



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Jennifer Howie: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

March 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	19
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	23

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

Teacher:	Miss Jennifer Howie
Teacher ref number:	0059760
Teacher date of birth:	01 December 1966
TRA reference:	23553
Date of determination:	27 March 2026
Former employer:	Kingsthorpe College, Northampton

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 23 to 27 March 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Miss Jennifer Howie.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist) and Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Samantha Cass of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alex Mullen of QEB Hollis Whiteman, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP.

Miss Howie was present and was represented by Mr Joseph Chiffers, JSC Chambers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 19 December 2025.

It was alleged that you were guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a teacher at Kingsthorpe College (the “College”):

1. In or around May 2021 to in or around June 2021, you:
 - a. Added notes and/or comments to the work of Student A and/or amended the work of Student A prior to the submission of their BTEC National Extended Certificate in [REDACTED];
 - b. Added notes and/or comments to the work of Student B and/or amended the work of Student B prior to the submission of their BTEC Tech Award in [REDACTED];
 - c. You did not report that you had amended the work of Student A to the College once you realised that you had done so.
2. By reason of your conduct in 1a and/or 1b above you provided improper assistance to one or more students and/or committed one or more acts of malpractice
3. Your conduct at 1 (a) and/or 1 (b) and/or 1 (c) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.
4. On or around 17 March 2023, you:
 - a. Shouted and/or swore at members of College staff;
 - b. Behaved aggressively and/or in a threatening manner towards members of College staff;
 - c. Demonstrated physically aggressive behaviour towards Colleague 1 in that you pointed your finger aggressively at his chest; and/or
 - d. Used racist language to describe students at the College.
5. Your conduct at 4(d) was racist and/or offensive and/or derogatory.
6. Your conduct in allegations 4a and/or 4b above was in the vicinity of students.

[REDACTED]

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 7 to 10

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 11 to 19

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 20 to 40

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 41 to 1325

Section 5: Teacher's documents – pages 1326 to 1425

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- JH Disclosure bundle – 13 pages
- Email communications – 11 pages

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the Procedures.

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED];

Witness B – [REDACTED];

Witness C – [REDACTED]; and

Miss Howie was present at the hearing and gave oral evidence.

Witness D - Miss Howie also called [REDACTED] as a witness in the case.

Individual A - [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Miss Howie commenced employment as deputy director of business and ICT at Kingsthorpe College ('the College') on 4 November 2019.

In May 2021, concerns were raised regarding Miss Howie's alleged assistance to students for the non-examined assessment portion of their BTEC qualifications. It was alleged that Miss Howie had accessed the students' work and made amendments and additions.

The College conducted an internal investigation into the allegations raised.

Miss Howie was invited to a disciplinary hearing regarding the allegations. It was alleged that at this meeting Miss Howie became aggressive and began shouting at other members of staff using explicit language. It was alleged that her behaviour was aggressive and threatening and that she had used racially discriminatory language regarding students.

On 16 April 2024, the matter was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. In or around May 2021 to in or around June 2021, you:

- a. Added notes and/or comments to the work of Student A and/or amended the work of Student A prior to the submission of their BTEC National Extended Certificate in [REDACTED];**

The panel noted that Miss Howie denied this allegation.

The panel considered the oral evidence and witness statement of Witness A, who stated in her witness statement that concerns about Student A's work being amended were first raised by Student A's mother, as Student A had discovered work that was not his own in his coursework documents.

The panel considered the written statement of Student A dated 27 May 2021 which was collected as part of the College's investigation and prepared shortly after the events relevant to this allegation. The panel noted that this was hearsay evidence and that it should attach the appropriate amount of weight to it. Student A had stated that, during a [REDACTED], Miss Howie had assisted him in creating a Microsoft Word document

which she then showed him how to share with her. Student A had then started to complete his coursework, with “a few pointers to support” from Miss Howie. A few days later, he described opening the document and finding 10 pages of work, of which only two to three pages were his own work. Student A had stated his belief that Miss Howie had completed the work for him as he had received an email which said that Miss Howie had accessed the document on two occasions over the previous days. Student A stated that, when he subsequently opened the document, large parts of the work had been deleted and replaced with instructions and what appeared to be a writing frame. The panel noted that Student A had said there was still some of Miss Howie’s work in the new document.

The panel considered the statement from Student A’s mother. Although the panel noted that this was also hearsay evidence, the statement confirmed that Student A had reported amendments having been made to his work. Student A’s statement and the supporting hearsay evidence from Student A’s mother were consistent with the suggestion that changes had been made without Student A’s knowledge or consent. The events were also reported promptly.

The panel considered screenshots in the bundle of documents before it which showed the audit logs from Student A’s work, as referenced by Witness A in her oral evidence. These logs showed Miss Howie accessing and editing Student A’s work from 10 May 2021, and deleting versions of the file on 19 May 2021. The panel considered that, on review of these logs, they showed how and when Student A’s work was accessed and changes made during the relevant period.

The panel considered the documents in the bundle which showed two versions of Student A’s work compared with tracked changes. The panel noted that there were significant deletions between the two versions. The panel noted that the second version had removed large sections of text and had instead inserted prompts such as “Explain what inflation is”, which could be seen as part of a writing frame.

The panel considered Miss Howie’s oral evidence at the hearing alongside the written account that she had given as part of the College’s investigation. The panel considered Miss Howie’s oral evidence which was that a colleague had access to her laptop. The panel considered this carefully but, noted the discrepancy between the dates upon which Miss Howie stated that she had handed over her laptop. Furthermore, this would have required Miss Howie’s laptop to have remained on and logged in for some time. The panel did not have sufficient evidence to support any contention that a colleague had made these changes using Miss Howie’s laptop. The panel was not provided with any evidence of Miss Howie’s login credentials having been shared or compromised. The panel also considered Miss Howie’s admission that she held Student A’s work at home and that this was inconsistent with her contention that the amendments were accidental. These inconsistencies undermined the credibility of Miss Howie’s account of the events.

The panel noted that, in Miss Howie's oral evidence, she had admitted that she made changes to Student A's work, albeit that she maintained that this occurred "accidentally". Witness A's analysis of system activity showed that Miss Howie had access to Student A's work on dates that corresponded with the alterations being made. The panel was taken through the logs in detail, which demonstrated that the changes were made from Miss Howie's login. Miss Howie ultimately accepted that she had made changes to Student A's work.

The panel considered that, on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that Miss Howie had added notes and/or comments to the work of Student A and/or amended the work of student A before the submission of their BTEC National Extended Certificate in [REDACTED] on or around May 2021 to June 2021.

The panel found allegation 1(a) proved.

b. Added notes and/or comments to the work of Student B and/or amended the work of Student B prior to the submission of their BTEC Tech Award in [REDACTED];

The panel noted that Miss Howie denied this allegation.

The panel considered the oral and written evidence of Witness A, who described in her written statement how she had reviewed Miss Howie's access to students' work on Microsoft 365 after the concerns were raised regarding Student A and discovered that Student B's work had also been accessed by Miss Howie.

The panel considered the written statement of Student B dated 29 June 2021 which was collected as part of the College's investigation. Student B stated that Miss Howie had told him to ignore a checklist of improvement from his teacher, and to share his work with her online. Student B stated that, after sending his work to Miss Howie, he could see a notification in the top right of the document which said it had been edited by Miss Howie. Student B described scrolling through the document and seeing additional text which he did not write and noticing that things he had written were no longer there but "replaced with Miss' words". The panel also considered the copy of Student B's work where the student had highlighted the text which was not his own. The panel noted that the highlighted sections represented significant additions to the student's work. The panel noted that Student B had stated in written evidence that he saw wording within his assignment which he had not written and which he believed came from Miss Howie.

The panel considered Miss Howie's written response to follow up questions asked as part of the College's internal investigation. Miss Howie had submitted that the sections highlighted by Student B as additions were poorly written and grammatically incorrect and appeared to have been written by a student, not a teacher.

The panel considered screenshots in the bundle of documents before it which showed the activity reports and audit logs from Student B's work. These screenshots showed the dates that the documents were accessed and modified by the student and by Miss Howie. The panel considered that, on review of these logs, they showed how and when Student B's work was accessed and changes made during the relevant period.

The panel considered the documents in the bundle which showed two versions of Student B's work compared with tracked changes. The panel noted that there were significant deletions between the two versions. The panel noted that the changes to the work was inconsistent with Student B's authorship. The panel also considered the examples which were summarised by Witness A showing the alterations and substitution of Student B's language.

The panel considered Miss Howie's oral evidence. Miss Howie provided explanations similar to those offered for allegation 1(a). Miss Howie initially denied making the changes, then stated that she was under significant pressure [REDACTED]. Although the panel could not necessarily attribute all amendments to Miss Howie as some of them were written in Student B's style of language, it considered that there was sufficient evidence that a significant number of amendments were made by Miss Howie.

The panel considered that, on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that Miss Howie had added notes and/or comments to the work of Student B and/or amended the work of Student B before the submission of their BTEC Tech Award in [REDACTED] on or around May 2021 to June 2021.

The panel found allegation 1(b) proved.

c. You did not report that you had amended the work of Student A to the College once you realised that you had done so.

The panel noted that Miss Howie denied this allegation.

The panel considered Miss Howie's response to the allegations as provided during the College's internal investigation. The panel noted that Miss Howie stated that she had been producing an exemplar report which could be used as a guide for learners to follow. She then realised that she had mistakenly been doing this within Student A's coursework document and that the document had autosaved to his file. She stated that she corrected the mistake when she realised what had happened.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness A, who in her written statement described Miss Howie's response to the allegations. Miss Howie had told Witness A that she had thought she was creating model answers and not editing a student's work. The panel considered Witness A's statement that there was a time delay between the addition of work and its deletion when Miss Howie had realised her mistake. The panel considered that, in this time Miss Howie could have reported this issue to the College but did not.

The panel considered Miss Howie's written response to follow up questions asked as part of the College's internal investigation. Miss Howie explained that she had not reported the error to the College because "I don't have a line manager at present and didn't realise this would be considered a problem, as I said it was just my mistake".

The panel considered Miss Howie's oral evidence during which she accepted that she had not told anyone at the College about the amendments. The panel noted the context which Miss Howie provided around this admission which was that she did not have a line manager at the time and that it was a mistake not to have reported this to anyone. However, the panel also noted that Miss Howie had given oral evidence that she "did not think" to report it and did not realise it would be a problem not to do so. The panel noted Miss Howie's admission in oral evidence that she had not reported the matter to any manager or colleague and that she had acknowledged that she could have raised this with another member of staff. The panel also noted that Miss Howie stated in oral evidence that, if she had a line manager, she "might have mentioned it in passing". The panel considered that this was evidence that Miss Howie knew the work had been amended and deleted. The panel therefore considered that Miss Howie had subsequently taken no steps to alert anyone at the College of the amendments that had been made or the reasons for doing so.

The panel considered that, on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that, on or around May 2021 to June 2021, Miss Howie had failed to report to the College that she had amended the work of Student A once she realised that she had done so.

The panel found allegation 1(c) proved.

2. By reason of your conduct in 1a and/or 1b above you provided improper assistance to one or more students and/or committed one or more acts of malpractice

The panel considered the Joint Council for Qualifications: Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures ("JCQ Procedures") as provided in the bundle. The JCQ Procedures define improper assistance as "Any act where assistance is given beyond that permitted by the specification or regulations to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment. For example: assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessment, coursework, nonexamination assessment or portfolios, beyond that permitted by the regulations."

The panel also noted the JCQ definition of malpractice as "any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations or which: gives rise to prejudice to candidates; and/or compromises public confidence in qualifications; and/or compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification nor the validity of a result or certificate; and/or damages the authority,

reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre.”

The panel considered the College’s Non-Examination Assessment Policy as provided in the bundle which emphasises the responsibility on teaching staff to be alert to the risk of malpractice and expressly provides that subject teachers “will not provide candidates with model answers or outlines/headings specific to the task” and that they will only give “oral and written advice at a general level to candidates”. These requirements reinforced that the type of conduct found proved under allegations 1(a) and 1(b), namely the substantive alteration and addition to students’ assessed work fell outside the scope of permissible support to students and constituted the type of conduct the policy was designed to prevent.

The panel considered the Pearson report which identifies “improper assistance to candidates which results in an advantage” as an example of malpractice. The panel concluded that the amendments made by Miss Howie had the clear potential to confer an academic advantage and therefore fell squarely within this category.

The panel considered Miss Howie’s response to the allegations as provided during the College’s internal investigation. Miss Howie stated she “can assure you I did not provide him with anymore assistance than is allowed within the Edexcel qualification”. However, the panel did not consider the explanation that the material was merely exemplar content to be plausible or realistic in the circumstances. The panel found that the nature and substance of the amendments went well beyond exemplar guidance and instead constituted the production of answers and/or content that could directly improve the students’ work.

Accordingly, based on the relevant procedures and guidance and the definitions of improper assistance and malpractice and, having found the conduct at allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proved, the panel concluded that Miss Howie had provided improper assistance to one or more students and had committed acts of malpractice in doing so.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

3. Your conduct at 1 (a) and/or 1 (b) and/or 1 (c) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

The panel considered whether Miss Howie had acted dishonestly and, in doing so, had regard to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*. The panel therefore approached the question in two stages: firstly, by considering Miss Howie’s actual state of knowledge or belief as to the relevant facts and, secondly, by considering whether, viewed objectively, her conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the actual state of Miss Howie's knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel examined the evidence relating to Miss Howie's understanding of her actions when she amended Students A and B's work and subsequently failed to report doing so. The panel considered Miss Howie's job application for the role of Deputy Director of Business and ICT dated 5 September 2019. The application detailed the professional courses Miss Howie had attended as a teacher, including a 2016 course on "BTEC Level 3 Nationals: Delivering Externally and Internally Assessed Units". The panel also considered the references provided by Miss Howie's previous employers. Both referees described Miss Howie as "always" displaying "Extensive knowledge and well-informed understanding of the assessment requirements and arrangements for the subjects/curriculum applicant teaches".

The panel considered Miss Howie's response to the allegations as provided during the College's internal investigation. She stated that she corrected her mistake when she realised what had happened and later explained that she had not reported the error to the College because "I don't have a line manager at present and didn't realise this would be considered a problem, as I said it was just my mistake". The panel also considered her live evidence, in which she accepted that she had amended the work and had subsequently deleted or attempted to remove those amendments.

The panel took account of Miss Howie's medical evidence provided, including the reports from Occupational Health. However, the panel found that, while this referenced health factors, it did not provide evidence that Miss Howie lacked the capacity to appreciate the nature or wrongfulness of her actions. The documentation did not explicitly link any medical condition or medication to any impairment in Miss Howie's capacity to understand, although the panel accepted that it could have this effect.

Having considered all the evidence, the panel concluded that Miss Howie knew she was altering the students' work, knew she should not have done so, and understood that the alterations were wrong. This was supported by the fact that she later attempted to remove what she had inserted. The panel found that this was behaviour consistent with recognising that her actions were inappropriate, and by her acceptance that she knew she had amended the work but acknowledged that she had failed to report it. The panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that she had the capacity to understand the nature of her conduct and that the subjective element of the dishonesty test was met.

The panel then went on to consider whether Miss Howie's conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel was satisfied that altering a student's assessed work, and subsequently failing to report those alterations, would clearly be

viewed as dishonest by any objective standards. The panel considered that, had another member of staff not intervened, Miss Howie's actions risked false grades being awarded to students and undermining the examination system which is a central pillar of the education system. The attempt by Miss Howie to remove the amendments she had made and the failure to report this were actions that ordinary decent people would consider indicative of dishonest behaviour.

Accordingly, the panel found that the objective element of the dishonesty test was satisfied.

The panel then went on to consider whether Miss Howie had failed to act with integrity. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*, which describes integrity as the "higher standards which society expects from professional persons".

The panel was mindful that professionals are not expected to be "paragons of virtue", but they are expected to act in accordance with the ethical and behavioural standards that underpin their professional role.

Given the panel's findings that Miss Howie acted dishonestly, and taking account of her subsequent attempts to remove the amendments and her failure to report them, the panel concluded that her conduct also demonstrated a lack of integrity. Although the panel carefully considered her [REDACTED] and the impact they may have had on her perception, the evidence did not suggest she was unaware of the ethical implications of her actions.

The panel found allegation 3 proved.

4. On or around 17 March 2023, you:

a. Shouted and/or swore at members of College staff;

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B, who described what she had witnessed on the 17 March 2023 when Miss Howie exited a meeting room within the College with the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Witness B stated that Miss Howie had been shouting loudly at Individual A, using lots of explicit language, including "you have fucking broken me, shame on you". Witness B noted in her written statement that she "felt that every other word was 'fucking'." The panel considered Witness B's oral evidence which was that Miss Howie was behaving in a disorderly and unruly manner. The panel considered Witness B's oral evidence that she saw Miss Howie being escorted from the room and being steadied on the stairs. The panel noted that Witness B stated that she recalled the specific language used by Miss Howie and that the

students described feeling scared by this. The panel found Witness B to be a credible and consistent witness.

The panel considered the oral evidence of Witness A who described Miss Howie becoming increasingly [REDACTED], dysregulated and interruptive during the meeting that she had with her.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness C, who described in his written statement being called to the conference room, where Miss Howie's meeting was being held, as raised voices could be heard. He described Miss Howie getting quite agitated and that she was shouting and becoming verbally aggressive.

The panel considered Miss Howie's oral evidence during which she acknowledged that she shouted and had become dysregulated because she was "[REDACTED]." The panel also noted that Miss Howie's oral evidence was that she was hardly able to recall the meeting and had generally a limited recollection of the events that followed.

The panel considered that there was direct, credible and consistent evidence from witnesses that Miss Howie had shouted and/or sworn at members of College staff on or around 17 March 2023. The panel also noted that Miss Howie herself and Witness D had stated that Miss Howie had shouted and therefore the panel considered the consistency of the evidence relating to this conduct.

The panel found allegation 4(a) proved.

b. Behaved aggressively and/or in a threatening manner towards members of College staff;

The panel considered the evidence of Witness C, who described in his written statement Miss Howie shouting "fucking [REDACTED]" at Individual A, [REDACTED].

The panel further considered Witness C's description of Miss Howie's comments whilst they were in the car park after she had been escorted from her hearing. The panel noted that Witness C stated that Miss Howie had made comments about other members of staff, saying their actions were "not a very Christian thing to do."

The panel considered that there was direct, credible and consistent evidence from witnesses that Miss Howie had behaved aggressively and/or in a threatening manner towards members of College staff on or around 17 March 2023. The panel also noted that witnesses had described Miss Howie's conduct as aggressive and dysregulated. Further, the panel noted that staff had reported concerns for the safety of both Miss Howie, the students who reported feeling scared and the College more generally which had resulted in a partial lockdown. The panel considered that this was supportive of the interpretation of staff that Miss Howie's conduct was aggressive and/or threatening and had the potential of escalating further.

The panel found the witnesses to be reliable and credible and considered that they had no obvious motive to give false evidence especially as they both reported having had positive professional relationships with Miss Howie leading up to the incident.

The panel noted that Miss Howie stated she had limited memory of the events, accepted she was highly distressed, and did not deny that the alleged behaviour could have occurred. She confirmed that she was “[REDACTED],” frightened, and dysregulated. The panel noted that her lack of recollection was consistent with the witnesses’ description of her emotional state during the incident but did not undermine the reliability of their accounts. The presence of vulnerable students, some of whom were distressed, and the resulting lockdown were relevant in assessing the gravity and nature of Miss Howie’s behaviour. Although not determinative of guilt, these factors supported the panel’s view that the behaviour was significant, disruptive and threatening.

The panel found allegation 4(b) proved.

c. Demonstrated physically aggressive behaviour towards Colleague 1 in that you pointed your finger aggressively at his chest; and/or

The panel considered the evidence of Witness C, who described in his witness statement Miss Howie’s behaviour towards him whilst they were in the car park after her hearing. He stated that Miss Howie had made accusations against him, including that he was [REDACTED] and there was a conspiracy against her, whilst “pointing her finger aggressively towards me”. The panel noted that Witness C did not recall whether or not Miss Howie had made physical contact. The panel noted that Witness C had described having had a good professional relationship with Miss Howie before the incident and that he was surprised by her behaviour. The panel found Witness C’s evidence to be clear and consistent and that he was a credible witness. The panel noted that his evidence was consistent with other witnesses who had reported Miss Howie’s highly aggressive and distressed state at the time of the incident.

The panel noted that Miss Howie was unable to recall all of the events and that she had accepted that this could have happened albeit she would never intend to hurt anyone and was particularly [REDACTED] at the time. The panel considered that the physical gesture was likely to have been consistent with the wider pattern of behaviour witnessed that day.

The panel considered that, on the balance of probabilities, Miss Howie was more likely than not to have demonstrated physically aggressive behaviour towards Colleague 1 by pointing her finger at his chest at the time of this incident when she was clearly in a distressed state and not acting rationally.

The panel found allegation 4(c) proved.

d. Used racist language to describe students at the College.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness C, who described in his witness statement Miss Howie's comments whilst they were in the car park after she had been escorted from her hearing. Witness C stated that Miss Howie made racist comments about a group of Pakistani students, referring to them as "those Paki boys". Witness C stated that Miss Howie's [REDACTED], Witness D, who had been present at times, was likely not present at the particular time the comment was made. In his oral evidence, Witness C clarified that, Miss Howie had, in fact, used the term "Paki boys," which he found shocking and offensive and that this stood out to him. The panel considered that the use of the term "Asians" in another colleague's statement could have been due to a reluctance to repeat the derogatory term used by Miss Howie rather than this reflecting what they believed was actually said.

The panel considered that there was no evidence of any motive of Witness C to fabricate this allegation. The panel considered that there was no evidence of conflict or personal animosity. On the contrary, Witness C described having previously had a professional and constructive working relationship with Miss Howie. The panel therefore accepted that he had no reason to invent or embellish an allegation of this nature.

During cross-examination, Witness C was asked directly whether he may have been mistaken. He was firm and unequivocal in responding and he was clear and consistent in stating that he "categorically" remembered this word being used. He acknowledged that the term was highly derogatory and inappropriate.

The panel considered the oral evidence of Witness D who did not recall specifically the alleged racist language, but she did say that there was a lot of inappropriate language and swearing taking place. The panel noted that Witness C was close by throughout the relevant events whereas Witness D had not been present for the entire incident.

The panel also took into account Miss Howie's own evidence. She stated that she could not recall the incident, given her distressed and dysregulated state at the time. The panel also noted that Miss Howie could not recall the incident but acknowledged that she could have said these words, albeit she found this comment disgusting and embarrassing.

The panel considered the wider context: Miss Howie's behaviour that day was significantly dysregulated, emotional and irrational. The use of inappropriate racist language was consistent with the broader pattern of uncontrolled and inappropriate behaviour found proved under allegations 4(a)–(c). The panel also noted that Miss Howie's inability to recall events, combined with her acceptance that she could have used such language, aligned with Witness C's account. The panel found Witness C to be a convincing and credible witness. His evidence was detailed, corroborated by the timing and setting of events, and consistent with the general escalation of Miss Howie's behaviour. His shock at hearing the language provided a logical explanation for his clear recollection.

The panel considered that, on the balance of probabilities, Miss Howie was more likely than not to have used racist language to describe students at the College at the time of this incident when she was clearly in a distressed state and not acting rationally.

The panel found allegation 4(d) proved.

5. Your conduct at 4(d) was racist and/or offensive and/or derogatory.

The panel considered the conduct found proved at allegation 4(d). The panel noted that such language as used by Miss Howie was generally considered a racial slur and unacceptable language.

The panel considered Miss Howie's written statement, in which she stated that she had no memory of what she said and she would not consider herself to be a racist. However, on the basis of the allegation 4(d), which the panel found proven, the panel considered that the language used was racist and derogatory in nature.

The panel therefore found allegation 5 proved.

6. Your conduct in allegations 4a and/or 4b above was in the vicinity of students.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness B, who in her written statement stated that the room from which Miss Howie left whilst loudly shouting explicit language on 17 March 2023 was two doors down from the special needs ("SEND") area at the College. Witness B explained that the volume of Miss Howie's shouting meant that the students in the SEND area could hear her. Witness B stated that the level of noise and an adult using such explicit language, scared some of the students in the SEND department, many of whom had sensory issues, and that one [REDACTED] student was "visibly upset". The panel further considered Witness B's statement that students were looking out of the window at Miss Howie in the car park.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness C, who in his written statement noted that Miss Howie's emotional outburst and shouting on 17 March 2023 was disruptive, particularly because the corridor in which Miss Howie was shouting was close to the SEND department. The panel noted Witness C's statement that he recalled "a couple of students walking by" at the time that Miss Howie was shouting and swearing at staff. The panel further considered Witness C's statement that the car park, where he stated that Miss Howie continued to be verbally abusive, was overlooked by three floors of the College building and he was concerned that students were looking out of the window witnessing the events.

The panel found allegation 6 proved.

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

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those 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 Miss Howie, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Howie 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions; and
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- 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 Miss Howie’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 offences of fraud or serious dishonesty; and intolerance...on the grounds of race...were relevant. Whilst the panel considered that there was evidence on the facts found proved of intolerance on the grounds of race, the panel did not consider that there was evidence that this constituted hatred on the grounds of race or indeed any other protected characteristic.

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

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

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

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

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Miss Howie was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offences of fraud or serious dishonesty; and intolerance...on the grounds of race...were relevant. Whilst the panel considered that there was evidence on the facts found proved of intolerance on the grounds of race, the panel did not consider that there was evidence that this constituted hatred on the grounds or race or indeed any other protected characteristic.

The panel considered that ordinary members of the public would find the conduct as found proven, namely examination malpractice and inappropriate behaviour, to be conduct which would bring the profession into disrepute and that Miss Howie's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

Notwithstanding the panel noting that Miss Howie was suffering with her [REDACTED] and, in particular on 17 March 2023, she was dysregulated and distressed, the panel found that Miss Howie had made the conscious decision to attend the meeting and had turned down the offer of taking a break during the meeting.

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Howie'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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the protection of other members of the public, including in this case colleagues; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Miss Howie, which involved aggressive outbursts against colleagues and shouting and swearing on College premises, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of staff/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 Miss Howie was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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 Miss Howie was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Miss Howie in the profession.

The panel noted that Miss Howie referenced her unblemished career as a teacher but there was no evidence before the panel as to Miss Howie's ability as an educator. Therefore, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Miss Howie in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 a high level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Miss Howie.

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 and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence...;
- collusion or concealment including:
 - ...concealing inappropriate actions.
- 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 Miss Howie's actions were not deliberate.

The panel noted that there was medical evidence before it which supported Miss Howie's contention that she was suffering significantly with her health at the time of the behaviour found proven. [REDACTED].

There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Howie was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Other than Miss Howie's oral testimony about her previous unblemished abilities as a teacher, the panel was not provided with any evidence of Miss Howie's personal and professional conduct nor any evidence that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel was not provided with any evidence as to Miss Howie's level of insight or remorse into her actions although the panel did note that Miss Howie had engaged with both the College's investigations and the regulatory proceedings. The panel did note that, notwithstanding her inability to fully recollect some of the incidents, Miss Howie commented on feeling embarrassed and disgusted by the racist comment that she was alleged to have made.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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 Miss Howie 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 Miss Howie. Her lack of insight into her actions and the fact that there were several serious allegations of misconduct found proven were significant factors 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.

The listed characteristics include:

- fraud or serious dishonesty; and
- intolerance...on the grounds of race...

The panel considered the lack of remorse and insight shown by Miss Howie into her actions and, as such, was concerned about the risk of repetition. The panel took account of the seriousness of the behaviour found proven including the fact that Miss Howie had sought to conceal her actions. Further, the panel considered the serious ramifications of Miss Howie's actions and misconduct, in particular the impact that Miss Howie's actions had on colleagues and pupils and the potential impact that the exam malpractice could

have had if the conduct had not been discovered in time. The panel therefore considered that a longer review period would be more appropriate in the circumstances.

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 5 year 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 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 Miss Jennifer Howie should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 5 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Howie 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions; and
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- 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 Miss Howie fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of dishonesty and using racist and derogatory language.

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 Miss Howie, 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 light of the panel’s findings against Miss Howie, which involved aggressive outbursts against colleagues and shouting and swearing on College premises, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of staff/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, which the panel has set out as follows:

“The panel was not provided with any evidence as to Miss Howie’s level of insight or remorse into her actions although the panel did note that Miss Howie had engaged with both the College’s investigations and the regulatory proceedings. The panel did note that, notwithstanding her inability to fully recollect some of the incidents, Miss Howie commented on feeling embarrassed and disgusted by the racist comment that she was alleged to have made.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of 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 panel considered that ordinary members of the public would find the conduct as found proven, namely examination malpractice and inappropriate behaviour, to be conduct which would bring the profession into disrepute and that Miss Howie’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher.”

I am particularly mindful of the findings of dishonesty and of using racist language in this case and the impact that such findings have on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct 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 Miss Howie herself. The panel has commented:

“Other than Miss Howie’s oral testimony about her previous unblemished abilities as a teacher, the panel was not provided with any evidence of Miss Howie’s personal and professional conduct nor any evidence that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

I have also noted the panel’s comments on Miss Howie’s health:

[REDACTED]

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Howie 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 seriousness of the misconduct which included examination malpractice, dishonesty, behaving aggressively to colleagues, and using racist language to describe students. The panel has noted that, although Miss Howie was suffering significantly with her health, there was no evidence that her actions were not deliberate and no evidence to suggest she was acting under extreme duress. I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding that there was no evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Miss Howie.

I have noted the panel’s comment that in deciding the public interest outweighed the interests of Miss Howie, “Her lack of insight into her actions and the fact that there were several serious allegations of misconduct found proven were significant factors in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Miss Howie 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 evidence of 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 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.

The listed characteristics include:

- fraud or serious dishonesty; and
- intolerance...on the grounds of race...

The panel considered the lack of remorse and insight shown by Miss Howie into her actions and, as such, was concerned about the risk of repetition. The panel took account of the seriousness of the behaviour found proven including the fact that Miss Howie had sought to conceal her actions. Further, the panel considered the serious ramifications of Miss Howie's actions and misconduct, in particular the impact that Miss Howie's actions had on colleagues and pupils and the potential impact that the exam malpractice could have had if the conduct had not been discovered in time. The panel therefore considered that a longer review period would be more appropriate in the circumstances."

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 serious nature of the multiple instances of misconduct found proven, the dishonesty found, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

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

This means that Miss Jennifer Howie 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 03 April 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, Miss Howie remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Miss Jennifer Howie has a right of appeal to 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: 30 March 2026

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