



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Lauren Oliver: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**July 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

**Teacher:** Ms Lauren Oliver

**Teacher ref number:** 0844552

**Teacher date of birth:** 12 January 1990

**TRA reference:** 23005

**Date of determination:** 18 July 2025

**Former employer:** Oasis Academy Shirley Park

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 18 July 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Oliver.

The panel members were Ms Susan Humble (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Michele Barlow-Ward (teacher panellist) and Mr Suhel Ahmed (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Bernard-Stevenson of Blake Morgan LLP.

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

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 2 May 2025.

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

1. On or around November 2022, she acted inappropriately in that she:
  - a) Drafted Pupil A's work for the exam board purporting this to be their own, when she knew this was not the case;
  - b) Submitted the work referred at 1a) above to the exam board;
  - c) Signed off and/or made a declaration that the work referred to at 1a) above was the work of Pupil A, when she knew this was not the case
2. Your conduct at paragraph 1:
  - a) was dishonest,
  - b) lacked integrity.

Ms Oliver admitted the facts of the allegations and that her actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and 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 and anonymised pupil list – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and initial response – pages 7 to 14

Updated response- pages 19-22

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 28 to 491

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 492 to 493.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting.

## Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Oliver on 25 February 2025.

## Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Ms Oliver was previously employed as Lead Teacher of Health and Social Care at Oasis Academy Shirley Park ('the School.')

Ms Oliver commenced work at the School on 19 March 2012. She resigned on 20 October 2023.

On 21 June 2023, the Principal of the School was approached by a student (Pupil A). At this time, Pupil A informed the Principal that the coursework submitted by Ms Oliver to the exam board (which purported to belong to Pupil A) was in fact produced by Ms Oliver.

Following this disclosure, the Principal spoke with Ms Oliver who admitted doing this. Shortly after this time, an internal investigation was conducted by the School.

## 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. On or around November 2022, you acted inappropriately in that you:**
  - a) Drafted Pupil A's work for the exam board purporting this to be their own, when you knew this was not the case;**
  - b) Submitted the work referred at 1a) above to the exam board;**
  - c) Signed off and/or made a declaration that the work referred to at 1a) above was the work of Pupil A, when you knew this was not the case**

Ms Oliver admitted the facts of allegations 1 (a) to 1 (c) which the panel considered together.

Ms Oliver admitted that:-

- She taught Pupil A.
- She advised Pupil A that her work was due to be sampled for moderation and that she would write the work (that would be submitted) on her behalf.
- She re-wrote Pupil A's Task 1 and Task 2 of Unit 14.
- She submitted work to the exam board which purported to have been completed by Pupil A but had in fact been completed by herself.
- She signed the internal verification on 21 November 2022, stating: *'I confirm that the assessment decisions are accurate, there is no evidence of assessment malpractice and any action points have been addressed and completed in respect of the whole cohort.'*
- She signed the internal verification on 4 January 2023, stating: *'I confirm that the assessment decisions are accurate, there is no evidence of assessment malpractice and any action points have been addressed and completed in respect of the whole cohort.'*

The panel also noted that:-

- During the internal investigation, Pupil A denied that the coursework that had been submitted by Ms Oliver was completed by Pupil A.
- The coursework that was originally submitted on behalf of Pupil A was different from the coursework that Pupil A produced.
- The facts were such that the School had to report the matter to the Joint Council for Qualifications.
- At the material time, Ms Oliver was at least one of the Lead Internal Verifiers at the School which meant that she was responsible for assuring the authenticity of coursework submitted by students for assessment.
- Ms Oliver had signed two forms pertaining to the coursework that had been submitted which stated that:- *'I confirm that the assessment decisions are accurate and that there is no evidence of malpractice...'*

The panel gave the term 'inappropriately' its ordinary meaning. The panel determined that Ms Oliver's behaviour was inappropriate because she undermined the credibility of the system of assessment and moderation which was in place.

Ms Oliver's admissions were consistent with the evidence before the panel. The panel found allegations 1(a), (b) and (c) proved.

## **2. Her conduct at paragraph 1:**

**a) was dishonest,**

**b) lacked integrity.**

Having found the facts of allegation 1 proved, the panel went on to consider whether Ms Oliver's conduct lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Ms Oliver admitted both elements.

The panel accepted Ms Oliver's admissions.

The panel considered the applicable tests set down in *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Limited [2017] UKSC 67* and *Wingate and Evans v SRA; SRA v Malins [2018] EWCA Civ 366*.

The panel noted that at the material time, Ms Oliver had more than 10 years of teaching experience and was also one of the Lead Internal Verifiers at the School. This meant that she was responsible for confirming to the examination board that coursework (which had been submitted on behalf of pupils at the school) was authentic. As a result of this, the panel determined on the balance of probabilities that Ms Oliver was aware that completing Pupil A's coursework on their behalf, and then attributing that coursework to Pupil A, was wrong.

The panel determined that ordinary decent people would consider her actions in these circumstances to be dishonest.

The panel determined that Ms Oliver's conduct lacked integrity. The panel considered that submitting work that was not the student's own for assessment fell far below the higher standards which society expected from a teacher resulting from their privileged and trusted role in society. The panel considered that Ms Oliver's actions in this regard were unethical and therefore lacked integrity.

The panel found allegations 2 (a) and (b) proved.

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

Having found all 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 Oliver in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, she was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach 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 Oliver’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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

The panel noted that serious dishonesty appeared on the list at page 13. Ms Oliver had been found by the panel to have displayed dishonest behaviour.

The panel also considered the wider context of Ms Oliver’s actions.

Ms Oliver was in a position of trust and responsibility. Therefore, honesty and integrity were integral to her role. Notwithstanding this, Ms Oliver behaved in a dishonest manner. Submitting her own work as the work of Pupil A which resulted in a situation where Pupil A temporarily received a better grade than they otherwise would have attained (until Ms Oliver’s conduct came to light.) Moreover, once Ms Oliver’s deception had been uncovered, Pupil A’s coursework component could have been disregarded which would potentially have had implications on their overall grade. The panel considers Ms Oliver’s conduct, in this regard, to be of a serious and significant nature.

Further, Ms Oliver was not pro-active in informing the School about her conduct. The matter was brought to the attention of the School by Pupil A who informed the School approximately 5 months after the incident.

In addition to this, as a result of Ms Oliver’s conduct, the School had to undertake an extensive investigation in order to determine whether Ms Oliver’s behaviour was an isolated incident. This would have had resourcing implications for the school.



For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Oliver fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

In relation to whether Ms Oliver's conduct may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel determined that Ms Oliver had cheated on an official assessment. As a result of this, Ms Oliver had undermined the reputation of the profession to act with honesty and integrity. Ms Oliver's conduct was capable of causing reputational damage to the school and her colleagues. Moreover, Ms Oliver also failed to role model good behaviour as she initiated the misconduct and it came to light only when Pupil A made a report to the Principal. Ms Oliver could have proactively brought her own conduct to the attention of the school had she chosen to do so.

The findings of misconduct were 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.

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

In summary, having found the facts of the allegations proved, the panel further found that Ms Oliver's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and 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 a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

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

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Oliver that she had acted dishonestly and with a lack of integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. Cheating in an assessment undermines the integrity of the assessment process used throughout the education system. Assessments are a fundamental aspect of the education system founded on integrity, trust and fairness. Ms Oliver placed Pupil A in a very difficult position where they found themselves in June 2023 reporting their teacher's misconduct to the Principal.

The panel also considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Oliver 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 were also present as the conduct found against Ms Oliver 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 Oliver in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Ms Oliver had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Oliver in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and she sought to exploit her position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that there is an 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. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Oliver.

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;
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (...) 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 considered that the following mitigating factors are present in this case:

- Ms Oliver appeared to have an otherwise unblemished record which consisted of 12 years of teaching, with no disciplinary offences.
- Ms Oliver had engaged with the TRA and made full admissions.
- The panel considered the misconduct to be a time limited error of judgment.
- Ms Oliver has stated in her mitigation that she ‘entirely accepts the seriousness of her actions, understands they are unacceptable.’
- The panel noted the difficult personal circumstances that existed at the time of the misconduct.

Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case included that:

- Ms Oliver’s behaviour was deliberate, and she was not acting under duress.
- Ms Oliver’s behaviour amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers’ Standards
- Ms Oliver admitted the facts of the allegation but failed to produce a witness statement which addressed insight and reflection. Although Ms Oliver submitted a statement which was written by her union representative, the panel determined that this lacked depth and did not sufficiently address insight and reflection. Therefore, the panel accorded limited weight to it.
- Ms Oliver did not report her conduct to the School which meant that the concerns only came to light 5-months after the incident.
- Ms Oliver abused her position of trust.

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 Oliver 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 Oliver. The fact that the panel had determined that Ms Oliver had acted dishonestly and behaved in a manner which lacked integrity 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 panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel considered that 2 years at the bottom of the scale would give Ms Oliver further time to reflect on how the misconduct came to pass and its impact on pupils and the School.

## **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 Lauren Oliver should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach 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 Oliver fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Oliver, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, although the panel did not comment directly on protecting children/safeguarding pupils, I have observed the following “Ms Oliver was in a position of trust and responsibility. Therefore, honesty and integrity were integral to her role. Notwithstanding this, Ms Oliver behaved in a dishonest manner. Submitting her own work as the work of Pupil A which resulted in a situation where Pupil A temporarily received a better grade than they otherwise would have attained (until Ms Oliver’s conduct came to light.) Moreover, once Ms Oliver’s deception had been uncovered, Pupil A’s coursework component could have been disregarded which would potentially have had implications on their overall grade. The panel considers Ms Oliver’s conduct, in this regard, to be of a serious and significant nature.” 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, “Ms Oliver admitted the facts of the allegation but failed to produce a witness statement which addressed insight and reflection. Although Ms Oliver submitted a statement which was written by her union representative, the panel determined that this lacked depth and did not sufficiently address insight and reflection. Therefore, the panel accorded limited weight to it.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “The panel also considered that public

confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Oliver was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Oliver and the panel comment “Ms Oliver appeared to have an otherwise unblemished record which consisted of 12 years of teaching, with no disciplinary offences.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Oliver 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, “In light of the panel’s findings against Ms Oliver that she had acted dishonestly and with a lack of integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. Cheating in an assessment undermines the integrity of the assessment process used throughout the education system. Assessments are a fundamental aspect of the education system founded on integrity, trust and fairness. Ms Oliver placed Pupil A in a very difficult position where they found themselves in June 2023 reporting their teacher’s misconduct to the Principal.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the that “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Oliver. The fact that the panel had determined that Ms Oliver had acted dishonesty and behaved in a manner which lacked integrity was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Oliver 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 two-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel considered that 2 years at the bottom of the scale would give Ms Oliver further time to reflect on how the misconduct came to pass and its impact on pupils and the School."

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

**This means that Ms Lauren Oliver 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 30 July 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 Oliver remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 23 July 2025**

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