



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Ms Jade W-Reid  
**Respondent:** 1. Anzuk Education Ltd  
2. Canons High School

## RECORD OF A PUBLIC PRELIMINARY HEARING

**Heard at:** Watford Employment Tribunal  
**On:** 9 May 2025  
**Before:** Employment Judge Alliott

### Representation

**Claimant:** In person  
**First Respondent:** Ms Victoria Hall (litigation consultant)  
**Second Respondent:** Ms Karen Minto (counsel)

## JUDGMENT

The judgment of the tribunal is that:

1. The claimant was at all material times disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010 by reason of dyslexia.

## REASONS

1. This preliminary hearing was directed by Employment Judge Cowen on 18 June 2024:
  - 1.1 To determine whether the Second Respondent should remain a party.
  - 1.2 To determine whether the claimant is a disabled person.
  - 1.3 To make case management orders for final hearing and listing.

### Disability

### **The law**

2. Section 6 of the Equality Act 2010 provides as follows:-

“6 Disability

(1) A person (P) has a disability if—

- (a) P has a physical or mental impairment, and
- (b) the impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on P's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.”

3. Section 212 of the Equality Act 2010 provides that:

“Substantial” means more than minor or trivial”

4. The Guidance on matters to be taken into account in determining questions relating to the definition of disability (2011) provides at B2:-

“The time taken to carry out an activity

B2. The time taken by a person with an impairment to carry out a normal day to day activity should be considered when assessing whether the effect of that impairment is substantial. It should be compared with the time it might take a person who did not have the impairment to complete an activity.”

**The facts**

- 5. In 2010 the claimant was assessed by a Chartered Psychologist and diagnosed with dyslexia,
- 6. The respondents accept that the claimant has the mental/physical impairment of dyslexia and that that has been long-term; indeed it is lifelong.
- 7. The issue in this case is whether it has a substantial adverse effect on the claimant's ability to undertake normal day to day activities.
- 8. The 2010 report contains the following in the “summary” section:-

“Summary.

- Jade's cognitive abilities are generally within the population average range.
- Jade's relative strengths are in her categorical thinking and analogical reasoning.
- Jade's working memory index is significantly lower than her other cognitive indices.
- Jade's phonological processing is significantly lower than expected.
- Jade's comprehension of text content is significantly lower than her ability to decode (read) the text.
- Jade is a relatively slow reader; around 110 words per minute (silent).
- Jade's writing speed is low; around 19 words per minute (prose).

- Jade's cognitive and literacy profile indicates that she is dyslexic."

9. In terms of reading speed the report makes clear that for a degree educated individual a reading speed of 200 words per minute would be expected. Thus, the claimant's ability to read is significantly reduced to just over 50%.
10. The claimant was reassessed on 25 February 2025 by a Professor Registered Educational & Occupational Psychologist. The conclusion to his report is as follows:-

"Conclusion

Dyslexia is inherited and is a lifelong condition. In particular, the processing problems associated with the syndrome persist and continue to undermine performance. Although Jade has done well academically and professionally she still has difficulties with silent reading speed and comprehension, as well as proofreading. Her spelling skills are unreliable. Diagnostic testing shows that she continues to have trouble with the processing of information in working memory, notably in verbal short term memory and naming ability. As these explain the difficulties she had experienced it is appropriate to confirm that Jade has dyslexia. Even before her formal identification when a student she will have had dyslexia, and it will have been a persisting problem over the years. At no time during her academic or professional career will she not have had dyslexia.

Jade meets the criteria for disability outlined in the Equality Act 2010, having a mental impairment that is long standing and permanent. It has a substantial impact on day to day activities as it is undermining skills essential to her job, such as fluent and efficient reading, comprehension, spelling and proofreading."

11. Notwithstanding the opinion of the Professor, the issue of disability is obviously one for myself.
12. I had an impact statement and heard evidence from the claimant.
13. There is no suggestion that there are any activities that the claimant cannot do. It is really the length of time taken that the claimant relies upon in support of her disabled status.
14. I found aspects of the claimant's evidence to be exaggerated. I note that in her ET1 claim form she has expressly pleaded:-

"My disability has never impacted me at Canons High School..."

15. In my judgment, needing to shop with a list, misplacing clothes, needing a timer when cooking and taking a minute or two longer to change classrooms are no more than trivial or minor effects. Her difficulties with a computer are due to the software not her dyslexia. In particular, the claimant's assertion that interaction with colleagues and speaking aloud could pose problems I found to be totally at variance with how she gave evidence. The claimant is clearly articulate, confident and intelligent.
16. However, I do accept that her reading, writing and therefore her ability to prepare documents are substantially adversely affected in that they take her longer to do.

Further, I find her memory and comprehension are substantially adversely affected in that her reliance on notes goes beyond what could be expected and it takes her longer to comprehend text. I find that all of these issues are features of her day to day life. Reading, writing, comprehension and a good short-term memory are ordinary day to day activities, all of which I find were substantially adversely affected at all material times.

17. Consequently, in my judgment, the claimant was disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010 at all material times by reason of dyslexia.

Second Respondent

18. It was accepted that the Second Respondent should remain a party.

Case Management

19. A separate case management order has been made.

Approved by:

**Employment Judge Alliott**

**Date** 28 May 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON  
25 June 2025  
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

**Notes**

All judgments (apart from judgments under Rule 51) and any written reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions> shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimants and respondents.

If a Tribunal hearing has been recorded, you may request a transcript of the recording. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, you will have to pay for it. If a transcript is produced it will not include any oral judgment or reasons given at the hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings and accompanying Guidance, which can be found here:

[www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/](https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/)