



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Joshua Reed: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

June 2021

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	6
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	7
Statement of agreed facts	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher:	Mr Joshua Reed
Teacher ref number:	0987603
Teacher date of birth:	10 May 1989
TRA reference:	18480
Date of determination:	14 June 2021
Former employer:	Haven High Academy, Lincolnshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened remotely on 14 June 2021 to consider the case of Mr Joshua Reed.

The panel members were Mr Ian Carter (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Rachel Cooper (teacher panellist) and Mr Martyn Stephens (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Clare Strickland of Blake Morgan LLP 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 Mr Reed that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Reed 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 Mr Ian Perkins of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors or Mr Reed.

The meeting took place in private, save for the announcement of the panel’s decision, which was announced in public and recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 10 June 2021.

It was alleged that Mr Reed was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher at the Haven High Academy in Lincolnshire, he:

- 1) Engaged in and/or developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A in that:
 - a) On or around 22 March 2014 he;
 - i) Went with her to the home of Individual A;
 - ii) Shared a taxi with her to her home;
 - iii) Placed his hand under her skirt and/or stroked her leg;
 - iv) Invited himself into her home;
 - b) On or around 18 July 2014 he:
 - i) Flirted with her;
 - ii) Stated “your legs look really good in that dress” or words to that effect;
 - iii) Stroked her leg;
 - iv) Entered the ladies toilet of a pub with her;
 - v) Kissed her;
 - c) In or around September 2014 he:
 - i) Collected Pupil A from her home in your car;
 - ii) Touched her leg;
 - iii) Kissed her;
 - iv) Engaged in sexual activity with her;
 - d) In or around October 2015 he:
 - i) Directed Pupil A to drive him to local woods;
 - ii) Touched her leg;

- iii) Kissed her;
- iv) Engaged in sexual activity with her;
- e) In or around April 2015 he:
 - i) Drove Pupil A to a country lane;
 - ii) Engaged in sexual activity with her;
- f) Engaged in sexual activity with her on one or more occasions in or around August 2015;
- g) Exchanged inappropriate electronic messages with her including:
 - i) Discussion of drinking alcohol and/or Pupil A being drunk;
 - ii) Discussion of Pupil A using his hot-tub whilst naked;
 - iii) Discussion of looking at her bottom whilst she was wearing a leotard;
 - iv) Requesting that Pupil A send him an image of herself whilst she was drunk;
 - v) Requesting that Pupil A send a further image with her top pulled down and/or whilst not wearing a bra whilst she was drunk;
 - vi) Discussion about sexual activity between Pupil A and himself;
 - vii) Stating "it definitely will" with reference to whether sexual activity would take place between Pupil A and yourself;
- 2) At an investigation meeting on 1 September 2014 concerning his conduct towards Pupil A as detailed at Allegation 1(b) he:
 - a) Failed to mention his conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1(a);
 - b) Failed to mention his conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1(g);
 - c) Stated that he had not exchanged mobile telephone numbers with Pupil A when in fact he had exchanged electronic messages with her;
 - d) Stated that he had not contacted Pupil A after the incident prior to September 2014 when in fact he had exchanged electronic messages with Pupil A after the incident including:
 - i) On 18 July 2018 stating that he should have gone to her house after the incident;

- ii) On 18 July 2018 stating that he hoped Pupil A had had a good night;
 - iii) On or around 19-20 July when he asked Pupil A what she had told Colleague B about the incident;
 - iv) On or around 19-20 July when he asked Pupil A to “cover” you and tell Individual C that nothing had happened between you prior to the incident;
- 3) Sought to conceal his relationship with Pupil A by:
- a) Blocking Pupil A and/or deleting Snapchat to avoid her being seen in his regular contacts with Colleague B;
 - b) Instructing her via electronic message not to tell anyone about their relationship;
 - c) Sending a message to Pupil A stating “best stay that way” with reference to her keeping their relationship a secret;
 - d) Instructing Pupil A to delete messages between them;
 - e) Instructing Pupil A not to attend a play at the school campus on or around 21 July 2014 following the events outlined at Allegation 1(b) above;
- 4) His conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1(c)-(g) was notwithstanding written advice issued to him on or around 3rd September 2014 to the effect that:
- a) He should not be alone with Pupil A;
 - b) He should not exchange mobile numbers with Pupil A;
- 5) His conduct as may be found proven at Allegation (1) was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated;
- 6) His conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 2(d)(iv) and (3) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Mr Reed admits the facts.

Mr Reed admits of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 2 to 16

Section 2: Correspondence with Pupil A – pages 17 to 19

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 21 to 29

Statement 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 31 to 204

There were no teacher documents.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Reed on 30 May 2021.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Reed 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.

Mr Reed was first employed as a music teacher at Haven High Academy (the School) in 2010. From 1 September 2016 until his dismissal on 21 March 2019, he was assistant head of the music faculty. It is alleged that between March 2014 and April 2015, he developed an inappropriate personal and sexual relationship with Pupil A [redacted].

In the course of that relationship, he exchanged multiple electronic messages with her of a personal and sexual nature, and they engaged in sexual activity on a number of occasions. This was outside school premises and hours. Mr Reed and/or Pupil A had consumed alcohol, sometimes to excess, on some of the occasions when the messaging and/or sexual activity took place.

After a school social event in July 2014, while at a pub with other members of staff and pupils, another member of staff witnessed Mr Reed kissing Pupil A and reported this. The

School carried out an internal investigation in September 2014. It is alleged that during this internal investigation, Mr Reed failed to provide all relevant information about the relationship, and that generally, he sought to conceal its full extent. He also sought to conceal the relationship by instructing Pupil A to cover it up. His conduct in this regard is alleged to be dishonest.

It is also alleged that following that internal investigation, he failed to comply with advice issued to him in September 2014 about how to maintain a professional relationship with Pupil A and continued to have an inappropriate personal and sexual relationship with her.

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:

Whilst working as a teacher at the School, you:

1) Engaged in and/or developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A in that:

a) On or around 22 March 2014 you;

- i) Went with her to the home of Individual A;**
- ii) Shared a taxi with her to her home;**
- iii) Placed your hand under her skirt and/or stroked her leg;**
- iv) Invited yourself into her home;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

b) On or around 18 July 2014 you:

- i) Flirted with her;**
- ii) Stated “your legs look really good in that dress” or words to that effect;**
- iii) Stroked her leg;**
- iv) Entered the ladies toilet of a pub with her;**
- v) Kissed her;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

c) In or around September 2014 you:

- i) Collected Pupil A from her home in your car;**
- ii) Touched her leg;**
- iii) Kissed her;**
- iv) Engaged in sexual activity with her;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

d) In or around October 2015 you:

- i) Directed Pupil A to drive you to local woods;**
- ii) Touched her leg;**
- iii) Kissed her;**
- iv) Engaged in sexual activity with her;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

e) In or around April 2015 you:

- i) Drove Pupil A to a country lane;**
- ii) Engaged in sexual activity with her;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

f) Engaged in sexual activity with her on one or more occasions in or around August 2015;

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

- g) Exchanged inappropriate electronic messages with her including:**
 - i) Discussion of drinking alcohol and/or Pupil A being drunk;**
 - ii) Discussion of Pupil A using your hot-tub whilst naked;**
 - iii) Discussion of looking at her bottom whilst she was wearing a leotard;**
 - iv) Requesting that Pupil A send you an image of herself whilst she was drunk;**
 - v) Requesting that Pupil A send a further image with her top pulled down and/or whilst not wearing a bra whilst she was drunk;**
 - vi) Discussion about sexual activity between Pupil A and yourself;**
 - vii) Stating “it definitely will” with reference to whether sexual activity would take place between Pupil A and yourself;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

- 2) At an investigation meeting on 1 September 2014 concerning your conduct towards Pupil A as detailed at Allegation 1(b) you:**
 - a) Failed to mention your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1(a);**
 - b) Failed to mention your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1(g);**
 - c) Stated that you had not exchanged mobile telephone numbers with Pupil A when in fact he had exchanged electronic messages with her;**
 - d) Stated that you had not contacted Pupil A after the incident prior to September 2014 when in fact you had exchanged electronic messages with Pupil A after the incident including:**
 - i) On 18 July 2018 stating that you should have gone to her house after the incident;**
 - ii) On 18 July 2018 stating that you hoped Pupil A had had a good night;**

iii) On or around 19-20 July when you asked Pupil A what she had told Colleague B about the incident;

iv) On or around 19-20 July when you asked Pupil A to “cover” you and tell Individual C that nothing had happened between you prior to the incident;

The panel noted that there appeared to be a typographical error in the date set out in allegations 2(d)(i) and (ii). From the statement of facts and the other evidence, it appears that the date alleged should be 2014. These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

3) Sought to conceal your relationship with Pupil A by:

- a) Blocking Pupil A and/or deleting Snapchat to avoid her being seen in your regular contacts with Colleague B;**
- b) Instructing her via electronic message not to tell anyone about your relationship;**
- c) Sending a message to Pupil A stating “best stay that way” with reference to her keeping your relationship a secret;**
- d) Instructing Pupil A to delete messages between you;**
- e) Instructing Pupil A not to attend a play at the school campus on or around 21 July 2014 following the events outlined at Allegation 1(b) above;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

4) Your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1(c)-(g) was notwithstanding written advice issued to you on or around 3rd September 2014 to the effect that:

- a) You should not be alone with Pupil A;**
- b) You should not exchange mobile numbers with Pupil A;**

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved.

5) Your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation (1) was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated;

These allegations were admitted unequivocally by Mr Reed. They were also supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. The panel therefore found them proved. The conduct admitted involved the exchange of messages about sexual activity and sexual activity itself. The panel concluded that the written evidence supported the allegation that Mr Reed was motivated by his own sexual gratification.

6) Your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 2(d)(iv) and (3) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

These allegations were admitted and were supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle, the allegations were therefore found proved. The panel was satisfied that on the facts as Mr Reed knew them to be, an ordinary decent member of the public would consider his behaviour to be dishonest. It also lacked integrity, falling below the standards expected of teachers by the public and the profession.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Reed in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Reed 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, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Reed fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. He took advantage of one of his pupils by developing a sexual relationship with her. This included sexual conduct and activity when she was under the influence of alcohol, and therefore vulnerable. As a teacher he should have taken steps to safeguard her and protect her rights, but instead, he took advantage of her for his own sexual gratification. When his conduct was first noticed by others, he sought to cover it up and instructed Pupil A to do the same. He was not open and honest during the initial investigation, and concealed the full extent of his misconduct. He then went on to continue the relationship, despite having been given advice by the School not to be alone with Pupil A or exchange mobile numbers with her. His unprofessional conduct lasted for over a year, and had an adverse impact on Pupil A's well-being both at the time and subsequently.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Reed was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

The panel therefore found that Mr Reed'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 protection of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Reed, which involved a prolonged breach of professional boundaries, abuse of trust, and sexual misconduct, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Reed, including dishonesty and a lack of integrity, were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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

Notwithstanding 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 Mr Reed.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Reed. 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 are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

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.

In the light of the panel's findings, there was no evidence that Mr Reed's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Reed was acting under duress. In fact, the panel found Mr Reed's actions to be motivated by his own sexual gratification.

The panel had limited information about Mr Reed's history but saw no evidence that he was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings. He did not provide any character evidence, but the panel noted his assertion that he had a successful history of teaching GCSE, A-level and BTEC.

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Reed 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 Mr Reed. The seriousness and wide scope of his misconduct, and the absence of evidence of insight on his part 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. 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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include serious dishonesty and serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used his professional position to influence or exploit a person.

The panel found that Mr Reed was responsible for serious sexual misconduct which resulted in or had the potential to result in harm to Pupil A, had used his professional position to influence or exploit her, and been dishonest about his conduct.

Mr Reed has made full admissions, but the panel was not satisfied that there were any genuine indicators of remorse or insight into the effect of his conduct on Pupil A. His apology focussed on the impact on himself, not Pupil A or the wider public interest.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Reed should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Reed 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, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 finds that the conduct of Mr Reed fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct 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 Mr Reed, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, Mr Reed “took advantage of one of his pupils by developing a sexual relationship with her. This included sexual conduct and activity when she was under the influence of alcohol, and therefore vulnerable.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future. I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “Mr Reed has made full admissions, but the panel was not satisfied that there were any genuine indicators of remorse or insight into the effect of his conduct on Pupil A.”

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at pupils at risk. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Reed, including dishonesty and a lack of integrity, were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, 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 Mr Reed himself. The panel observe “there was no evidence that Mr Reed's actions were not deliberate” and “there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Reed was acting under duress. In fact, the panel found Mr Reed's actions to be motivated by his own sexual gratification.”

I have observed that the panel had limited information about Mr Reed's history but saw no evidence that he was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Reed from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, Mr Reed's “apology focussed on the impact on himself, not Pupil A or the wider public interest.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Reed's conduct “involved a prolonged breach of professional boundaries, abuse of trust, and sexual misconduct.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Reed has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition 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 remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments that “Mr Reed was responsible for serious sexual misconduct which resulted in or had the potential to result in harm to Pupil A, had used his professional position to influence or exploit her, and been dishonest about his conduct.”

I have considered whether allowing for a no review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the

profession. In this case, I consider five factors mean that a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These factors are, the prolonged breach of professional boundaries, the abuse of trust, the sexual misconduct, dishonesty, and the lack of either insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Joshua Reed is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Reed shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Joshua Reed has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Knowles', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 17 June 2021

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