



Ms Tandy L'Enfant: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	21
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	26

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

Teacher: Ms Tandy L'Enfant

Teacher ref number: 3355983

Teacher date of birth: 21 November 1975

TRA reference: 23641

Date of determination: 13 July 2026

Former employer: The Joseph Whitaker School, Mansfield

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 6 July 2026 to 13 July 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Tandy L'Enfant.

The panel members were Mr Martyn Stephens (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Gamel Byles (teacher panellist) and Mrs Sofia McGreavy (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Nicholas West of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Lee Bridges of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Ms L'Enfant was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 2 April 2026.

It was alleged that Ms L'Enfant was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as the Lead Teacher of Health & Social Care and/or Lead Internal Verifier at the Joseph Whitaker School ("the School"):

1. From in or around September 2023, she did not provide any, or any adequate, tuition to one or more pupils that she taught.
2. From in or around September 2023, in respect of the assessments titled 'OCR Cambridge Nationals Health and Social Care, Units R033 and R035' and/or 'OCR Level 3 Cambridge Technical Extended Certificate in Health and Social Care – 05831', she:
 - a) Instructed pupils to copy other pupils' coursework and/or to copy from examples;
 - b) Amended and/or added to pupils' coursework, purporting it to be their own, for one or more of the pupils listed in Schedule A;
 - c) Awarded and/or submitted grades for pupils which the pupils' work did not support, for one or more of the pupils listed in Schedule B;
 - d) Asked pupils to sign candidate authentication forms in advance of completing the work and/or without dating them; and/or
 - e) Awarded and/or submitted marks to OCR for pupils' without keeping internal records and/or without securely retaining pupils' work until at least confirmation that the final grades had been received.
3. Her conduct at 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(d) and/or 2(e) was:
 - a) Misleading;
 - b) Dishonest and/or lacking in integrity.

Schedule A

- i. Pupil G
- ii. Pupil Z6
- iii. Pupil Z7
- iv. Pupil Z9

- v. Pupil Z5
- vi. Pupil Z16
- vii. Pupil Z19
- viii. Pupil Z
- ix. Pupil T
- x. Pupil Z27
- xi. Pupil Z28
- xii. Pupil Z29
- xiii. Pupil Y
- xiv. Pupil V
- xv. Pupil Z1
- xvi. Pupil T
- xvii. Pupil X
- xviii. Pupil Z32
- xix. Pupil H
- xx. Pupil U
- xxi. Pupil S

Schedule B

- i. Pupil A
- ii. Pupil B
- iii. Pupil C
- iv. Pupil F
- v. Pupil D
- vi. Pupil E
- vii. Pupil S

- viii. Pupil T
- ix. Pupil U
- x. Pupil V
- xi. Pupil X
- xii. Pupil Y
- xiii. Pupil Z
- xiv. Pupil Z1
- xv. Pupil Z2
- xvi. Pupil H

Ms L'Enfant admitted the facts of allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), 3(a) and 3(b) and denied the facts of allegations 1 and 2(a), as set out in her written representations which were sent by email on 4 May 2025 and 3 June 2026.

In respect of the admitted facts of allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), 3(a) and 3(b), Ms L'Enfant made no admissions in regard to her conduct amounting to that of 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 list of key people and anonymised pupil list – pages 7 to 10

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 11 to 27

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 28 to 75

Section 4: TRA exhibits – pages 76 to 962

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 963 to 991

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- A proceeding in absence bundle totalling 47 pages for the purposes of considering the application to proceed in the absence of Ms L'Enfant.

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

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Witness C - [REDACTED]

Witness D - [REDACTED]

Witness E - [REDACTED]

Pupil H

Parent A

Pupil C

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 L'Enfant commenced employment at the School on 1 September 2023 as a teacher and Lead Teacher of Health and Social Care and Lead Internal Verifier.

On 15 March 2024, the School made a referral to the exam board in respect of allegations of exam malpractice on behalf of Ms L'Enfant in that it was alleged that she instructed students to copy from other coursework and she had awarded grades for work that students had not submitted nor completed.

From 15 March 2024 to 7 May 2025, Ms L'Enfant was absent from the School, due to a period of sick leave.

On 27 March 2024, the School commenced an internal investigation into allegations of exam malpractice by Ms L'Enfant.

On 7 May 2024, a disciplinary hearing into the allegations of exam malpractice took place and was held by the School.

On 1 May 2024, Parent A referred Ms L'Enfant to the TRA.

The School subsequently referred Ms L'Enfant to the TRA on 10 May 2024.

On 18 September 2024, the OCR Malpractice Committee met to discuss the malpractice allegations against Ms L'Enfant. On 2 January 2025, [REDACTED], Individual F, referred Ms L'Enfant to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. From in or around September 2023, you did not provide any, or any adequate, tuition to one or more pupils that you taught.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statements of Pupil H who had raised concerns about Ms L'Enfant's teaching. Pupil H's contemporaneous written statement dated 25 April 2024 stated that Miss L'Enfant gave Pupil H six sheets of paper and an instruction to copy all of it exactly how it was written "*even with the spelling mistakes*". Pupil H's subsequent witness statement dated 22 July 2025, and their oral testimony were consistent in respect of this issue.

The panel considered that Pupil H's suggestion that Ms L'Enfant had instructed this pupil to copy work with spelling mistakes was concerning. The panel considered that such an instruction would have had no apparent educational purpose and could amount to evidence of inadequate tuition. However, Pupil H explained in their oral testimony that they were provided with different resources to the rest of the class who had been provided with booklets. The panel understood from Pupil H's more detailed oral testimony that they had received differentiated work from Ms L'Enfant to meet their educational needs [REDACTED]. Pupil H was unable to confirm whether other pupils in the class were instructed to copy work in the same way.

Pupil H also stated that Ms L'Enfant "*did not really teach us*" and would put on television shows or movies during class which were not educational programmes but rather what the class wanted to watch instead. The panel accepted Pupil H's evidence that there may have been times when the class were permitted by Ms L'Enfant to watch television shows. However, the panel determined that there was not enough precision or corroboration of evidence on this issue for the panel to make a finding that it had happened in every lesson. The panel therefore accepted that Ms L'Enfant may have

permitted Pupil H's class to watch television shows from time to time but without an understanding or evidence of the frequency of that practice, the panel did not find it amounted to a lack of adequate tuition.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Pupil C dated 2 September 2025, in which they stated that Ms L'Enfant would rarely teach pupils, and she would put slides on the whiteboard and read them aloud with no further explanation. Pupil C's contemporaneous statement dated 29 April 2024 stated, Ms L'Enfant would *"mainly just sit and show us some previous exam questions and then also show us the answers"*. Pupil C accepted in their oral evidence that it would be difficult for them to comment on the standard of Ms L'Enfant's teaching, and the panel was mindful that a professional teacher witness would be better qualified to make such a judgement.

The panel considered the witness statement and oral evidence from Witness A who was Ms L'Enfant's line manager during her employment at the School. Witness A stated he had identified early on in her employment that there were some concerns regarding her teaching practice. Witness A explained that he had completed some learning walks and one lesson observation in Ms L'Enfant's classroom to review her teaching and he had held line management meetings with Ms L'Enfant and [REDACTED], Witness E.

The panel noted that the only documentary evidence of the line management meetings was an undated document summarising the minutes of such meetings. This referred to a lesson observation on 19 December 2023, and Witness A had recorded, *"the only concern was the lesson was a bit teacher heavy, with not a huge amount of individual tasks"*. The panel noted a contemporaneous lesson observation document dated 19 December 2023 which provided a judgement against the eight standards in Part One of the Teachers' Standards. This document recorded that Ms L'Enfant was judged to have 'met' seven of the eight standards with only *"TS5 - Adapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all pupils"* being judged as 'not met'. Witness A provided further detail in his oral testimony noting, *"I sat in the classroom for a whole hour on that occasion. On that occasion, in that hour, my only concern was a little fine tuning. Nothing really stuck out as a really bad lesson, she seemed reasonably competent"*.

The panel considered Ms L'Enfant's written response to the allegations in which she stated that she consistently engaged in teaching and supporting students and that she regularly worked exceptionally long hours, often between 16 and 17 hours per day, organising additional workshops and intervention sessions to ensure students received the support they needed.

The panel considered that Witness A was best placed, as Ms L'Enfant's line manager and a qualified teacher, to comment upon the standard of her teaching. The panel was satisfied that Witness A's evidence supported the position that Ms L'Enfant had provided adequate tuition to pupils. The panel noted that there was evidence of isolated issues

that could have amounted to inadequate tuition, however, it was not reasonable to consider these issues in isolation. On the balance of probabilities, the panel concluded that Ms L'Enfant had provided adequate tuition to pupils during her employment at the School.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 not proved.

2. From in or around September 2023, in respect of the assessments titled 'OCR Cambridge Nationals Health and Social Care, Units R033 and R035' and/or 'OCR Level 3 Cambridge Technical Extended Certificate in Health and Social Care – 05831', you:

a) Instructed pupils to copy other pupils' coursework and/or to copy from examples;

The panel considered Ms L'Enfant's written response to the allegations dated 3 June 2026 in which she stated that she did not instruct students to copy coursework.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statements of Pupil H. Pupil H's contemporaneous statement dated 25 April 2024 stated, "*Miss L'Enfant gave me about 6 sheets of paper and told me to copy all of it up exactly how it was written even with the spelling mistakes. It took me about 4 weeks and then she gave me more*". Pupil H provided further detail about this practice in their oral evidence, noting, "*I had multiple pieces of paper, a big thick stack, coursework which she had wrote herself for me to copy on my laptop... so every class I would copy down the words and write a star on the sentence I was on and then put the papers in her drawer and close them*". The panel accepted Pupil H's evidence that they had been instructed by Ms L'Enfant to directly copy work that she had provided to them.

The panel further considered Pupil C's oral evidence and written statement dated 2 September 2025 in which they stated, "*For coursework she gave us past years coursework and told us to 'use it' ... To use the past years coursework and to research it ourselves at home*". Pupil C stated Ms L'Enfant told the pupils that they would "*be fine*" if they copied some of the coursework. The panel considered the instruction as described by Pupil C was not as clear as the instruction to copy that had been provided by Ms L'Enfant to Pupil H. The panel noted it was possible that Ms L'Enfant had suggested to pupils that they use the work as an example or a guide to complete their own work, rather than instructing them to copy it.

This appeared to accord with Ms L'Enfant's written representations dated 4 May 2025, which stated, "*It was my understanding that these examples were intended for their comprehension and learning, not for direct copying*". However, the panel was mindful that Ms L'Enfant had not attended the hearing, and as such her evidence was hearsay as the

panel had not had the opportunity to test it. The panel therefore noted that it could only give her evidence limited weight.

The panel was not taken to any other evidence of pupils being instructed to copy work, other than Pupil H. The panel was also mindful that the School's investigation only noted evidence of one student, Pupil H, having testified that they were instructed to copy out work which was not their own. The panel recalled Pupil H's oral testimony when they had noted that they had seen other pupils being provided with booklets by Ms L'Enfant but could not confirm if the class had been instructed to copy work from the booklets in the same way. Pupil H also noted that they sat on a separate table away from the rest of the class [REDACTED].

Having considered all of the available evidence, the panel concluded that Ms L'Enfant had instructed Pupil H to copy from example work that she had provided. However, there was no evidence of any other pupils having been instructed to copy other pupils' coursework or from examples.

As the panel's finding only related to a single pupil and not multiple pupils, it did not find allegation 2(a) proved.

b) Amended and/or added to pupils' coursework, purporting it to be their own, for one or more of the pupils listed in Schedule A;

The panel noted that Ms L'Enfant admitted allegation 2(b) in her written representations dated 4 May 2025 stating, *"Yes with the students sat with me working together...I recognize that my participation in amending student coursework, and the collaborative nature of this work, was not appropriate. I should not have been so supportive in this manner. I regretfully admit to modifying students' coursework"*. Notwithstanding her admission, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available.

The panel considered the written statement of Ms L'Enfant where she specifically admitted to amending student coursework, but stated that she did so because she was following instructions given by senior colleagues.

The panel reviewed the admission alongside the documentary evidence available before it, including a comparison document that had been drafted by Witness A. Witness A explained in his witness statement dated 18 August 2025, *"I asked the students to email me the work they had actually done, and I then compared this with what the exam board sent me (i.e. what had been submitted to the exam board by Tandy L'Enfant)"*. This comparison document recorded in respect of Unit RO33 that for two pupils, Pupil G and Pupil Z28, the work returned by OCR and the work provided to Witness A by the students was similar work on the same topic but had differences. In respect of Unit R035, Witness A had made a similar conclusion in respect of Pupil H, recording the following

observation, *“The work submitted by Pupil H to me does appear in the work sent to OCR but there appears to be some significant additions to it beyond the work submitted”*.

There appeared to be numerous other examples included in Witness A’s presentation of his comparison analysis, however, the panel was cautious in making further findings as it had not been provided with the source material in order to make its own determination. It appeared to the panel that there was at least one error in the comparison document as it recorded Pupil H as having provided work on the topic of a [REDACTED] to Witness A in the comparison document, however, during their oral testimony, Pupil H confirmed that they had never heard of [REDACTED].

The TRA’s case alleged that Ms L’Enfant had amended or added to pupils’ coursework by substituting the work that they had completed with other work. The panel accepted there was documentary evidence to support this having happened on at least one occasion with Pupil G, who provided a written statement dated 17 April 2024 confirming, *“the piece of coursework I emailed to [REDACTED] is my coursework and I don’t remember writing anything about [REDACTED]. The coursework on [REDACTED] I was shown was not mine”*. The panel was not able to make a wider finding of Ms L’Enfant having amended pupils’ work by substituting work as it was unable to test Witness A’s analysis with reference to the documentary source material. Although the panel recognised Witness A’s comparison analysis had been carried out for the right reasons and his seniority and experience inferred his competence to do so, the panel’s belief that there was at least one error in respect of Pupil H meant that it could not make a finding on the balance of probabilities about the extent of other alleged amendments to pupils’ work by substitution.

Having considered the available evidence, the panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Ms L’Enfant had amended and/or added to pupils’ coursework, purporting it to be their own, namely for Pupil G, Pupil Z28 and Pupil H, as listed in Schedule A.

The panel therefore found allegation 2(b) proved.

c) Awarded and/or submitted grades for pupils which the pupils’ work did not support, for one or more of the pupils listed in Schedule B;

The panel noted that Ms L’Enfant admitted allegation 2(c). Ms L’Enfant’s written representations dated 3 June 2026 noted, *“I acknowledge submitting grades that were not fully supported by the available evidence”*. Notwithstanding her admission, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available.

The panel reviewed the admission alongside the documentary evidence available before it. The panel noted a Unit Recording Sheet for Unit 24 in respect of Pupil A which evidenced that Ms L’Enfant had awarded Pupil A a distinction for this unit on 4 December

2023. The panel noted contemporaneous documentary evidence from Pupil A in the form of a statement that was taken by Witness A on 15 March 2024. This statement confirmed, *"Pupil A has not completed work for Unit 24. Pupil A states that the work has not been submitted, nor has Miss L'Enfant seen the work"*.

The panel reviewed a printout from the OCR Interchange dated 25 March 2024 in respect of the Level 3 course – 05831. This document confirmed that Pupil B was awarded a distinction for Unit 1. However, a contemporaneous written statement from Pupil B dated 25 March 2024 confirmed, *"I have never submitted [sic] Unit 1"*.

The panel reviewed a printout from the OCR Interchange dated 25 March 2024 in respect of the Level 3 course – 05831. This document confirmed that Pupil C was awarded a distinction for Unit 1. However, a contemporaneous written statement from Pupil C dated 25 March 2024 confirmed, *"I have not submitted or finished Unit 1. But have been given a distinction which I don't understand how"*.

The panel reviewed a printout from the OCR Interchange dated 25 March 2024 in respect of the Level 3 course – 05831. This document confirmed that Pupil D was awarded a distinction for Unit 17. However, a contemporaneous written statement from Pupil D dated 25 March 2024 confirmed, *"I have not submitted any work for Unit 17, but I am halfway through"*.

The panel reviewed a printout from the OCR Interchange dated 25 March 2024 in respect of the Level 3 course – 05831. This document confirmed that Pupil E was awarded a distinction for Unit 17. However, a contemporaneous written statement from Pupil E dated 25 March 2024 confirmed, *"I submitted Unit 17 on the 4th of March 2024"*. The School's investigation report dated 18 April 2024 confirmed that this was a month after moderation had been completed and Ms L'Enfant would have had to award Pupil E's grade for Unit 17 before they had submitted the work. The panel further noted documentary evidence of OCR's Moderation Visit Report dated 6 February 2024 in respect of Units 1, 17 and 24 for the Level 3 course – 05831, confirming that Ms L'Enfant would have been required to have awarded and submitted grades before this moderation visit.

The panel was unable to find documentary evidence from OCR to support that Ms L'Enfant had awarded or submitted grades for Pupil S, Pupil T, Pupil U, Pupil V, Pupil Y, Pupil Z or Pupil Z1. The panel did review evidence that Pupil Z2 was awarded a distinction for Unit 1 and Unit 17 but there was no evidence from Pupil Z2 to suggest that Ms L'Enfant had awarded this grade without having their work to support it.

The panel considered the written statement and oral evidence of Pupil H who confirmed that Ms L'Enfant awarded them a distinction for their coursework for Unit RO33. Pupil H recalled that they had been instructed to copy coursework provided by Ms L'Enfant regarding [REDACTED] and an interview supposedly with their grandad called

[REDACTED], but they did not have a grandad called [REDACTED]. Pupil H confirmed in their oral evidence, when asked if [REDACTED] was a topic of their choosing, *“No, I didn’t know who [REDACTED] was until I was writing the coursework”*. Unlike the evidence in respect of Pupil A, Pupil B, Pupil C, Pupil D and Pupil E set out above, work had been submitted for Pupil H, but the panel found it could not be said to be Pupil H’s own work as they had copied it directly from an example and had no knowledge of the subject matter.

The panel considered Ms L’Enfant’s admission in respect of allegation 2(c) to be consistent with the above evidence.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel was satisfied Ms L’Enfant had awarded and submitted grades for Pupil A, Pupil B, Pupil C, Pupil D, Pupil E and Pupil H (as listed in Schedule B), which the pupils’ work did not support.

The panel therefore found allegation 2(c) proved.

d) Asked pupils to sign candidate authentication forms in advance of completing the work and/or without dating them; and/or

The panel noted that Ms L’Enfant admitted allegation 2(d). Ms L’Enfant’s written representations dated 3 June 2026 noted, *“I instructed students to sign authentication forms before they were dated”*. Notwithstanding her admission, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available.

The panel noted a handwritten survey response document dated 29 April 2024 and signed by Pupil C which asked if they signed the authentication form when submitting their work. Pupil C answered, *“yes multiple papers, just a signature with no date, didn’t have time to read it, as she’d say, “quickly sign these forms”*. The panel noted Pupil C’s contemporaneous statement dated 25 March 2024 which stated, *“I have not submitted or finished Unit 1”* indicating that Pupil C must have been asked to sign the candidate authentication form in advance of completing the work.

The panel noted multiple handwritten survey response documents dated 29 April 2024 from Pupil N, Pupil Z33 and Pupil U, all of which confirmed that they were asked to sign authentication forms without dating them. Pupil N answered, *“yes. On many occasions strickly [sic] being told not to fill in any other part and to not date it. If any of this was done it was thrown away and had to be re done”*. Pupil Z33 answered, *“Yes – no date added - before coursework was handed in”* and Pupil U answered, *“I signed one + it [sic] was told to not write a date with my work present”*. The panel accepted this as evidence to support its finding that Pupil N, Pupil Z33 and Pupil U must have all been asked to sign the candidate authentication form without dating the form.

The panel further noted documentary evidence in the form of signed candidate authentication forms from Pupil Z22 and Pupil V which were also undated.

The panel considered Ms L'Enfant's admission in respect of allegation 2(d) to be consistent with the above evidence.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found on the balance of probabilities that Ms L'Enfant did ask pupils to sign candidate authentication forms both in advance of completing the work in respect of Pupil C and without dating the form in respect of Pupil N, Pupil Z33, Pupil U and Pupil Z22 and Pupil V.

The panel therefore found allegation 2(d) proved.

e) Awarded and/or submitted marks to OCR for pupils' without keeping internal records and/or without securely retaining pupils' work until at least confirmation that the final grades had been received.

The panel noted that Ms L'Enfant admitted allegation 2(e). Ms L'Enfant's written representations dated 3 June 2026 noted, *"I acknowledge submitting marks without having access to complete supporting documentation. During my absence, coursework and related records were removed from my work area, which significantly affected my ability to maintain accurate records. Despite these circumstances, I accept that I remained professionally responsible for the submissions made in my name"*.

Notwithstanding her admission, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available.

The panel reviewed its finding of fact at allegation 2(c), namely that Ms L'Enfant had awarded and submitted grades to OCR for Pupil A, Pupil B, Pupil C, Pupil D, Pupil E and Pupil H, which the pupils' work did not support. The panel did not find that there was evidence of Ms L'Enfant failing to keep internal records, however, it did consider that Ms L'Enfant could not be found to have securely retained pupils' work until at least confirmation that the final grades had been received in respect of these pupils. The panel's finding at allegation 2(c) confirmed that the grades awarded and submitted by Ms L'Enfant were not supported by pupils' work in respect of these pupils.

The panel considered Ms L'Enfant's admission to be consistent with the above evidence.

Having considered the admitted facts and the available supporting evidence, the panel found that Ms L'Enfant had awarded and submitted marks to OCR for Pupil A, Pupil B, Pupil C, Pupil D, Pupil E and Pupil H, without securely retaining pupils' work until at least confirmation that the final grades had been received in respect of these pupils.

The panel therefore found allegation 2(e) proved.

3. Your conduct at 2 (a), 2 (b), 2 (c), 2 (d) and/or 2 (e) was:

a) Misleading;

The panel noted that Ms L'Enfant admitted allegation 3(a). Ms L'Enfant's written representations dated 3 June 2026 noted, "*I acknowledge that aspects of my conduct were misleading. I deeply regret this and recognise the importance of honesty and transparency within the teaching profession*". Notwithstanding her admissions, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available.

The panel was invited by the presenting officer to consider the ordinary dictionary definition of 'misleading' when considering this allegation. The definition agreed by the panel in this respect was "*an adjective describing something that gives a false impression, deceives, or causes someone to believe something that is not true*".

The panel considered that Ms L'Enfant's conduct as found proven at allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e) was inherently misleading. Ms L'Enfant's actions in amending or adding to pupils' coursework purporting it to be their own, awarding and submitted grades for pupils which the pupils' work did not support, asking pupils to sign candidate authentication forms in advance of completing the work and without dating them and awarding and submitting marks without securely retaining pupils' work until final grades had been received, all caused someone to believe something that was not true.

In particular, the panel found that Ms L'Enfant's conduct resulted in her misleading pupils, parents, her colleagues that completed internal verification duties, the School and the exam board.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 3(a) proved.

b) Dishonest and/or lacking in integrity.

The panel noted that Ms L'Enfant admitted allegation 3(b). Ms L'Enfant's written representations dated 3 June 2026 noted, "*I accept that my actions did not demonstrate the level of integrity expected of a teacher. This is something I have reflected upon extensively. I am profoundly sorry for the mistakes I made and for any damage caused to students, colleagues, the school, and the profession*". Notwithstanding her admissions, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available.

The panel considered whether Ms L'Enfant had acted dishonestly in relation to allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e). In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford* and the two-part subjective and objective dishonesty test.

The panel was further assisted by guidance from the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*, which states “*honesty is a basic moral quality which is expected of all members of society. It involves being truthful about important matters [...] Telling lies about things that matter [...] [is] generally regarded as dishonest conduct [...] The legal concept of dishonesty is grounded upon the shared values of our multi-cultural society. Because dishonesty is grounded upon basic shared values, there is no undue difficulty in identifying what is or is not dishonest.*”

The panel first sought to ascertain the actual state of Ms L’Enfant’s knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel considered Ms L’Enfant’s written representations. The panel considered that Ms L’Enfant was aware that the marks and coursework that she submitted were not accurate. The panel could find no alternative explanation and concluded that Ms L’Enfant must have been aware that her conduct was dishonest.

The panel then went on to consider whether Ms L’Enfant’s conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel concluded that Ms L’Enfant’s conduct as found proven at allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e) was intended to inflate grades and enhance coursework that was internally verified and externally moderated by the exam board, despite those grades not reflecting the actual work completed by pupils. The panel was therefore satisfied that Ms L’Enfant had acted dishonestly, and that her conduct would be considered dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel concluded that Ms L’Enfant’s conduct as found proven at allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e) above was dishonest, in that she had knowingly submitted inaccurate marks and coursework to OCR.

In determining whether Ms L’Enfant’s conduct lacked integrity, the panel reconsidered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority* which defines “integrity” as “*the higher standards which society expects from professional persons*”.

The panel was satisfied that Ms L’Enfant had failed to act within the higher standards expected of a teacher by knowingly submitting inaccurate marks and coursework to OCR. The panel also noted that Ms L’Enfant had regular line management meetings and there was a period of time between submitting inaccurate marks and collating the sample coursework for internal verification and external moderation by OCR. Therefore, the panel noted that there were numerous opportunities for Ms L’Enfant to raise concerns and admit her wrongdoing.

The panel was mindful that professionals are not expected to be “*paragons of virtue*”. However, on examination of the documents, the panel was satisfied that Ms L’Enfant had failed to act within the higher standards expected of a teacher in respect of the conduct found proven at allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e). The panel was therefore satisfied that Ms L’Enfant’s conduct in respect of allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e), as found proven, lacked integrity.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 3(b) proved.

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

Having found allegations 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), 3(a) and 3(b) 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 L’Enfant, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms L’Enfant was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- 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 L’Enfant’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 found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant. The panel considered that Ms L’Enfant’s conduct as found proved, affected a significant number of pupils across different year groups and exam courses which increased the seriousness of her misconduct. The panel further considered that Ms L’Enfant’s conduct was fraudulent insofar as she dishonestly awarded grades with the intention to secure an advantage for the affected pupils. Ms L’Enfant’s conduct sought to deliberately subvert the integrity of a nationally accredited qualification which forms an integral part of the nation’s education system.

The panel considered whether there were any mitigating circumstances, noting Ms L'Enfant's written representations that she was "*following instructions from senior colleagues*" and she was "*under considerable pressure*". Ms L'Enfant also submitted that some pupils were "*extremely disruptive*" which created "*a hostile classroom atmosphere*". The panel was unable to test Ms L'Enfant's evidence at the hearing and could only place limited weight on this hearsay evidence.

The panel considered the witness evidence it did hear from Witness A, Witness B, Witness C, Witness D and Witness E, was consistent in confirming that the School did not place Ms L'Enfant under pressure over and above a normal teacher's experience. There was witness evidence to support Ms L'Enfant's representations that she was teaching classes with challenging pupil behaviours which may have affected her ability to perform her role. However, there was witness evidence of support that was provided to Ms L'Enfant by the School in the form of line management meetings, learning walks from Witness A, internal verification support from Witness A, Witness D and Individual G, support in respect of examination procedure from Witness B and regular check-ins from Witness A to "*see how she was getting on...and to check she was ok*". The panel did not consider that the mitigating circumstances identified by Ms L'Enfant affected its finding in respect of the seriousness of her misconduct.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms L'Enfant amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms L'Enfant was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms L'Enfant'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 Ms L'Enfant'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 Ms L'Enfant was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Ms L'Enfant's status as a teacher. The panel considered that

Ms L'Enfant's conduct as found proven would likely damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms L'Enfant's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

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

In light of the panel's findings against Ms L'Enfant, which involved amending or adding to pupils' coursework purporting it to be their own, awarding and submitting grades for pupils which the pupils' work did not support, asking pupils to sign candidate authentication forms in advance of completing the work and without dating them and awarding and submitting marks without securely retaining pupils' work until final grades had been received, there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct, given the serious findings of dishonesty and lack of integrity. 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 L'Enfant was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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

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 L'Enfant in the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Ms L'Enfant 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 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.

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 L'Enfant.

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 of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- 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.

There was no evidence that Ms L'Enfant's actions were not deliberate.

Ms L'Enfant did not provide evidence to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel considered there was limited evidence relating to Ms L'Enfant's professional competence and contribution to the education sector. Having heard from Witness A, the panel accepted that Ms L'Enfant was a competent classroom practitioner

during her time teaching at the School, although Witness A noted that some aspects of her practice required support and improvement.

The panel was not provided with any character references pertaining to Ms L'Enfant's good character and therefore were unable to find that the incident was out of character. However, the panel noted that the presenting officer confirmed there were no previous decisions to take account of.

The panel carefully considered Ms L'Enfant's written representations regarding her [REDACTED], personal circumstances and the working environment at the School. The panel accepted that there may have been some truth in those representations and recognised the possibility that Ms L'Enfant [REDACTED] at the relevant time. However, the panel was provided with no [REDACTED] or other independent corroboration capable of supporting her representations. In circumstances where findings of serious dishonesty have been made, the panel found it difficult to determine the extent to which those written representations could safely be relied upon. Accordingly, whilst the panel did take those matters into account, it could only attach limited weight to them.

The panel also considered the extent to which Ms L'Enfant's conduct may have been influenced by external pressures. It accepted that Ms L'Enfant was relatively new to the School, may have been required to deal with challenging behaviour in her classes and may have been placed in a difficult professional environment. The panel considered that these factors may have contributed to her poor decision-making. Nevertheless, there was no evidence before the panel to suggest that Ms L'Enfant was acting under duress.

In considering insight and remorse, the panel took account of Ms L'Enfant's written representations. The panel acknowledged that she expressed remorse and apologised to her pupils, the School community, the profession and the panel. The panel also recognised that Ms L'Enfant stated that she had reflected upon her actions and accepted that her conduct fell below the standards expected of a teacher:

"I fully recognise the seriousness of these matters and the responsibility I held as an educator. Before addressing the specific allegations, I wish to express my sincere remorse for the part I played in the events that have brought me before this panel. I deeply regret the decisions I made and the consequences that followed. Regardless of the circumstances I was experiencing at the time, I acknowledge that my actions fell below the professional standards expected of a teacher."

"Throughout this period, I have spent considerable time reflecting on my actions and the standards expected of teachers. I fully recognise that there were moments when I should have acted differently, sought additional support, or challenged decisions more robustly. I deeply regret that I did not do so."

I am sincerely sorry for my role in these matters. I apologise to my students, to the school community, to the profession, and to the panel for the failings identified. I understand the trust placed in teachers and appreciate the importance of maintaining the highest standards of integrity at all times.

These experiences have taught me difficult but important lessons about professional responsibility, ethical decision-making, personal boundaries, and the need to seek support when faced with overwhelming circumstances.”

However, the panel had concerns regarding the depth and extent of Ms L’Enfant’s insight. Whilst expressing regret, she repeatedly sought to place her actions within the context of instructions from others and difficult personal circumstances. The panel considered that these qualifications diminished the weight that could be attached to her acceptance of responsibility. Further, Ms L’Enfant stated that she had not read the bundle of evidence for this hearing. In the panel’s view, this raised questions as to the extent to which Ms L’Enfant presently understands the full nature and consequences of the misconduct found proved and the impact of that misconduct on pupils, colleagues and public confidence in the profession.

The panel therefore found that Ms L’Enfant had demonstrated some insight and some remorse, but that both remained limited. The panel considered that Ms L’Enfant has not yet demonstrated a full appreciation of the seriousness of her actions or of the harm caused. Whilst the panel acknowledged the possibility that her current [REDACTED] difficulties may affect her ability to engage fully with the proceedings, the available evidence nevertheless reveals a significant limitation in the level of insight that can be identified.

The misconduct involved deliberate conduct and findings of fraud and serious dishonesty. The actions were not isolated or momentary lapses of judgement. Rather, they occurred across more than one class, involved more than one examination process and continued over a period of time. The panel considered that such conduct strikes at the heart of the trust placed in teachers and undermines the integrity of educational assessment.

The panel also considered the potential impact of the misconduct on pupils. By inflating grades, pupils may have been led to believe that they had achieved a level of attainment which was not in fact justified. The consequences of such conduct could extend beyond the classroom and affect important educational and life decisions. The panel therefore considered the misconduct to be particularly serious.

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 L'Enfant 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 L'Enfant. The above specified behaviours in respect of the Advice of which Ms L'Enfant presented with was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice 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 is fraud and serious dishonesty and the panel considered its findings of dishonesty and lack of integrity at allegation 3(b) engaged this characteristic.

The panel noted Ms L'Enfant's written representations that her immediate focus was on [REDACTED], stabilising her personal circumstances and rebuilding her life. The panel also noted Ms L'Enfant's acknowledgement that she is not presently in a position to demonstrate her fitness to practise. Whilst the findings of fraud and serious dishonesty weigh strongly in favour of a substantial review period, the panel found that Ms L'Enfant's limited expressions of remorse and insight, together with the possibility of future rehabilitation, justify a review mechanism rather than prohibition without a review period.

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.

Having balanced all relevant factors, the panel considered that a review period of five years would reflect the seriousness of the findings, including the element of fraud and serious dishonesty. It would also provide sufficient time for Ms L'Enfant to address her personal circumstances, develop fuller insight into her misconduct, undertake any relevant professional development and obtain independent evidence, such as testimonials or other material, capable of demonstrating that she is suitable to return to the profession. The panel therefore recommended a prohibition order with a review period of five years.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Tandy L'Enfant should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 5 years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel has found that the conduct of Ms L'Enfant fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include dishonesty and deliberate contravention of the requirements for the conduct of assessments for an externally awarded qualification.

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 L'Enfant, 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 does not mention having considered any evidence that Ms L'Enfant's behaviour placed the safety and wellbeing of his pupils in jeopardy. However the panel has noted that:

"By inflating grades, pupils may have been led to believe that they had achieved a level of attainment which was not in fact justified. The consequences of such conduct could extend beyond the classroom and affect important educational and life decisions. The panel therefore considered the misconduct to be particularly serious."

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

"The panel therefore found that Ms L'Enfant had demonstrated some insight and some remorse, but that both remained limited. The panel considered that Ms L'Enfant has not yet demonstrated a full appreciation of the seriousness of her actions or of the harm caused. Whilst the panel acknowledged the possibility that her current [REDACTED] difficulties may affect her ability to engage fully with the proceedings, the available evidence nevertheless reveals a significant limitation in the level of insight that can be identified."

In my judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse 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 has observed:

"The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Ms L'Enfant's status as a teacher. The panel

considered that Ms L'Enfant's conduct as found proven would likely damage the public's perception of a teacher."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of fraud and serious 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 L'Enfant herself. The panel has commented:

"Ms L'Enfant did not provide evidence to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel considered there was limited evidence relating to Ms L'Enfant's professional competence and contribution to the education sector. Having heard from Witness A, the panel accepted that Ms L'Enfant was a competent classroom practitioner during her time teaching at the School, although Witness A noted that some aspects of her practice required support and improvement.

The panel was not provided with any character references pertaining to Ms L'Enfant's good character and therefore were unable to find that the incident was out of character. However, the panel noted that the presenting officer confirmed there were no previous decisions to take account of."

A prohibition order would prevent Ms L'Enfant 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 on the fraud and serious dishonesty involved in Ms L'Enfant's behaviour. The panel has said:

"The panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant. The panel considered that Ms L'Enfant's conduct as found proved, affected a significant number of pupils across different year groups and exam courses which increased the seriousness of her misconduct. The panel further considered that

Ms L'Enfant's conduct was fraudulent insofar as she dishonestly awarded grades with the intention to secure an advantage for the affected pupils. Ms L'Enfant's conduct sought to deliberately subvert the integrity of a nationally accredited qualification which forms an integral part of the nation's education system."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's findings that Ms L'Enfant's actions were deliberate and that there was no evidence to suggest that she was acting under duress. The panel has said:

"The misconduct involved deliberate conduct and findings of fraud and serious dishonesty. The actions were not isolated or momentary lapses of judgement. Rather, they occurred across more than one class, involved more than one examination process and continued over a period of time."

In addition, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the limited insight and remorse demonstrated by Ms L'Enfant.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Ms L'Enfant 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 and remorse, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 5-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel noted Ms L'Enfant's written representations that her immediate focus was on [REDACTED], stabilising her personal circumstances and rebuilding her life. The panel also noted Ms L'Enfant's acknowledgement that she is not presently in a position to demonstrate her fitness to practise. Whilst the findings of fraud and serious dishonesty weigh strongly in favour of a substantial review period, the panel found that Ms L'Enfant's limited expressions of remorse and insight, together with the possibility of future rehabilitation, justify a review mechanism rather than prohibition without a review period."

The panel has also said:

"Having balanced all relevant factors, the panel considered that a review period of five years would reflect the seriousness of the findings, including the element of

fraud and serious dishonesty. It would also provide sufficient time for Ms L'Enfant to address her personal circumstances, develop fuller insight into her misconduct, undertake any relevant professional development and obtain independent evidence, such as testimonials or other material, capable of demonstrating that she is suitable to return to the profession. The panel therefore recommended a prohibition order with a review period of five years."

I have considered whether a 5-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a shorter review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the fraud, dishonesty and breaches of examination procedures found proven in this case, and the lack of full insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that a 5-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Ms Tandy L'Enfant 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 17 June 2031, 5 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 L'Enfant remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 15 July 2026

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