



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Veronique Matchim: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

January 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	3
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher: Miss Veronique Matchim

TRA reference: 24901

Date of determination: 16 January 2026

Former employer: Abbey Grange Church of England School, Leeds (the School) and Just Teachers Ltd (the Agency)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 16 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Miss Veronique Matchim.

The panel members were Miss Rachel Kruger (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Aisha Miller (teacher panellist) and Mr Philip Jolowicz (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Clare Strickland of Blake Morgan Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Miss Matchim that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Miss Matchim 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, Miss Matchim or any representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 18 December 2025.

It was alleged that Miss Matchim was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while a teacher at the Abbey Grange Church of England Academy (“the School”):

1. On or around 29 April 2024, she provided improper assistance to one or more pupils during a GCSE French Speaking examination in that she whispered prompts to pupils for the production of answers.

2. She failed to promptly inform her contracting body, Just Teachers Ltd, of the School's investigation into her conduct as described at paragraph 1 above when she was required to do so.
3. Her actions at paragraph 1 and/or 2 above demonstrated a lack of integrity

Miss Matchim admits the facts alleged.

Miss Matchim also admits 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: Notice of referral, response, and notice of meeting – pages 3 to 23

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 24 to 26

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents (including MP3 files) – pages 27 to 279

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 280 to 283

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Miss Matchim on 29 July 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 Miss Matchim 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.

Miss Matchim worked as an agency supply teacher through Just Teachers Ltd ("the Agency") between April 2023 and December 2024. When applying to work through them, she declared that no concerns had ever been raised with her in relation to her performance in an education-related role and agreed that she would inform the Agency immediately if this changed.

She was placed at the School between July 2023 and July 2024. On 29 April 2024, she took part in the oral component of the AQA GCSE French speaking examinations. Her role was to ask questions and partake in role plays with the students. The assessments were audio recorded and the recordings were provided to AQA.

Having listened to the audio recordings, AQA identified four recordings in which Miss Matchim may have provided improper assistance to students by whispering French words to them, which they could use to answer the questions she had asked. This conduct was not permitted.

The School carried out an investigation. Miss Matchim was interviewed twice, on 26 June 2024 and 11 September 2024. She was played the audio recordings. At both interviews, and in a statement made in October 2024, she denied whispering anything to the students.

On 21 October 2024, the School notified the Agency of its investigation. Miss Matchim had not previously notified the Agency of the investigation into her conduct.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the teaching profession into disrepute in that, while a teacher at the Abbey Grange Church of England Academy ('the School'):

- 1. On or around 29 April 2024, you provided improper assistance to one or more pupils during a GCSE French Speaking examination in that you whispered prompts to pupils for the production of answers.**

2. You failed to promptly inform your contracting body, Just Teachers Ltd, of the School's investigation into your conduct as described at paragraph 1 above when you were required to do so.

3. Your actions at paragraph 1 and/or 2 above demonstrated a lack of integrity

The allegations were admitted and were supported by evidence presented to the panel, including recordings of the assessments in which Miss Matchim whispered prompts to pupils. The allegations were therefore found 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 proven 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 Miss Matchim, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Matchim 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, ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, ...

The panel also considered whether the teachers conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the advice.

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

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel considered that participating in examination assessments may be an important part of a teacher's role, and as such, teachers play a key part in maintaining the fairness and integrity of examinations. Miss Matchim's conduct undermined that fairness and integrity. Her conduct had the potential to give an unfair advantage to the students involved, or alternatively, risked causing them the disadvantage of them having to retake

examinations when her conduct was discovered. It also put the School's right to conduct examinations at risk, which could have far-reaching consequences for the School, its pupils, and the community it serves.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Matchim as found proven at allegations 1 and 3 amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Regarding allegations 2 and 3, notwithstanding her assumptions about what the School might have told the Agency, Miss Matchim was under a clear duty to inform the Agency immediately she found out she was under investigation. The requirement to inform the Agency was an important safeguarding measure, because it would enable the Agency to carry out a risk assessment and put in place steps to manage any risk. By failing to inform the Agency promptly that she was under investigation, Miss Matchim prevented them from carrying out their risk assessment, thereby undermining their ability to safeguard properly. This was a serious matter and the panel was therefore satisfied that her conduct as found proven at allegations 2 and 3 fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Miss Matchim was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Miss Matchim's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Miss Matchim's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Miss Matchim was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel noted that the Advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute".

Miss Matchim's conduct as found proven at allegations 1 and 3 amounted to examination cheating, and the panel considered that this has the potential seriously to undermine public confidence in Miss Matchim, the School, and the integrity of examinations.

Similarly, her conduct as found proven at allegations 2 and 3 had the potential to cause grave concern, given she failed in her duty to put the Agency in a position whereby it could carry out an effective risk assessment and take action to manage risk pending the outcome of investigation.

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Matchim's actions constitute 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/conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings about Miss Matchim's conduct, which involved an improper attempt to help pupils during oral assessments and failing to inform the Agency that she was under investigation, there was a strong public interest consideration in maintaining public confidence. Her conduct breached the trust that had been placed in her by the School and the Agency.

The panel was also of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was present, as the conduct found against Miss Matchim 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 Miss Matchim in the profession. The panel had no evidence about her abilities as a teacher but noted no evidence that her abilities have been called into question. 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 potentially 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 Miss Matchim.

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;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (or deliberate collusion in or deliberate concealment of such action) particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel concluded that there was evidence that the teacher's actions were deliberate. However, the panel also had regard Miss Matchim's account that her actions were not premeditated, but rather a reflexive response. The panel noted that she had no previous experience of acting as an examiner in formal examinations. It also noted that she cited a specific health condition [REDACTED] that may have clouded her judgement. The panel had no medical evidence that this condition was present, or about what specific impact it may have had on her actions, but it accepted that generally it is a condition that may impact on thought processes.

In these circumstances, the panel accepted that Miss Matchim had not entered the assessments with a premeditated plan to cheat, but that in some of the assessments, she had provided prompts to the students of the sort that a teacher might legitimately provide outside a formal examination setting. This was a clear breach of the examination

rules, but the panel concluded that it was at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness for examination breaches.

There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Matchim was acting under extreme duress.

In the absence of evidence calling into question her past conduct as a teacher, the panel accepted that she has a previous good history.

The panel also noted that Miss Matchim had made full admissions to the TRA and provided statements to the TRA which demonstrated remorse and some insight. The panel noted that her position developed over time, as she initially denied any wrongdoing during the initial investigation, and maintained that denial during two interviews in June and September 2024, and in a statement to AQA's Malpractice and Appeals Committee in October 2024. But from May 2025 she has accepted responsibility for her misconduct and committed to take remedial action to ensure no repetition in future.

The panel noted that Miss Matchim is currently barred from involvement in AQA examinations until after the 2026 examination session, and thereafter, any involvement by her in AQA examinations must be supervised by a senior person until after the 2027 examination session. She must also be trained on examination assessment rules.

Therefore there are measures in place that will enable her to develop her knowledge and insight further and support her remediation. These measures, along with the panel's decision, will alert any future employer to her past misconduct and enable them to carry out a risk assessment and put in place measures to address any remaining risks.

Regarding her failure to inform the Agency about her investigation, the panel concluded that while this was a serious matter, it was not so serious that it requires a prohibition order. The panel considers that the TRA's process, which culminates in this decision and clearly sets out to Miss Matchim that her failure was serious and why, is sufficient to address the public interest in respect of this matter.

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 were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, 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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Veronique Matchim 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, ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, ...

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Matchim fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a teacher both providing improper assistance to pupils during a public examination as well as behaving in a way that lacked integrity

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 that may 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 Miss Matchim, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel makes this observation:

“Her conduct had the potential to give an unfair advantage to the students involved, or alternatively, risked causing them the disadvantage of them having to retake examinations when her conduct was discovered.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk to the wellbeing of pupils from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which it sets out as follows:

“The panel also noted that Miss Matchim had made full admissions to the TRA and provided statements to the TRA which demonstrated remorse and some insight. The panel noted that her position developed over time, as she initially denied any wrongdoing during the initial investigation, and maintained that denial during two interviews in June and September 2024, and in a statement to AQA’s Malpractice and Appeals Committee in October 2024. But from May 2025 she has accepted responsibility for her misconduct and committed to take remedial action to ensure no repetition in future.

The panel noted that Miss Matchim is currently barred from involvement in AQA examinations until after the 2026 examination session, and thereafter, any involvement by her in AQA examinations must be supervised by a senior person until after the 2027 examination session. She must also be trained on examination assessment rules. Therefore there are measures in place that will enable her to develop her knowledge and insight further and support her remediation. These measures, along with the panel’s decision, will alert any future employer to her past misconduct and enable them to carry out a risk assessment and put in place measures to address any remaining risks.”

In my judgement, the insight and remorse demonstrated by Miss Matchim, as well as the measures that have been implemented to improve her understanding of examination assessment rules means that the risk of repletion is limited. I have therefore given this element some 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 makes this observation:

“Miss Matchim’s conduct as found proven at allegations 1 and 3 amounted to examination cheating, and the panel considered that this has the potential seriously to

undermine public confidence in Miss Matchim, the School, and the integrity of examinations.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher engaging in exam cheating in this case and the negative impact that such a finding may have 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, 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 Miss Matchim herself. The panel makes this comment:

“In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Miss Matchim in the profession. The panel had no evidence about her abilities as a teacher but noted no evidence that her abilities have been called into question. 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 potentially able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.”

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Matchim 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, and recognising that Miss Matchim’s behaviour fell well below the standards expected of teachers by the public, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the relative seriousness of her misconduct and whether it warrants a prohibition order. For example:

“Regarding her failure to inform the Agency about her investigation, the panel concluded that while this was a serious matter, it was not so serious that it requires a prohibition order. The panel considers that the TRA’s process, which culminates in this decision and clearly sets out to Miss Matchim that her failure was serious and why, is sufficient to address the public interest in respect of this matter.”

And here:

“Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, 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.”

I have also placed considerable emphasis in my determination on the limited risk of repetition identified by the panel, and have taken into account the lack of premeditation underpinning Miss Matchim’s actions and their isolated nature. In addition I have given regard to its comments regarding the potential for her to make a valuable contribution 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 "Marc Cavey". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a small oval flourish around the "M".

Decision maker: Marc Cavey

Date: 29 January 2026

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