



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Louisa Yakit: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**April 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	16
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	21

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Ms Louisa Yakit
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0666468
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	26 October 1981
<b>TRA reference:</b>	20999
<b>Date of determination:</b>	4 April 2025
<b>Former employer:</b>	Skidders' Kent Academy, Kent (the "School")

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 31 March 2025 to 4 April 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Yakit.

The panel members were Ms Mona Sood (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Aruna Sharma (teacher panellist) and Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Rosa Bennathan of 3 Raymond Building, who was instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP.

Ms Yakit was present and was represented by Ms Gurpreet Rheel of Cornwall Street Barristers.

The hearing took place in public, save for parts which were heard in private, and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 18 November 2024.

It was alleged that Ms Yakit was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher at the Skinners' Kent Academy:

1. In or around May 2022, Ms Yakit:
  - a) provided one or more pupils with improper assistance during their preparation time for the French GCSE speaking examinations in that Ms Yakit:
    - i) told them what they needed to write down and/or say; and/or
    - ii) provided them with written assistance and/or answers
  - b) provided one or more pupils with improper assistance during their French GCSE speaking examination in that Ms Yakit:
    - i) allowed pupils to see prepared answers and/or directed pupils to answers displayed on your computer screen; and/or
    - ii) held up prompts and/or mouthed answers to pupils
2. Ms Yakit's conduct at paragraphs 1ai and/or 1aii and/or 1bi and/or 1bii above was:
  - a) Dishonest; and/or
  - b) Demonstrated a lack of integrity

Ms Yakit admitted the facts of the allegations, save for allegation 2(a) which she took a neutral position on and therefore denied. Ms Yakit also admitted that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 8 to 11

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 12 to 20

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 21 to 46

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 47 to 539

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 540 to 584

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

## **Witnesses**

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

- Witness A: [REDACTED]; and
- Pupil 7 – former pupil at the School.

Ms Yakit also gave oral evidence and her representative called the following witnesses:

- Witness B: [REDACTED]; and
- Witness C: [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 Yakit was employed as the head of modern foreign languages at the School from 4 July 2016.

On 4 May 2022, the School was made aware of suspected malpractice in respect of Ms Yakit following a disclosure by a year 11 pupil to a member of staff.

An investigation was subsequently undertaken by the School which concluded on 27 May 2022.

The School made a referral to the TRA on 26 July 2022.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**1. In or around May 2022, you:**

- a) provided one or more pupils with improper assistance during their preparation time for the French GCSE speaking examinations in that you:**
  - i) told them what they needed to write down and/or say; and/or**
  - ii) provided them with written assistance and/or answers**

Ms Yakit admitted allegations 1(a)(i) and 1(a)(ii).

The panel considered exhibit 40 of Witness A's written statement, which was a document entitled 'AQA Instructions for the Conduct of Exams in Summer 2022 - GCSE Modern Foreign Languages'. The panel noted this document outlined the scope and requirements associated with the preparation time for a French GCSE speaking examination and noted the following statements in this regard:

- "It is a requirement of the specification that all candidates have exactly 12 minutes' preparation time and invigilation arrangements must be in place to facilitate this. If a student reaches the end of the 12 minutes' preparation time and the teacher-examiner is not ready to start the test, the student must be asked to stop their preparation by the invigilator, turn over their notes and cards so they are not visible and remain under supervision until the teacher-examiner is ready to start the test";
- "After the student has completed the 12 minutes' preparation period, he/she should move to the exam room, remaining under supervision and retaining his/her copies of the role-play card and photo card. Any notes on the role-play card and photo card made by the student on the MFL additional answer sheet/exam stationery should be taken into the exam room to be used during the first two parts of the test"; and
- The teacher-examiner cannot "let the candidate know in advance the questions or topics within each theme which will be covered during their own speaking test" or "re-test a candidate during the speaking window, apart from in the limited circumstances listed".

The panel also considered exhibit 27 and exhibit 28 of Witness A's written statement, which Witness A described in her written statement as the "invigilator's register" in respect of the French speaking examination. The panel noted that both exhibits showed a timetable for the speaking examinations undertaken at the School on 4 and 5 May 2022, which outlined when each pupil was undertaking the examination, the examiner present and the location of the examination. Specifically, the panel noted that the

timetable had a manuscript note of the start and end times of the preparation time provided in the preparation room.

The panel noted from the timetables that Pupils 1, 2, 4, 16, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 34 undertook examinations with Ms Yakit on 4 May 2022, whilst Pupils 7, 8, 9, 17, 21, 24, 27, 33, 36 and 37 undertook examinations with Ms Yakit on 5 May 2022. Pupils 32 and 35 were originally noted as having an examination on the afternoon of 5 May 2022 but they were rescheduled. The panel acknowledged that 12 minutes of preparation time was recorded for each of the pupils which was consistent with the time permitted by the instructions outlined in exhibit 40.

Ms Yakit stated in her oral evidence that she could not recall her conduct with each individual pupil yet could remember how she conducted the examinations generally. Ms Yakit stated in her written statement that she “asked certain students to rewrite” their notes to “ensure they can effectively use their notes during the exam”. Ms Yakit explained in her oral evidence that their original notes were not formulated properly or could not be easily understood by the pupil. Ms Yakit also “reviewed their candidate sheets and notes” and also helped them “structure their responses in a way that would allow them to communicate effectively”.

In her written statement, Ms Yakit stated that she “provided more specific assistance by completing practice runs” with “most” of her pupils. Ms Yakit further stated in oral evidence that practice runs were provided immediately prior to the examination to allow the pupils to familiarise themselves with the examination as they had not all been afforded the opportunity to sit a mock examination. When questioned by the panel, Ms Yakit accepted in her oral evidence that “practice runs” were not permitted within the examination rules.

The panel considered the oral evidence of Pupil 7, as well as Pupil 7’s two written statements, one of which was prepared as part of the School’s investigation and dated 13 May 2022 (“Investigation Statement”) and the other which was prepared for the purposes of the TRA’s case and dated 18 April 2023 (“TRA Statement”). The panel noted that Pupil 7’s Investigation Statement and TRA Statement were inconsistent in places, however Pupil 7 clarified in her oral evidence that her Investigation Statement was rushed and she admitted that she failed to capture all the relevant information due to the stressful circumstances she found herself in. The panel was satisfied with this explanation as Pupil 7’s Investigation Statement was written by her when she was 16 years old or under at the time of the examinations, during which time she would have been under pressure.

Pupil 7 stated in her oral evidence that she was provided with 12 minutes of preparation time in an invigilated preparation room on the morning of 5 May 2022 to write her own notes ahead of the examination. The panel noted this was consistent with the timetable provided in evidence which stated Pupil 7’s preparation time was between 09:06 and 09:18 on the morning of 5 May 2022. Pupil 7 stated in her oral evidence that she then

went into the examination room with Ms Yakit where she was told to re-write her prepared notes using her previous work from lessons to copy from.

Pupil 7 stated in her TRA Statement that she undertook the examination twice; the first time occurred in the morning, however Ms Yakit stopped her halfway through the first element of the examination and told her she “wasn’t good enough” and there was “no point in doing it now”. Pupil 7 elaborated in oral evidence that the second time she undertook the examination was in the afternoon on 5 May 2022 albeit she could not recall the exact timings.

In oral evidence, Ms Yakit could not recall that Pupil 7 returned in the afternoon to do the examination a second time. Ms Yakit explained that it would not have been possible for this to happen as Ms Yakit was prevented from undertaking any further examinations in that afternoon when the School became aware of allegations against her. The panel noted this was supported by the timetable which showed Ms Yakit’s examinations in the afternoon were rescheduled. Notwithstanding this, Ms Yakit accepted in her oral evidence that Pupil 7 was provided a “practice run” immediately prior to the examination which supported Pupil 7’s view that this was undertaken twice. Ms Yakit also accepted in her oral and written evidence that Pupil 7 was told to re-write her notes once she arrived in the examination room.

The panel considered each of the written statements from pupils who undertook a French GCSE examination on either 4 or 5 May 2022 who were not attending the hearing as witnesses. This included the statements prepared by the pupils as part of the School’s investigation during May 2022 which were exhibited to Witness A’s written statement, as well as Pupil 16’s written statement dated 21 September 2023 which was prepared for the purposes of this case. The panel noted that each of these written statements were hearsay evidence which it had already decided to admit in a preliminary application. The panel acknowledged that the teacher’s representative had not had the opportunity to cross-examine the pupils and neither had the panel had the opportunity to ask these pupils questions, meaning the evidence had not been tested. However, the panel determined that it could rely on the evidence to the extent it was consistent with factors presented in other evidence. The panel noted the following consistencies:

- Pupils 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 16, 19, 22, 23, 25, 29 and 31 specify in their statements that they were provided with 12 minutes to prepare notes whilst in the preparation room ahead of their examination which was consistent with Pupil 7 and Ms Yakit’s evidence, as well as the timetable set out in exhibit 27 and 28 of Witness A’s written statement;
- Pupils 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29 and 31 stated that whilst in the examination room with Ms Yakit following their 12 minute preparation time, Ms Yakit provided them material and/or gave them information to use to re-write or amend their notes which they had prepared in the preparation room during the 12



minutes permitted. The panel noted this was consistent with Pupil 7 and Ms Yakıt's evidence; and

- Pupils 3, 5, 6, 11, 13, 15 and 17 stated that they were provided an opportunity to practice answering questions with Ms Yakıt prior to the examination starting. Pupil 15 elaborated that their practice included the same questions in the same order as the examination and that Ms Yakıt assisted them with their answers in the practice run. The panel noted that the provision of a practice run prior to the examination was consistent with Pupil 7 and Ms Yakıt's evidence. Ms Yakıt clarified in her oral evidence that the pupils might have been given some of the same questions in both the practice run and the examination but that she would also deviate from these questions.

The panel considered that the oral evidence of Witness A and Ms Yakıt referred to the context within which the pupils were sitting their exams in May 2022, being the first in person exam since the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, Witness A noted that the School operated in unusual circumstances as modern foreign languages was a mandatory GCSE meaning there was a significant number of pupils who did not wish to pursue the subject or who were struggling. Ms Yakıt stated in her written statement that the relevant cohort was "experiencing high levels of anxiety". To that end, Ms Yakıt stated in her oral evidence that her approach to the preparation time was to support them, build up their confidence in pronunciation and to make them feel at ease.

Ms Yakıt also explained in her oral evidence that she was experiencing a number of personal and professional pressures at the relevant time, including [REDACTED], a recent incident at the School which included her being verbally abused and additional teaching responsibility due to the departure of a colleague.

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that Ms Yakıt provided improper assistance to one or more pupils by telling them what they needed to write down in their notes and provided them with written assistance and/or answers. The panel determined that the examination instructions were clear that there was no provision for a practice run in between the set preparation time and the examination and neither was it permitted to have additional time to prepare notes outside the 12 minute allocated period. The panel was satisfied that Ms Yakıt was an experienced teacher-examiner and should not have provided this additional assistance notwithstanding that the cohort may have had particularly high anxiety given the context of the examination period and that she had additional personal and professional pressures at the relevant time.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(a)(i) and 1(a)(ii) proved.

**b) provided one or more pupils with improper assistance during their French GCSE speaking examination in that you:**

- i) allowed pupils to see prepared answers and/or directed pupils to answers displayed on your computer screen; and/or**
- ii) held up prompts and/or mouthed answers to pupils**

Ms Yakıt admitted allegations 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii).

The panel again considered exhibit 40 of Witness A's written statement, which was the document entitled 'AQA Instructions for the Conduct of Exams in Summer 2022 - GCSE Modern Foreign Languages'. The panel noted this document outlined the scope of what a teacher examiner can and cannot do during the French GCSE speaking examination and noted the following statements in this regard:

- The supervision requirements section stated that the "responsibility to prompt the student question, if the student forgets to ask a question, lies with the teacher-examiner and teachers may have access to whatever materials they need in order to conduct the tests. Care must be taken to ensure that materials teacher-examiners have in the exam room for their own reference cannot be read by the student taking the test";
- a teacher examiner cannot "point to the candidate's notes or cards to prompt the candidate during the test", "use any form of non-verbal communication during the test, including visual aids, hand signals or pointing" or "let the candidate know in advance the questions or topics within each theme which will be covered during their own speaking test" or "re-test a candidate during the speaking window, apart from in the limited circumstances listed"; and
- "all communication must be clearly audible on the recording".

Ms Yakıt stated in her written statement that she had a "significant amount of material" on her desk "during the examination", including a "small space with two computers". Ms Yakıt stated that there may have been visibility of certain materials "such as the paper copy of the speaking booklet" which is material used by pupils in preparing for the examination in class. This was because the examination was done in her office, rather than in a classroom meaning there was a lack of space in the room so the pupils were required to sit at an angle which allowed them to potentially see the computer screen or physical materials.

Ms Yakıt accepted in her oral and written evidence that she used notes to hold up and elicit a response from the pupils. Ms Yakıt elaborated in her oral evidence that the post it notes would state things such as "future tense" or "question" to remind the pupils about the tense or asking questions that they needed to during the examination. Ms Yakıt also stated in her oral evidence that she used a variety of methods to assist pupils during the practice runs, such as referring to notes, speaking booklets and post it notes. However, Ms Yakıt could not recall whether she "did that for all the students in the examinations".

Ms Yakit also stated in her written statement that she could “not recall specifically mouthing any answers”.

Pupil 7 stated in her TRA Statement that she had “two computer screens facing” her in the examination room, one of which was used to record speech and the other displayed her “fully marked answers to the questions, which [Ms Yakit] pointed to and [Pupil 7] could read off of” during the examination. Pupil 7 also stated that Ms Yakit was “mouthing” what to say.

The panel noted the following consistencies across the written statements provided by pupils who sat examinations with Ms Yakit on either 4 or 5 May 2022:

- Pupils 3, 5, 6, 11, 13, 15 and 17 stated that they were provided an opportunity to practice answering questions with Ms Yakit prior to the examination recording starting. The panel noted that the provision of a practice run prior to the examination was consistent with Pupil 7 and Ms Yakit’s evidence;
- Pupils 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29 and 31 stated that Ms Yakit wrote prompts and/or answers on post it notes for them to read during their examination. The panel noted this was consistent with Pupil 7 and Ms Yakit’s evidence;
- Pupils 8, 21, 27 and 28 stated that they could read from Ms Yakit’s computer screen which had the answers on during the examination. The panel noted this was consistent with Pupil 7’s evidence. Ms Yakit stated that she did not intentionally allow pupils to view her computer screen albeit this was a possibility due to the room being small;
- Pupil 9 stated that Ms Yakit mouthed answers during the course of the examination which was consistent with Pupil 7’s evidence; and
- Pupil 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29 and 31 stated that Ms Yakit directed them to an answer which was written down and/or allowed them to view written material during their examination which was not part of their prepared notes. Ms Yakit stated that she did not intentionally allow pupils to view written material albeit this might have been possible because the room was small and their positions relative to each other.

The panel was satisfied on the corroborating evidence that Ms Yakit provided one or more pupils with improper assistance during their French GCSE speaking examination by holding up notes, mouthing answers, and allowing pupils to view answers via material either on physical documents on her desk or on her computer screen. Whilst Ms Yakit’s position was that the pupils’ ability to view her written or digital materials was unintentional due to the small examination space, the panel noted the exam instructions clearly state that the teacher-examiner must take care to ensure the materials cannot be

read by the pupils, which Ms Yakit did not do. Additionally, whilst some prompts are permitted by the teacher examiner, the panel was satisfied that Ms Yakit breached the boundary of what was acceptable and was providing answers rather than encouragement.

As with allegations 1(a)(i) and 1(a)(ii), the panel was satisfied that the examination instructions were clear. Ms Yakit was an experienced teacher-examiner and should not have provided additional assistance notwithstanding that the cohort may have had particularly high anxiety given the context of the examination period and that she had pressured personal and professional circumstances.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii) proved.

## **2. Your conduct at paragraphs 1ai and/or 1aii and/or 1bi and/or 1bii above was:**

### **a) Dishonest; and/or**

Ms Yakit denied allegation 2(a).

The panel considered whether Ms Yakit was dishonest by her conduct in allegation 1. The panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford* [2017].

In reaching a decision in respect of dishonesty, the panel needed to first ascertain, subjectively, the actual state of Ms Yakit's knowledge or belief as to the facts. Secondly, the panel needed to determine whether Ms Yakit's state of mind was honest or dishonest by the application of the objective standards of the ordinary honest person.

The panel firstly turned its mind to the actual state of Ms Yakit's knowledge or belief as to the facts. Ms Yakit stated in her written statement that, at the time of her conduct, she "did not consider it inappropriate for practice runs to take place in the examination room". Ms Yakit further stated in oral evidence that "she did not think" at the time that her assistance by re-writing notes or referring to notes during the examination was dishonest as she was prioritising the confidence of the pupils and their ability to undertake the examinations.

Ms Yakit also stated in her oral evidence that at the time of her conduct, as referred to by the panel in its decision for allegations 1(a) and 1(b), she was facing a number of personal and professional pressures which impacted on her judgement.

The panel considered the oral evidence of Witness A, Witness B and Witness C, who had each worked with Ms Yakit at the School. The panel noted that each described Ms Yakit to be of previously good character and her reputation was widely recognised within the School to be that of a good and honest teacher.

The panel noted that both Pupil 8 and Pupil 9 stated in their written statements that Ms Yakit told them in the examination room that the exam board would need to be informed

of the additional assistance that they received during their examination. The panel determined this to be evidence that Ms Yakit understood that such assistance was not permitted.

The panel also noted that Pupil 6 and Pupil 11 stated in their written statement that they were told by Ms Yakit that they were undertaking what was described by Ms Yakit as a practice run and that they would return at a later time to undertake the actual examination. However, the pupils were not invited back and what they believed to be their practice run recording was their actual examination. The panel was satisfied that Ms Yakit would have been aware as the teacher-examiner whether or not the pupils were undertaking a practice or the actual examination which demonstrated dishonesty.

The panel also considered that Ms Yakit had ten years' experience as a teacher-examiner and would have been very familiar with the examination rules. It was Ms Yakit's own oral evidence that she had the examination manual material with her in the examination which she was able to refer to. The panel noted the examination instructions set out in exhibit 40 of Witness A's written statement were clear about the process of the examination, being that no "re-runs" or practice runs were provided for in between the preparation time and the start of the examination.

The panel noted that Ms Yakit was under a number of pressures at the time of her conduct which may have impacted on her judgement, and that her intention was likely to instil confidence in her pupils who had not had the opportunity to undertake a mock examination. However, in weighing up the evidence as to Ms Yakit's knowledge of the facts, the panel considered that Ms Yakit understood her additional assistance during preparation time and the examination to be wrong and dishonest. Improper assistance was provided on numerous occasions despite Ms Yakit's experience, previous good character and her ability to refer to the rules.

The panel then considered the objective standards of the ordinary honest person and was further satisfied that an ordinary honest person would consider providing improper assistance to pupils during their French speaking GCSE examinations to be dishonest. The panel determined that Ms Yakit's conduct had a clear intention to assist the candidates, which in the context of an examination was cheating and fundamentally dishonest.

For the reasons set out above, the panel found allegation 2(a) proved.

#### **b) Demonstrated a lack of integrity**

Ms Yakit admitted allegation 2(b).

The panel considered whether Ms Yakit had failed to act with integrity by her conduct at allegation 1. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2018]. The panel was mindful of the legal advice it received and

that integrity is a more nebulous concept than honesty, for which it is not possible to formulate an all-purpose comprehensive definition but connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession.

In reaching a decision in respect of integrity, the panel noted that Ms Yakit ultimately failed to put the interests of the School or her pupils first. Whilst Ms Yakit stated her intentions were to support the pupils, she undermined the reliability of the examination process and the pupils examination results which fell below the standards expected of a teacher.

Ms Yakit stated in her oral evidence that her improper assistance was "wrong" and that she did not "follow the protocol" for the examinations.

The panel considered that Ms Yakit's behaviour did not adhere to the ethical standards expected of a teacher and was contrary to the manner in which the profession professes to serve the public. This was especially the case as Ms Yakit was the head of her department and would be very aware of the standards expected of her as a teacher-examiner.

For the reasons set out above, the panel determined that Ms Yakit's conduct lacked integrity and found allegation 2(b) proved.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document 'Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers', which is referred to as "the Advice".

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

The panel considered that Ms Yakit was in breach of the requirement in the Preamble of Teachers' Standards:

- Teachers make the education of their pupils their first concern and are accountable for achieving the highest possible standards in work and conduct. Teachers act with honesty and integrity.

With reference to Part Two of Teacher's Standards, the panel found Ms Yakit to have breached the following in relation to the facts found proved:

- 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; and
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Yakit, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

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

The panel also considered whether Ms Yakit’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offence types 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 type of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Yakit amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The panel considered that there were clear standards to be met in conducting examinations which Ms Yakit failed to adhere to with multiple pupils, which negatively impacted the integrity of their results and the School’s examination process. Additionally, the panel determined it to be serious for a teacher to provide improper assistance in this manner.

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

In relation to whether Ms Yakit’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 they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Ms Yakit’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offence types in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel’s findings as to whether Ms Yakit was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence type of fraud and serious dishonesty was relevant.

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. The panel was satisfied that the general public would be concerned that a teacher had conducted a number of examinations in contravention of the rules which would have a negative impact on pupil results, the School's status as an examination centre and the integrity of the public examination as a whole. The panel therefore considered that the conduct found proven could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, therefore bringing the profession into disrepute.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Yakit'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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found the following to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

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

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

The panel was not satisfied that the contravention of examination conditions and dishonesty was relevant to the public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public.



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 Yakıt in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining Ms Yakıt 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 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 Yakıt.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity;
- collusion or concealment including lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing; and
- 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.

The panel found that Ms Yakıt's actions were deliberate as she intended to provide her pupils with additional support to make them feel at ease during their examination, despite knowing this was in contravention of the rules.

Whilst the panel noted Ms Yakit was under personal and professional pressure at the time of her conduct, there was no evidence to suggest that Ms Yakit was acting under extreme duress or significant intimidation.

The panel considered the context of Ms Yakit's conduct, including that:

- [REDACTED];
- Ms Yakit stated in her oral evidence that she was [REDACTED] around the time of her conduct due to a previous incident at the School whereby she was verbally abused by a parent in front of pupils, parents and her line manager. Ms Yakit explained that she felt unsupported by the School and subsequently contacted her union representative for the first time in her 16 year career, as she had never experienced such difficulties in her teaching career before. The panel noted that Witness A's oral evidence confirmed that this incident occurred and that in hindsight the School could have done more to support Ms Yakit;
- Leading up to the French GCSE examinations, a teacher in the modern foreign languages department had left the School which meant Ms Yakit was under extra pressure in the department to teach those that were shortly due to take their examinations; and
- [REDACTED].

Whilst the above context was considered, the panel was not satisfied that it significantly mitigated Ms Yakit's conduct. The panel noted that Ms Yakit was a very experienced teacher-examiner and the head of her department. Ms Yakit should have made alternative arrangements for the examinations if she was not capable of conducting them herself to the required standards, such as seeking a postponement or arranging for an alternative examiner. The panel saw no evidence to suggest that Ms Yakit was impaired to the extent that she was unable to perform her professional responsibilities.

The panel saw some evidence of exceptionally high standards being demonstrated in Ms Yakit's previous professional conduct and that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. To that end, the panel relied on the following statements from three experienced teachers:

- Witness A stated in her oral evidence that Ms Yakit was an "excellent teacher" and she "brought a lot of knowledge to the School" being the "best teacher in the department" and offering a "transformative experience of teaching modern foreign languages";
- Witness B stated in her written statement that Ms Yakit's lessons "were consistently outstanding and students really enjoyed the subject when she taught them". Additionally, Witness C stated that Ms Yakit "was very valued in school because of

her teaching, and even OFSTED made a special mention when they visited, to her inspirational teaching and her views of the MFL curriculum”; and

- Witness C stated in her written statement that Ms Yakıt “managed a diverse team with skill and sensitivity, fostering a supportive environment”, that she “cared deeply not only about the success of her students but also about the professional development of her colleagues” and that “under her leadership, the Modern Foreign Languages department saw significant improvements in both academic outcomes and student engagement”. Additionally, Witness C stated that Ms Yakıt’s “drive to raise the profile of language learning within the school was evident in the increased uptake of languages at GCSE and the improved attitudes of students toward the subject”.

Ms Yakıt stated in her oral evidence that she had never conducted examinations in contravention of the rules previously, and this conduct was the only time she had done so due to the context of her circumstances at that time. Whilst the panel considered there to be evidence that the incident was out of character for Ms Yakıt, the panel noted that her conduct could not be described as a momentary lapse of judgment as her departure from the prescribed regulations recurred across a two day period with multiple pupils. It appeared that the level of over assistance given to pupils varied according to Ms Yakıt’s own judgement.

The panel considered that Ms Yakıt regretted her actions as she stated in her oral evidence that she wished she “could have done things differently” and felt regret as she “broke the trust” placed in her as a teacher in the way she conducted the French speaking examinations and had “made a huge mistake”. The panel considered that the risk of Ms Yakıt repeating her conduct was low in light of her regret and the impact her actions have had on her teaching career.

Ms Yakıt stated in her oral evidence that she realised with hindsight that her conduct did not adhere to the examination protocols. Ms Yakıt also stated that she was “sorry” for the impact her conduct had on her pupils. Whilst Ms Yakıt had displayed some insight upon reflection, the panel was not satisfied that Ms Yakıt appreciated the broader gravity of her actions. The panel considered that Ms Yakıt’s conduct fundamentally undermined the integrity of public examinations which has wide reaching implications for the confidence held in the examination process and pupil results, as well as potentially that of future cohorts. Ms Yakıt’s actions could have also potentially jeopardised the School’s status as an approved examination centre. The panel did not see any evidence that this was a matter fully considered by Ms Yakıt as she noted in oral evidence that the results of the pupils in her class were the only ones impacted, and not the results of the cohort as a whole or the integrity of the examination process.

Whilst Ms Yakıt admitted most of the allegations against her, the panel considered that her oral evidence sought to justify her over assistance with pupils, for example, Ms Yakıt stated in her oral evidence that Pupil 34 was also given “practice run” by another teacher-

examiner and it was not just her pupils that were provided this in contravention of the rules.

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 Yakit of prohibition. The panel determined that a recommendation of no prohibition would undermine the public confidence in the profession and the public examination process.

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 Yakit. Whilst the panel determined the risk of repetition to be low given Ms Yakit's passion for her teaching career and her expressed regret, the panel determined prohibition to be justified given the seriousness of the conduct found proven and her lack of full insight in relation to consequences of her actions. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. One of these includes fraud or serious dishonesty given the finding that Ms Yakit's conduct was dishonest.

The panel was satisfied that the risk of repetition was low, despite the lack of full insight into the implications of her actions, as Ms Yakit was clearly passionate and devoted to her teaching profession. The panel noted that Ms Yakit had committed to re-training and seeking mentorship, as outlined in her written statement, to ensure she is confident to adhere to relevant guidelines upon re-entering the teaching profession. The panel noted

that Ms Yakit would be able to make a valuable contribution to the teaching profession and learn from her previous misconduct, having heard from multiple witnesses as to her teaching abilities and good character.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a 2 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 Louisa Yakit should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

- Teachers make the education of their pupils their first concern and are accountable for achieving the highest possible standards in work and conduct. Teachers act with honesty and integrity.

With reference to Part Two of Teacher's Standards, the panel found Ms Yakit to have breached the following in relation to the facts found proved:

- 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; and
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Yakit, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and/or involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that a teacher had conducted a number of examinations in contravention of the rules which would have a negative impact on pupil results.

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 Yakit, 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, "The panel was not satisfied that the contravention of examination conditions and dishonesty was relevant to the public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public."

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "Ms Yakit stated in her oral evidence that she realised with hindsight that her conduct did not adhere to the examination protocols. Ms Yakit also stated that she was "sorry" for the impact her conduct had on her pupils. Whilst Ms Yakit had displayed some insight upon reflection, the panel was not satisfied that Ms Yakit appreciated the broader gravity of her actions. The panel considered that Ms Yakit's conduct fundamentally undermined the integrity of public examinations which has wide reaching implications for the confidence held in the examination process and pupil results, as well as potentially that of future cohorts. Ms Yakit's actions could have also potentially jeopardised the School's status as an approved examination centre. The panel did not see any evidence that this was a matter fully considered by Ms Yakit as she noted in oral evidence that the results of the pupils in her class were the only ones impacted, and not the results of the cohort as a whole or the integrity of the examination process." I have 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 considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Yakit was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct 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 Yakit herself and the panel comment “The panel saw some evidence of exceptionally high standards being demonstrated in Ms Yakit’s previous professional conduct and that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.” The panel had regard to a number of statements from experienced teachers.

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Yakit 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 given considerable weight to the following findings of the panel “Ms Yakit stated in her oral evidence that she had never conducted examinations in contravention of the rules previously, and this conduct was the only time she had done so due to the context of her circumstances at that time. Whilst the panel considered there to be evidence that the incident was out of character for Ms Yakit, the panel noted that her conduct could not be described as a momentary lapse of judgment as her departure from the prescribed regulations recurred across a two day period with multiple pupils. It appeared that the level of over assistance given to pupils varied according to Ms Yakit’s own judgement.”

I have also placed weight on the panel’s comments concerning insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel considered that Ms Yakit regretted her actions as she stated in her oral evidence that she wished she “could have done things differently” and felt regret as she “broke the trust” placed in her as a teacher in the way she conducted the French speaking examinations and had “made a huge mistake”. The panel considered that the risk of Ms Yakit repeating her conduct was low in light of her regret and the impact her actions have had on her teaching career.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Yakit. Whilst the panel determined the risk of repetition to be low given Ms Yakit’s passion for her teaching career and her expressed regret, the panel determined prohibition to be justified given

the seriousness of the conduct found proven and her lack of full insight in relation to consequences of her actions.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Yakit 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 full 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 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel was satisfied that the risk of repetition was low, despite the lack of full insight into the implications of her actions, as Ms Yakit was clearly passionate and devoted to her teaching profession. The panel noted that Ms Yakit had committed to re-training and seeking mentorship, as outlined in her written statement, to ensure she is confident to adhere to relevant guidelines upon re-entering the teaching profession. The panel noted that Ms Yakit would be able to make a valuable contribution to the teaching profession and learn from her previous misconduct, having heard from multiple witnesses as to her teaching abilities and good character.”

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a 2 year review period.”

I agree with the panel and have decided that a two year review period is proportionate and in the public interest in this case in order to maintain public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Ms Louisa Yakit 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 9 April 2027, 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 Yakit remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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



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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 9 April 2025**

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