths teacher at Oak Tree High School from 2019 to 2020.

Oak Tree High School was removed from the register of independent schools and closed on 22 July 2020.

Ms Zamzami was employed as a teacher and centre manager of ATC from September 2020 to May 2021.

Ofsted referred Ms Zamzami to the TRA on 15 May 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. You were convicted of conducting an independent education institution that was not registered between/around 6 September 2020 – 22 May 2021.

Ms Zamzami admitted having been convicted of the offence but maintained that she had limited responsibility as to the status of ATC as an unregistered education institution.

The panel considered Witness A's oral and written evidence which stated that site inspections under section 97 of the Education and Skills Act 2008 were undertaken by Ofsted at ATC on 23 March 2021, 19 May 2020¹ and 20 May 2021. On each occasion, warning notices were provided in respect of ATC being conducted as an unregistered education institution. Witness A further stated that Ms Zamzami was thereafter charged with an offence in relation to the information he obtained during the site inspections.

The panel was presented with a memorandum of conviction from South Yorkshire Magistrates Court, confirming that Ms Zamzami was convicted on 5 January 2022 of the offence particularised in this allegation. Ms Zamzami was sentenced to carry out 80 hours of unpaid work, pay surcharge to fund victim services of £95 and to pay costs of £150 to the Crown Prosecution Service.

The panel acknowledged that Ms Zamzami maintained her lack of responsibility regarding the behaviour outlined in the offence, despite her guilty plea and conviction.

However, the panel accepted the memorandum of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of this offence by Ms Zamzami.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

Findings as to a conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Ms Zamzami, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Zamzami was in breach of the following standard:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by not undermining...the rule of law.

The panel noted that Ms Zamzami's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting as the pupils at ATC were receiving their education without the quality of their education or the suitability of the staff being regulated.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils, as the welfare, health and safety of pupils at ATC was not properly regulated.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Zamzami's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel determined that the public would be concerned about a teacher conducting an unregistered educational institution.

The panel noted that a conviction for any offence that led to a term of imprisonment is likely to be considered "a relevant offence", but that such a sentence had not been imposed on Ms Zamzami.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. Whilst the offence did not involve any of behaviours listed, the panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other offences that panels consider to be "a relevant offence". The panel considered that an offence relating to the regulation of an education institution was a pertinent one.

The panel noted Ms Zamzami's mitigating circumstances, being that she stated in her oral evidence that she was inexperienced and did not have full responsibility for the conduct of ATC. Ms Zamzami stated in her oral evidence that she was assured by the trustees of ATC that it would take steps to resolve the registration issue following the first Ofsted warning and that she relied on this in good faith.

The panel acknowledged that Ms Zamzami was a newly qualified teacher at the time of the offence with limited experience, meaning that she likely committed the offence due to her naivety rather than for any deliberate reason. The panel acknowledged that Ms Zamzami did not set up ATC or have any legal responsibility for its operation. Notwithstanding this, the panel placed weight on the fact that Ms Zamzami continued in her role at ATC despite receiving three separate warnings provided by Ofsted as to the likely offence that was being committed. To that end, the panel relied on the oral and written evidence of Witness A as to the three warnings provided.

The panel noted Ms Zamzami's personal commitment to her community which shone through in her oral and written evidence, as she stated in her written statement that her "focus has always been the desire to help and support the children/community to gain valuable education and become productive members of society". In particular, Ms Zamzami noted that following the closure of ATC, many of the girls would remain at home without any intention to seek alternative education and so she dedicated "many hours over the final weeks" of ATC being open to communicate with parents to persuade them to provide adequate education to their daughters. Whilst the panel recognised Ms Zamzami's commitment, the panel was not satisfied that this had a material impact on the relevance of the offence to teaching.

Although the panel found that evidence of Ms Zamzami's commitment to her community was of note, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Ms Zamzami's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of 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;
- the protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the findings that a number of pupils were receiving their education at an unregistered institution.

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

The panel was of the view that a public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as Ms Zamzami's offence 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 Zamzami in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator, and she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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 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 Zamzami.

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;

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; and
violation of the rights of pupils.

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.

Based on the evidence available, the panel found that Ms Zamzami’s actions were not deliberate as her actions were more likely due to her naivety as an inexperienced teacher. The panel noted there was no evidence to suggest that Ms Zamzami was acting under extreme duress or significant intimidation.

The panel saw no evidence of exceptionally high standards being demonstrated in her professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel accepted that the incident was out of character and relied on the following seven statements provided regarding Ms Zamzami’s character:

Witness B ([REDACTED]) [REDACTED], stated that Ms Zamzami had been able to bring out a “self-belief” in her son which her and other teachers had struggled to do and in her oral evidence stated that Ms Zamzami would be an asset to the teaching profession;

Person A ([REDACTED]) an ex-colleague of Ms Zamzami [REDACTED], stated that she is an “honest, resolute, and a conscientious individual” who “was, without question, instrumental in helping to change the attitudes and mindsets of the children and their families for the better”;

Person B ([REDACTED]) an individual that has worked with Ms Zamzami [REDACTED], stated that she has “unquestionable integrity” and “is a reliable and committed individual with high work and moral values” and “her enthusiasm for her role is contagious, and she serves as an outstanding role model for both the children and staff alike”;

Person C ([REDACTED]) an individual with 53 years teaching experience who has worked with Ms Zamzami [REDACTED] stated she was “confident in her skills and abilities as a teacher” and is “keen to act as a positive role model”;

Person D ([REDACTED]) an ex-colleague of Ms Zamzami with 25+ years of teaching experience, stated that Ms Zamzami is “the very model of probity in a responsible role, passionate, committed, and an advocate of the highest possible standards, and a role model of exemplary ethical standards”. Additionally, Person D stated that he “would have no hesitation in working with, employing, and recommending Ms Zamzami in any role involving teaching, training or young person advocacy”;

Person E ([REDACTED]) an individual with a personal connection to Ms Zamzami and through their mutual involvement in community-based work, stated that she is a respected woman in the community known for her “honesty, reliability and hard work” and she was “deeply committed to voluntary work because she recognised the additional value her skills could bring to communities”; and

Person F ([REDACTED]) an individual with a personal connection to Ms Zamzami over the last 20 years and through their mutual volunteer work, stated that Ms Zamzami is known as a “reliable, responsible, and dependable individual, who demonstrates her compassion whenever she comes across any worthwhile charitable events” and she “has a positive and optimistic outlook in life and is a very approachable and friendly person”.

In relation to the above, the panel placed particular weight on the character reference provided by Witness B as she also outlined her position in oral evidence regarding Ms Zamzami’s good character and ability to be a good teacher in the future. Additionally, the panel placed weight on the statements provided by Person C and Person D as they were very experienced teachers and attested to Ms Zamzami’s suitability as a teacher.

In relation to Ms Zamzami’s character, the panel also acknowledged Ms Zamzami’s written evidence referred to the significant personal circumstances which she overcame in order to qualify as a teacher, which demonstrated her determination and commitment to teaching.

The panel also noted the following statements provided in relation to Ms Zamzami’s role at ATC:

Person G ([REDACTED]) an individual who worked with Ms Zamzami at ATC stated that the title of ‘manager’ was given” to Ms Zamzami “purely for the benefit of the community and parents, which would allow them to communicate more openly, with her”; and

Ms Zamzami stated in her written statement that she was “clearly told that legal advice/guidance had been obtained prior to the opening of the centre, and that they were following this legal guidance from their legal representative”. She further stated that she “had no reason to doubt that they would not conduct the correct procedures, preparation, registration, or requirements needed for the centre, especially because they knew Ofsted would be checking”.

The panel noted that Ms Zamzami demonstrated insight into the wrongfulness of her actions as she stated in her oral evidence that she now realises the impact of her failure to ensure that ATC was complying with the law. Ms Zamzami outlined in her written statement that she “sincerely and wholeheartedly” apologised for placing herself in “a precarious position”. Ms Zamzami further stated that “with the benefit of hindsight” she “unknowingly put the teaching profession in disrepute”.

The panel considered that Ms Zamzami regretted her actions as she stated in her written statement that this “has been a very bitter and harsh lesson to learn” and “a lesson that

[she] never wish[ed] to experience again". This position was corroborated by Witness B in her written statement as she stated she "saw genuine regret and remorse in Ms Zamzami but also a determination to work hard and make amends to show that she is worthy of being called a teacher".

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the contribution that Ms Zamzami is able to make in the profession going forwards and the extent of Ms Zamzami's insight and remorse indicating a low risk of repetition, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Zamzami should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of a relevant conviction should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Zamzami 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...the rule of law.

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Zamzami fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include conducting an independent education institution that was not registered.

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 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 Zamzami 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "There was a public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the findings that a number of pupils were receiving their education at an unregistered institution." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel noted that Ms Zamzami demonstrated insight into the wrongfulness of her actions as she stated in her oral evidence that she now realises the impact of her failure to ensure that ATC was complying with the law. Ms Zamzami outlined in her written statement that she "sincerely and wholeheartedly" apologised for placing herself in "a precarious position". Ms Zamzami further stated that "with the benefit of hindsight" she "unknowingly put the teaching profession in disrepute". 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, "The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Zamzami's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel determined that the public would be concerned about a teacher conducting an unregistered educational institution." I am particularly mindful of the finding of conducting an unregistered education establishment 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 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 Zamzami herself and the panel comment “the panel placed particular weight on the character reference provided by Witness B as she also outlined her position in oral evidence regarding Ms Zamzami’s good character and ability to be a good teacher in the future. Additionally, the panel placed weight on the statements provided by Person C and Person D as they were very experienced teachers and attested to Ms Zamzami’s suitability as a teacher.”

“In relation to Ms Zamzami’s character, the panel also acknowledged Ms Zamzami’s written evidence referred to the significant personal circumstances which she overcame in order to qualify as a teacher, which demonstrated her determination and commitment to teaching.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Zamzami 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 level of insight and remorse shown. The panel has said, “The panel considered that Ms Zamzami regretted her actions as she stated in her written statement that this “has been a very bitter and harsh lesson to learn” and “a lesson that [she] never wish[ed] to experience again”. This position was corroborated by Witness B in her written statement as she stated she “saw genuine regret and remorse in Ms Zamzami but also a determination to work hard and make amends to show that she is worthy of being called a teacher.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “having considered the contribution that Ms Zamzami is able to make in the profession going forwards and the extent of Ms Zamzami’s insight and remorse indicating a low risk of repetition, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case.”

I have given weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Zamzami has made and is able to make to the profession in the future.

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey'.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 24 March 2025

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