



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Joanna Broad- Reeder: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

March 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher:	Ms Joanna Broad-Reeder
Teacher ref number:	8937649
Teacher date of birth:	12 February 1967
TRA reference:	23523
Date of determination:	7 March 2025
Former employer:	St Margaret Ward Catholic Academy, Stoke-on-Trent

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 7 March 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Joanna Broad-Reeder.

The panel members were Mrs Julie Wells (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Nigel Shock (lay panellist) and Mr Philip Thompson (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Benjamin Lewins of Birketts 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 Ms Broad-Reeder that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Broad-Reeder provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Sophie Allen of Kingsley Napley LLP, Ms Broad-Reeder or any representative for Ms Broad-Reeder.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 27 January 2025 (the panel being satisfied that Ms Broad-Reeder had waived her entitlement to 10 weeks' notice of the meeting).

It was alleged that Ms Broad-Reeder was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working at St Margaret Ward Catholic Academy:

1. Between and/or around September 2022 and January 2024, she had an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, a pupil she taught at her former employer St Thomas More School, in that while Pupil A was under 18, she:
 - a) Arranged to meet and/or met outside of school;
 - b) Exchanged telephone numbers;
 - c) Exchanged messages of a personal nature.

Ms Broad-Reeder admitted the facts of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) and that her behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute falling short of the standards of behaviour expected of a teacher, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Broad-Reeder on 13 January 2025.

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: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 6
- Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 7 to 14
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations– pages 15 to 21
- Section 4: TRA documents – pages 22 to 183

- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 184 to 189
- Section 6: Notice of Meeting – page 190 to 191

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Broad-Reeder on 13 January 2025, and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 17 January 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

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

Ms Broad-Reeder commenced employment at St Thomas More Catholic High School ('the School'), on the 1 January 2022.

Ms Broad-Reeder was a supply teacher covering for Pupil A's form tutor at the School, until Pupil A left the School in July 2022.

Ms Broad-Reeder left her employment at the School and commenced employment at St Margaret Ward Catholic Academy ('the Academy'), on the 5 September 2022.

Pupil A started at [REDACTED] and disclosed that he and Ms Broad-Reeder had been messaging via WhatsApp and met up on one or more occasions between and/or around September 2022 and January 2024.

The matter was referred to the TRA on the 8 April 2024, by the Academy.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. Between and/or around September 2022 and January 2024, you had an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, a pupil you taught at your former employer St Thomas More School, in that while Pupil A was under 18, you:

a) Arranged to meet and/or met outside of school;

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Broad-Reeder on 13 January 2025. In this statement of agreed facts, Ms Broad-Reeder admitted the particulars of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c). Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel considered the notes of Pupil A's disclosure, dated 27 February 2024. The notes stated that Pupil A had said whilst he was at the School, he became close with a supply teacher who was covering for his form tutor, and they remained in touch after she left the School. The notes stated that Pupil A said he met up with Ms Broad-Reeder on numerous occasions, going for a meal, to an art gallery and the cinema.

The panel also considered an email sent by Ms Broad-Reeder to Kingsley Napley, in which she stated she *"[...] did meet up with the student to attend various films, plays, Art exhibitions and concerts[...]"*.

The panel found that it was inappropriate for Ms Broad-Reeder to meet and/or to arrange to meet Pupil A in these circumstances.

The panel found allegation 1(a) proven.

b) Exchanged telephone numbers;

c) Exchanged messages of a personal nature.

The panel considered screenshots of WhatsApp messages between Ms Broad-Reeder and Pupil A.

The panel noted the following messages from Ms Broad-Reeder to Pupil A in particular:

- *"[...]Just this very moment, I realise what it is I feel for you. It is love – a love of who I used to be and who I longed for when I was young – which was you.[...]"* (47)
- *"[...]Btw- the deep connection is rare- I don't have it with [Person B] but I still married him- I didn't settle, he was just 'right'. But what I have with you, is what I've spent my whole life believing in- I just expected it to be with someone of a similar age.[...]"* (54)
- *"[...]I think you are stunning – I didn't see your masculinity at school – I do now, I think you dress beautifully.[...]"* (54)

- “[...]I see you as a very close friend/ soul mate, but I definitely don’t think some people would see it like that. As if you’d be interested in my historical sex life anyway!!![...]” (56)
- “[...]She thinks I’m in love with you. What do you think?...You are just my soul mate.[...]” (58)
- “Miss you x” (60)
- “I miss our chats. It feels like it was something I’d dreamt. Surreal and beautiful – but I’m left with a howling emptiness in believing everything you said [...]” (60)
- “[...]I know I can’t change how I feel and know nothing can come of it because of the huge age gap, (that’s if you do feel the same way).[...]” (61)
- “No matter what you say. You are the other half of me and I am the other half of you. We both feel it. – not just me. Otherwise everything you’ve said is a lie and I don’t believe that. You are so kind and selfless. Thank you. I know you.” (72)

The panel noted the picture of prose written by Ms Broad-Reeder and sent to Pupil A, reading:

“Her fingers stretched out tentatively, each one searching, humming with awareness and fear.

A whisper of a touch. So gentle-almost invisible, like soft voile moving in a summer breeze, leaving a burning on her fingertips, their whorls scolded by his skin.

Still trembling, she reached out again. This time three finger tips found him, traced the outline of his cheek, the soft stubble with smooth. How beautiful. How achingly beautiful.

In her head, she drew a map of him, memorising him as each finger discovered new land: The angles of his chin, the sweep of his jaw, the soft dip around his nostrils, the ridge of his nose. Up, up to the fragile delicateness of his eye lids, the skin almost transparent; the fine, blue etchings of his life gracing the surface.

Her fingers talked to her soul, saying ‘remember, remember’ as she softly journeyed over the warmth of his skin.

The fear beat loudly in her ears and her whole body felt alive and sick and wonderful at the same time.

Her fingers burnt still.

Down, down to the shallow furrow above his lips.

Fear made her tremble and she stopped, her heart thudding and she thought she might stop breathing.

Dizzy, and shaking she continued, tracing the outline of the blush pink swellings, reading his lips like braille.

Her breath caught as his lips opened slightly and she saw the ivory of his teeth, her finger tips bare[ly] touching the surface. Fear and the need colliding.

She stood back and looked at him in wonder, searched his dark eyes, asking the question, his face burning into her soul.” (85)

The panel considered the notes of Pupil A’s disclosure, dated 27 February 2024. The notes stated that Pupil A said Ms Broad-Reeder discussed sex with him in general terms, and that she told him she loved him in March 2023.

The panel also considered a WhatsApp message from Pupil A to Ms Broad-Reeder sending a picture of the ‘prose’ referred to above and asking “...is it you or do you just have a literary genius in your class?” and Ms Broad-Reeder responding, “It’s me about you”.

The panel found clear evidence that Ms Broad-Reeder and Pupil A had exchanged telephone numbers and exchanged messages of a personal nature, both via WhatsApp and the prose set out above.

Ms Broad-Reeder stated that when she first met Pupil A, she was astounded by his intellect, maturity and love of the arts. She stated it was never sexual, but she was in awe of his brain and intelligence, and he reminded her of a better version of herself at his age. The panel made no findings about the motivation of the messages exchanged, only that they were inappropriate in tone and content and demonstrated an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

The panel found allegations 1(b) and 1(c) proven.

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

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Broad-Reeder in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Broad-Reeder 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Broad-Reeder fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession, as she had developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A over a sustained period.

The panel also considered whether Ms Broad-Reeder's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of controlling or coercive behaviour was relevant. In doing so, the panel considered the nature of the messages sent by Ms Broad-Reeder including one that apportioned blame on Pupil A for not responding to her messages sooner stating, "[...] *I'm so pissed off now! You read my text and didn't even bother to make a short reply[...]*" (71) and "[...] *I was angry because I was worried about you [...]*" (80).

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Broad-Reeder 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 Ms Broad-Reeder's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars of allegation 1 proved, the panel further found that Ms Broad-Reeder conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct/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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession; and
- that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Broad-Reeder, which involved the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Broad-Reeder 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 Ms Broad-Reeder was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator and/or that she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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 Ms Broad-Reeder. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

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 Ms Broad-Reeder. 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 pupils);
- any abuse of any trust, knowledge or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- violation of the rights of pupils; and
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

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 Broad-Reeder's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence that Ms Broad-Reeder was acting under extreme duress.

There was no evidence that Ms Broad-Reeder demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered the written statement of Ms Broad-Reeder, who set out that it was never her intent to bring the profession into disrepute, and that she is proud to be a teacher.

The panel also considered Ms Broad-Reeder long service in the teaching profession which had previously been unblemished.

Ms Broad-Reeder stated that she met Pupil A's mother several times and took him home numerous times when his parents couldn't pick him up. She stated that his parents never once got in touch or expressed any concerns over her friendship with Pupil A. The panel considered that the knowledge, or even the approval, of Pupil A's mother did not absolve Ms Broad-Reeder of her responsibility to uphold the standards of the teaching profession.

Ms Broad-Reeder stated that as she was no longer at the School, she foolishly thought that as it was a friendship it would not be deemed inappropriate. The panel considered that given her length of service in the profession, Ms Broad-Reeder should have known that her relationship with Pupil A was inappropriate notwithstanding that she no longer taught Pupil A or the knowledge of Pupil A's mother.

The panel considered statements made by Ms Broad-Reeder in various emails sent to Kingsley-Napley and in particular the following:

- *"[...] I totally understand that I may have exceeded the parameters [...]"* (184)
- *"[...] I am only guilty of emotionally caring for and enjoying sharing the Arts with the pupil [...]"* (185)
- *"[...] I understand completely why I have been seen to bring the teaching profession into disrepute, although this was never my intent [...]"* (187)
- *"[...] I agree that it now seems as unprofessional and totally accept that some of my actions were not best thought through [...]"* (188)
- *"[...] I am filled with regret and grief at the loss of my career, the loss of my good reputation, the shame and the loss of a friendship I hoped would be with me till I die [...]"* (189)

The panel considered the statements and apologies made by Ms Broad-Reeder, including those referenced above. However, the panel did not consider these to be persuasive mitigation for her actions. The panel considered Ms Broad-Reeder's

apologies to be framed in such a manner that they did not show true insight or remorse. The panel found that Ms Broad-Reeder's focus was largely on the detrimental impact of her actions on herself, rather than on Pupil A.

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 Ms Broad-Reeder 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 Broad-Reeder. The panel's findings against Ms Broad-Reeder, which involved developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, 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. The panel found none of these behaviours to be relevant.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. The panel found none of these behaviours to be relevant.

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 of 4 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 sanctions and review period.

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

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Joanna Broad-Reeder should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 4 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Broad-Reeder 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Broad-Reeder fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of an inappropriate relationship over a sustained period with a pupil whom she had taught at her former employer and who was under 18.

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

of unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Broad-Reeder, 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 has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Broad-Reeder, which involved the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public." 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. The panel has observed that it considered statements and apologies made by Ms Broad-Reeder but that it "did not consider these to be persuasive mitigation for her actions. The panel considered Ms Broad-Reeder's apologies to be framed in such a manner that they did not show true insight or remorse. The panel found that Ms Broad-Reeder's focus was largely on the detrimental impact of her actions on herself, rather than on Pupil A." In my judgement, the lack of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. 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 that "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Broad-Reeder were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of developing an inappropriate relationship with a pupil 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 or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Broad-Reeder herself. The panel has noted that "There was no evidence that Ms Broad-Reeder demonstrated

exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector.” The panel has also noted that it “considered Ms Broad-Reeder long service in the teaching profession which had previously been unblemished.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Broad-Reeder 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 concerning the serious nature of the misconduct. The panel has said that “given her length of service in the profession, Ms Broad-Reeder should have known that her relationship with Pupil A was inappropriate notwithstanding that she no longer taught Pupil A or the knowledge of Pupil A’s mother.” I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Ms Broad-Reeder 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 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 4-year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of 4 years.”

The panel has noted that none of the behaviours that the Advice indicates would weigh favour of a longer review period are relevant in this case. I am mindful that the Advice states that it does not provide an exhaustive list of behaviours and that panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances. In this case, the panel has found that Ms Broad-Reeder abused a position of trust and developed an inappropriate relationship with a pupil over a sustained period. I am also mindful of the panel’s finding that Ms Broad-Reeder “did not show true insight or remorse” which in my judgement means that there is some risk of repetition of this behaviour.

I have considered whether a 4-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 2-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the behaviour found proven, the lack of insight or remorse, and the potential damage to the public's perception of the teaching profession.

I consider therefore that a 4-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Ms Joanna Broad-Reeder 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 18 March 2029, 4 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 Broad-Reeder remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Joanna Broad-Reeder has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

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

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 12 March 2025

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