



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Philip Turner: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

March 2020

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mr Philip Turner

Teacher ref number: 1725675

Teacher date of birth: 18 February 1968

TRA reference: 18264

Date of determination: 3 March 2020

Former employer: Mary Elton Primary School, Clevedon

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 2 March 2020 to 3 March 2020 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Philip Turner.

The panel members were Mr John Armstrong (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Gail Goodman (teacher panellist) and Mr Paul Hawkins (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Anna Marjoram of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Holly Quirk of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Philip Turner was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 6 January 2020.

It was alleged that Mr Philip Turner was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a teacher at Mary Elton Primary School (“the School”) between 2012 and 2019 he:

1. Between August and December 2017 posted, and/or between August 2017 and September 2018 failed to remove, one or more posts and/or images on his Facebook page which demonstrated a lack of tolerance and/or respect for individuals of an Islamic faith and/or different nationality to himself;
2. During one or more lessons with pupils he expressed inappropriate views and/or discussed inappropriate topics leading to one or more pupils suggesting that:
 - a. on or around 13 July 2018, “All Mexicans were criminals and/or bad” or words to that effect;
 - b. on or around 4 September 2018, if a person of an ethnic minority is unhappy with a country’s policies they should “leave the country”.

Mr Turner did not admit the allegations.

Preliminary applications

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer for the hearing to proceed in the absence of Mr Turner.

The panel was satisfied that the TRA has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 a to c of the Teachers’ Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the “Regulations”).

The panel was also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings complied with paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession, (the “Procedures”).

The panel determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 4.29 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

The panel understands that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one.

In making its decision, the panel noted that the teacher may waive his right to participate in the hearing. The panel has taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention

from the case of R v Jones [2003] 1 AC1. Mr Turner was given 8 weeks' notice of the hearing, notice was sent to a known address and Mr Turner has provided his response to confirm that he would not attend. Mr Turner has been made aware that he could seek an adjournment to attend in future, however, he has indicated that he does not wish to make an application for an adjournment, and he does not wish to attend. The panel, therefore, considered that the teacher has waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing is taking place.

The panel had regard to the requirement that it is only in rare and exceptional circumstances that a decision should be taken in favour of the hearing taking place. There is no indication that an adjournment might result in the teacher attending the hearing. Mr Turner has also indicated that he does not wish to be legally represented at the hearing.

The panel had regard to the extent of the disadvantage to the teacher in not being able to give his account of events, having regard to the nature of the evidence against him. The panel has the benefit of representations made by Mr Turner in advance of this hearing, and his submissions as part of the School's investigations, and the panel is able to ascertain the lines of defence. The panel has the teacher's evidence addressing mitigation and is able to take this into account at the relevant stage. The panel noted that all witnesses relied upon are to be called to give evidence and the panel can test that evidence in questioning those witnesses, considering such points as are favourable to the teacher, as are reasonably available on the evidence. The panel did not identify any significant gaps in the documentary evidence provided to it and should such gaps arise during the course of the hearing, the panel may take such gaps into consideration in considering whether the hearing should be adjourned for such documents to become available and in considering whether the presenting officer has discharged the burden of proof. The panel is also able to exercise vigilance in making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard the teacher's account.

The panel had regard to the seriousness of this case, and the potential consequences for the teacher and accepted that fairness to the teacher is of prime importance. However, it considered that in light of the teacher's waiver of his right to appear; by taking such measures referred to above to address that unfairness insofar as is possible; and taking account of the inconvenience an adjournment would cause to the witnesses; that on balance, these are serious allegations and the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time is in favour of this hearing continuing in the absence of Mr Turner.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – page 2

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 4 to 14

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 16 to 23

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 25 to 299

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 301 to 310

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A, [REDACTED]

Witness B, [REDACTED]

Witness C, [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.

Mr Turner was first employed at the School as a newly qualified class teacher in September 2010. Mr Turner was employed in a permanent teaching position as a class teacher from September 2012.

In or around September 2018, the School was notified of concerns raised by parents through the School's chair of governors. These concerns related to a comment allegedly made by Mr Turner in the classroom in or around July 2018 and the content of Mr Turner's Facebook posts. This report prompted the School to access Mr Turner's Facebook posts and, subsequently, to seek advice from the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) for Allegations against Adults ("DOFA") and the Clevedon Learning Trust.

Following this consultation, the School commenced an internal investigation regarding the concerns raised, and on 6 September 2018, Mr Turner was suspended pending investigation.

On 11 January 2019, Mr Turner attended a disciplinary hearing at the School, and on 15 January 2019, he was summarily dismissed.

On 24 January 2019, Mr Turner contacted the School to appeal the decision to summarily dismiss him. On 1 March 2019, a disciplinary appeal hearing was held, although Mr Turner was unable to attend. On 5 March 2019, the School wrote to Mr Turner to confirm that the disciplinary appeal was not upheld.

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 August and December 2017 you posted, and/or between August 2017 and September 2018 you failed to remove, one or more posts and/or images on your Facebook page which demonstrated a lack of tolerance and/or respect for individuals of an Islamic faith and/or different nationality to yourself;**

The panel considered all the evidence before it.

The panel noted that Mr Turner has accepted that the account in question was his Facebook account. The panel heard evidence from Witness A [REDACTED] and Witness B [REDACTED], who were both able to verify the identity of this account from personal posts made by Mr Turner, including identifiable pictures of Mr Turner and his dogs. Both witnesses stated that they had been able to access Mr Turner's Facebook page despite not being "friends" of Mr Turner at the time these posts came to the attention of the School. In particular, Witness A [REDACTED] took significant steps to confirm this account was publicly accessible. Once the School's investigation had commenced, the account was no longer visible to the public.

The panel saw screenshots of the Facebook posts which raised concerns – some of which were comments by Mr Turner and some of which were shared posts from other sources. For example:

- Mr Turner's account shared a post which included pictures of Asian men and which stated: "*Once again, British girls raped by men who have no right to be in this country...*";

- there was a separate comment stating “...our freedom of speech policy means we can’t actually speak against it. Vile vile vile religion”, with an image stating “Who’s going to die next because of Islam?...Islam is the cancer of the world. Cut it out!”;
- a separate post from Mr Turner’s account stated: “Do not buy muzzlim [sic] halal though”; and
- Mr Turner shared a previously posted article which contained a picture of a number of Asian men, with the comment: “More child rapists – wonder what they have in common?”

The panel was provided with a significant number of similar screenshots which expressed consistent views to those quoted above. The panel considered that these posts – both individually and as part of a wider sequence - demonstrated an unacceptable lack of tolerance and respect for individuals of other nationalities or faiths. The panel acknowledged that both Witness A [REDACTED] and Witness B [REDACTED] found these posts to be offensive in nature. The panel shared their views. Further, the panel had regard to a post on Mr Turner’s Facebook account which demonstrated Mr Turner’s own insight into the nature of his views, that being “...the freedom of speech we enjoy in this country would mean if I voted or endorsed a right wing political party I would lose my job. UKIP is as far as I can go and that would be pushing it for some liberal loonies...”.

The panel had regard to Mr Turner’s statement which he had prepared for the benefit of the hearing and his statements taken during the School’s investigations. Mr Turner had admitted to making some of the Facebook posts and associated comments but had suggested that other posts were made by [REDACTED]. The panel considered that Mr Turner’s account was inconsistent, particularly with regard to the dates he claimed his [REDACTED] had access to his account and noted that the disputed posts were interspersed with other posts relating to Mr Turner’s personal and family life. The panel also considered that, irrespective of any potential involvement of Mr Turner’s [REDACTED], Mr Turner continued to use his Facebook account, making posts relating to his personal and family life. This demonstrated he would have had the opportunity to review posts to his account, and to query and remove any posts which he did not make.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel determined that Mr Turner was responsible for posting all the material and/or failing to remove material which demonstrated a lack of tolerance and/or respect for persons of other faiths or nationalities. The panel found this allegation proved.

2. During one or more lessons with pupils you expressed inappropriate views and/or discussed inappropriate topics leading to one or more pupils suggesting that:

- a. on or around 13 July 2018, “All Mexicans were criminals and/or bad” or words to that effect;**

b. on or around 4 September 2018, if a person of an ethnic minority is unhappy with a country’s policies they should “leave the country”.

The panel heard evidence from Witness B [REDACTED] who was present in Mr Turner’s lesson on 4 September 2018 in which the second comment was made. Witness B [REDACTED] commented that Mr Turner seemed to be waiting for the answer that the person could “leave the country”, and appeared to affirm that pupil’s opinion. This caused concern.

Whilst the panel acknowledged that there was no direct witness for the comment concerning Mexicans made on the “shuffle up day” on or around 13 July 2018, the panel considered, on the balance of probabilities, that the way in which Witness C [REDACTED] had been made aware of the concerns and the way in which the pupil’s evidence had been tested by a parent, was persuasive.

The panel had regard to Mr Turner’s submissions that both comments were taken out of context of the lesson. However, the panel preferred the evidence of Witness B [REDACTED] and Witness C [REDACTED].

Whilst the panel did not consider the respective topics of discussion were in themselves inappropriate, the panel determined, on the balance of the evidence before it, that Mr Turner had allowed pupils to take views of this nature from the classroom, rather than a balanced view of the issues at hand.

The panel found this allegation proved.

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

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Turner, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Turner was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position;

- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
 - 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; and
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach; and
 - Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Turner amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mr Turner's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of intolerance and/or hatred on the grounds of race/religion was relevant. 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 noted that allegation 1 took place outside the education setting. The panel concluded that this conduct affected the way in which Mr Turner fulfilled his teaching role because, as demonstrated by the facts found proven at allegation 2, there was evidence that Mr Turner's unacceptable views had been presented to pupils in the classroom setting. Further, the panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Turner's Facebook account could have been viewed, at that time, by members of the public including pupils and parents.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Turner 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 that they behave.

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

The panel therefore found that Mr Turner's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 1 and 2 proved, the panel further found Mr Turner's 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 and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the protection of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Turner which involved statements made on Facebook and in the classroom context, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of statements demonstrating a lack of respect and/or tolerance made on Facebook and similarly inappropriate comments made towards year 5/6 pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Turner were 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 Mr Turner was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel considered if there was a strong public interest in retaining Mr Turner in the profession.

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 Mr Turner.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Turner. 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 well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- actions or behaviours that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs; or that promote political or religious extremism. This would encompass deliberately allowing the exposure of pupils to such actions or behaviours, including through contact with any individual(s) who are widely known to express views that support such activity, for example by inviting any such individuals to speak in schools;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour; and
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils.

Even though 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.

The panel had no evidence to suggest that Mr Turner's actions were not deliberate. Similarly, there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Turner was acting under duress. The panel acknowledged that Mr Turner did have a previously good history and that the witnesses confirmed he was a "sound" teacher.

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 Mr Turner of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Turner. Mr Turner's lack of insight and remorse throughout, and the risk of such extreme views being presented to impressionable pupils, 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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours is intolerance and/or hatred on the grounds of race/religion. The panel found that Mr Turner was responsible for posting and maintaining the content on his Facebook account which demonstrated an unacceptable lack of tolerance towards those of other nationalities or religions, including sustained offensive posts promoting racial and religious hatred.

The panel further found these posts to have been submitted over a significant period of time with ample opportunity to reflect and to remedy any such posts, had he at any time have considered the adverse impact of these posts on the teaching profession. The panel placed particular weight on one post which showed Mr Turner fully understood the unacceptable nature of the material he had on his Facebook account.

Throughout all the evidence presented, Mr Turner failed to show any insight whatsoever into his actions or the impact that his views could have on pupils, and the manner in which the public view the teaching profession. He showed no remorse throughout the process.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Turner is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
 - 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; and
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach; and
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was also "satisfied that the conduct of Mr Turner amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession."

The panel also considered whether Mr Turner's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the Advice.

The panel found “that the offence of intolerance and/or hatred on the grounds of race/religion was relevant.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of intolerance and/or hatred on the grounds of race/religion.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Turner, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has commented on, “the risk of such extreme views being presented to impressionable pupils,”. The panel also speak of, “evidence that Mr Turner’s unacceptable views had been presented to pupils in the classroom setting. Further, the panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Turner’s Facebook account could have been viewed, at that time, by members of the public including pupils and parents.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “Throughout all the evidence presented, Mr Turner failed to show any insight whatsoever into his actions or the impact that his views could have on pupils, and the manner in which the public view the teaching profession. He showed no remorse throughout the process.” In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is considerable risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future well-being of pupils and the future reputation of the teaching profession. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “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 that they behave.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of intolerance and/or hatred on the grounds of race/religion in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Turner himself. The panel comment, “that Mr Turner did have a previously good history and that the witnesses confirmed he was a “sound” teacher.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has also said that it, “further found these posts to have been submitted over a significant period of time with ample opportunity to reflect and to remedy any such posts, had he at any time have considered the adverse impact of these posts on the teaching profession. The panel placed particular weight on one post which showed Mr Turner fully understood the unacceptable nature of the material he had on his Facebook account.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Turner 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 any remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “Throughout all the evidence presented, Mr Turner failed to show any insight whatsoever into his actions or the impact that his views could have on pupils, and the manner in which the public view the teaching profession. He showed no remorse throughout the process.”


I have considered whether allowing for no 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, there are factors which mean that a no review is in the public interest and is necessary to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the unacceptable lack of tolerance towards those of other nationalities or religions, including sustained offensive posts promoting racial and religious hatred and the lack of either insight or remorse. The panel give many examples of the posts that they took into account when reaching their decision.

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

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

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

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



Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 5 March 2020

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