



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Garry Turner: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

July 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	18

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

Teacher: Mr Garry Turner

Teacher ref number: 1430580

Teacher date of birth: 17 May 1970

TRA reference: 23768

Date of determination: 14 July 2025

Former employer: Outwood Academy Adwick, South Yorkshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 14 July 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Garry Turner.

The panel members were Mr Neil Hillman (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) and Mrs Lynsey Draycott (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Turner that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Turner provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of a presenting officer, Mr Turner or any representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 19 May 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Turner was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that, whilst working as a teacher at Outwood Academy Adwick:

1. Between 2 December 2022 and 24 June 2023 he exchanged emails with Pupil A that were inappropriate and/or unprofessional in nature.
2. He failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil A, by:
 - a. engaging in email correspondence with Pupil A as set out in paragraph 1 above;
 - b. failing to promptly share disclosures made to him by Pupil A on:
 - i. 21-22 March 2023;
 - ii. 1 April 2023;
 - iii. 22 June 2023.

Mr Turner admitted the facts of the allegations and that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 3

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 4 to 6

Section 3: Notice of meeting and response – pages 7 to 19

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 20 to 785

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 786 to 795

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 796 to 800

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020.

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Turner on 26 February 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Turner for the allegations to be considered without a hearing.

The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest.

The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Turner was previously employed as a mathematics teacher at Outwood Academy Adwick ("the School"). He commenced work at the School in September 2019.

In or around June 2023, Mr Turner raised concerns of a safeguarding nature involving a pupil, referred to as Pupil A. In the course of considering those concerns, it was considered necessary to investigate the nature and extent of Mr Turner's communications with Pupil A and his conduct in failing to report safeguarding information.

The School subsequently commenced a disciplinary process.

On 30 April 2024, Mr Turner attended a disciplinary hearing.

He was subsequently referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. Between 2 December 2022 and 24 June 2023 you exchanged emails with Pupil A that were inappropriate and/or unprofessional in nature.

Mr Turner admitted the following matters:

- Between 2 December 2022 and 24 June 2023, he and Pupil A exchanged emails with one another which were agreed to number 478.
- It was recorded that 235 of these emails were sent by Mr Turner to Pupil A.
- The emails were exchanged using Pupil A's and Mr Turner's school email addresses and over 40 separate days, which included weekends and school closure periods such as Christmas Eve and Christmas Day.
- Emails were sent outside of core school hours, including a number up to and including 10pm in the evening.
- Within the emails, Mr Turner commented on Pupil A's appearance and personality; her relationship with another pupil; and negatively about other pupils.

Mr Turner accordingly admitted the facts of allegation 1.

The panel was presented with the emails, which it carefully considered. It concluded that this admission was consistent with the evidence before it.

The panel was also satisfied that this conduct was inappropriate and unprofessional, for the following reasons in particular:

- Whilst sent using a school email rather than a personal address, the messages were over personal and strayed into personal matters, for example stressing Mr Turner's availability to speak with Pupil A outside of the formal school context and indicating that he was thinking of her.
- Certain emails alluded to Mr Turner's health and medical matters, to being lonely, his [REDACTED] and other pupils. For example, on one occasion Mr Turner referred to Pupil A as his "rock". In several respects, they went beyond what was appropriate as between a teacher and a pupil.
- As well as the content and tone, they were also inappropriate in relation to the volume and timing of the messages, which had a degree of intensity. For example, on 1 April 2023, between 3:43pm and 4:53pm, Mr Turner sent 25 emails to Pupil A who sent 20 emails in return. A further exchange takes place later on that day, starting at 6:17pm, with nearly 2 hours of further conversation.

- In totality, the emails were also sent over an extended time period which included holiday periods, which was in itself inappropriate and unprofessional. Certain messages were also sent late at night and early in the morning.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proved.

2. You failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil A, by:

- a. engaging in email correspondence with Pupil A as set out in paragraph 1 above;**
- b. failing to promptly share disclosures made to you by Pupil A on:**
 - i. 21-22 March 2023;**
 - ii. 1 April 2023;**
 - iii. 22 June 2023.**

The panel repeats in findings in allegation 1.

The following matters were also agreed by Mr Turner:

- On 21 March 2023, Pupil A informed him that they had been [REDACTED].
- On 22 March 2023, in emails to Mr Turner, Pupil A stated:
 - At 19:21 *"I don't know if I'm okay I'm really struggling, it's made me shaky but I'll see how I'm doing tomorrow. Sorry for crying it's been a bad week, I feel really pushed down."*
 - At 19:49 *"I feel like such a broken person no amount of love I get can fix me and it will drag others down to [sic]. Sometimes I wonder if life is worth it after what I've already been through"*.
- On 27 March 2023, Mr Turner reported Pupil A's disclosure to the School's safeguarding team, namely that they had been [REDACTED]. A CPOMS, a computer system used by the School to record safeguarding information, record was created the next day on 28 March 2023 by the School's Designated Safeguarding Lead.
- On 1 April 2023, in an email to Mr Turner, Pupil A stated (at 15:55) *"[REDACTED]"*.

- Following further emails that same day, at 16:01 the Teacher asked “*Are you okay until Monday? I am really panicking, was it deliberate, was it serious? [sp]*”.
- At 16:01, Pupil A responded, “*I mean yes but I wasn’t really myself I’m fine now just hurt a bit and it’s alright right now*”.
- He did not appropriately report Pupil A’s disclosure to the School in line with the School’s Safeguarding Policy and procedures.
- On 22 June 2023, Pupil A informed him by email of the following, which occurred whilst they were on [REDACTED]:

“He was hugging me which was fine but he started grabbing me constantly and did things like make me sit on his lap which was totally uncomfortable but when he walked me home. He kissed me over and over and over again and I couldn’t move and he wouldn’t let go and constantly wanted to come inside to my bedroom if yk [you know] what that means. After that I’m having serious doubts and I’m a bit scared and uncomfortable and I don’t feel safe right now. He was being super forceful.”

Mr Turner responded to this email the same day and continued an email conversation into the evening. The next day, he spoke with a fellow teacher and was advised to report the matter to the safeguarding team. He did so at 15:20, at the end of the school day.

The panel took account of the School’s Safeguarding Children policy, which states that staff must immediately report:

- Any behaviours which give rise to suspicions that a child may have suffered harm (e.g. worrying drawings, writing or acts).
- Any hint or disclosure of abuse from any person.
- Safeguarding concerns will be recorded on CPOMS. If this system is unavailable, staff are asked to complete separate documentation to be passed to the Designated Safeguarding Lead or Principal.

Mr Turner accordingly admitted the facts of allegation 2(a) and (b).

In relation to allegation 2(b)(i), the panel was concerned that there was a degree of confusion regarding the precise timeline of events. Specifically, whilst Mr Turner admitted being notified of an [REDACTED] on 21 March 2023, the papers alluded to that being notified to him on 23 March 2023, outside of the timeframe pleaded.

Nonetheless, the panel considered that the two emails referred to above, sent in the evening on 22 March 2023, were in and of themselves reportable matters that required immediate action on the part of Mr Turner to safeguard Pupil A, whether or not they were referencing an [REDACTED] or something else entirely. There was an obvious inference, from the wording used, that Pupil A was at particularly low ebb and the reference to her wondering “[REDACTED]” was concerning and necessitated immediate action. However, Mr Turner took no action that day or the next. The evidence suggests a report was not made.

Allegation 2(b)(i) was found proved on that basis.

In relation to allegations 2(b)(ii) and (iii) the relevant emails were similarly clear in disclosing concerns that were certainly reportable. In relation to allegation 2(b)(ii), Mr Turner’s response alluded to him being worried, yet by his own admission he took no action. In relation to allegation 2(b)(iii), whilst Mr Turner did make a disclosure at the end of the next day, the nature of the disclosure, essentially an [REDACTED] that led to Pupil A stating she did not “*feel safe right now*”, warranted immediate and urgent action.

Allegations 2(b)(ii) and (iii) were also, therefore, found proved.

The panel went on to consider whether, by his actions, Mr Turner failed to take appropriate actions and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil A.

Plainly, as with any teacher, Mr Turner had a duty to appropriately address and respond concerns of a safeguarding nature.

On any reasonable assessment, the panel considered these concerns fell within that definition.

In relation to allegation 2(a), Mr Turner did not have a formal pastoral role in relation to Pupil A. Yet, he in effect took on an informal role of that nature without any element of transparency or oversight.

For example, in a message dated 4 April 2023, Mr Turner said “*remember your daily check in please*”.

If Mr Turner had considered Pupil A had heightened pastoral needs, that required the input and oversight of those charged with such matters within the School. As such, it was not appropriate for him to engage in email correspondence of this nature in the first instance. It was not Mr Turner’s role. By doing so, he failed to ensure that appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil A’s needed in line with the School’s policies and procedures.

Further, by engaging in emails to this extent and of this nature, this in turn created a safeguarding concern. Not least, they presented a clear risk of dependency on the part of

Pupil A, which Mr Turner did not report or otherwise seek to address through formal channels. To this extent, he again failed to ensure that appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil A.

In relation to allegation 2(b), each of the events particularised were disclosures of a safeguarding nature that required appropriate action.

Accordingly, by not disclosing these matters either at all or in a timely manner, Mr Turner failed to take appropriate action and, as a consequence, failed to ensure that appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil A.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 proved in its entirety.

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

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

Whilst this was admitted by Mr Turner and that admission was taken into account, the panel made its own, independent determination.

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 Mr Turner, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, he was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- 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, in relation to the facts found proved, engaged and did not adhere to the Keeping Children Safe in Education (“KCSIE”) guidance, which was extensively referenced within the papers. Not least, this required that if staff have any concerns about a child’s welfare, they should act on them immediately.

The panel also considered whether Mr Turner’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 none of these offences was relevant.

Over and above the above matters. in relation to all of the proven allegations the panel took into account the wider context.

Mr Turner’s failings in relation to the emails occurred over a prolonged period of time and without appropriate transparency in terms of the School’s knowledge. At times, messages were exchanged late at night and outside of school days. The content was frequently inappropriate and was largely unrelated to school matters, in relation to which the panel’s findings are repeated. There was a personal element to the communications, which was inappropriate as between a teacher and a pupil. Certain emails also alluded to other pupils in a disrespectful manner, which was extremely inappropriate.

He was also in a position of trust and responsibility as an experienced teacher. He was a role model. He had a duty to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with all pupils and at all times.

Mr Turner had clearly breached his obligations in that regard.

Further, whilst it was not alleged that Mr Turner’s actions were improperly motivated, his actions presented a risk of feelings of dependency on the part of the pupil, who was clearly vulnerable.

It was also apparent from the emails that Mr Turner shared personal details on his own part, which was clearly inappropriate whilst also demonstrating that he was potentially deriving some element of emotional support from the exchanges and using Pupil A as an emotional crutch. It was clear that professional boundaries had significantly dissipated.

Insofar as some of the communications alluded to concerns on the part of Pupil A, these were not shared with the School, or external agencies to the extent required, as they should have been. Mr Turner’s actions raised obvious safeguarding implications. Allegation 2(b) and its respective sub-limbs were considered together, whereby in the

distinct respects outlined Mr Turner had failed to appropriately respond to clear safeguarding issues.

This is despite the fact that he had received appropriate and ongoing training in relation to safeguarding. Not least, the case papers before the panel included evidence that he had successfully completed a Keeping Children Safe in Education 2022 course.

For all these reasons, in relation to each of the proven allegations, considered individually and together, 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.

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

In relation to whether Mr Turner'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.

For the reasons set out above, 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. The panel also considered that the proven conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, particularly taking into account the safeguarding implications to his failings, whereby he failed to meet the expectations upon him in a crucial part of his role. He was an experienced teacher with an additional level of responsibility as second in department.

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

In summary, having found the facts of allegations 1 and 2 proved, the panel further found that 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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings, which involved a breach of professional boundaries concerning a vulnerable pupil over a prolonged time period and a failure to adequately address disclosures, there was a strong public interest in the safeguarding and wellbeing of 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.

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

The panel considered that was relevant but not to a significant degree. There was no evidence that he had made a notable or exceptional contribution to teaching. There was no evidence that he was to be regarded as an exceptional practitioner and no references or testimonials were available. However, no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as a teacher and there was a suggestion that he was thought of as a good teacher. He had clearly been sufficiently well regarded to have been promoted to second in department. There was, therefore, some element of public interest in retaining him in the profession.

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 an exemplary 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 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 safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified; and
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE).

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.

The panel considered the following mitigating factors were present in this case:

- Mr Turner had not been subject to any previous regulatory proceedings. So far as the panel were aware, he had an otherwise unblemished record over the course of his career.
- Mr Turner had fully engaged with this process and made full admissions. He was realistic in accepting that his actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.
- Whilst the communications were wrong and inappropriate, they were limited to the school's systems. This was not a case, for example, where the teacher had used private email addresses or social media to communicate. There was no attempt to delete or otherwise conceal the communications, which were stored in a folder he created on the School's system. He also made limited disclosures to colleagues about the fact that he was communicating with Pupil A, albeit not to the extent he should have done.

- Whilst Mr Turner did not act as he could and should have done, he did not ignore the safeguarding concerns completely. He took belated action to report concerns about Pupil A, albeit not in line with the School's policies and procedures.
- This was an isolated episode in the context of Mr Turner's career as a whole.
- Mr Turner had apologised for his actions and shown some regret and remorse. He recognised and accepted that he had fallen short of the standards expected of him and accepted responsibility for his actions.
- It was not alleged that Mr Turner was improperly motivated. To that extent, the panel accepted he was driven to act as he did due to concerns about Pupil A's welfare.

Whilst Mr Turner also alluded to health and personal difficulties, there was no independent evidence and the panel was unable to determine the extent to which these mitigated his actions, if at all.

Weighed against these mitigating factors and over and above the behaviours identified above, the panel considered there were some aggravating factors present, including:

- Mr Turner was in a position of trust and responsibility as well as a role model. The panel considered he ought to have known what was expected of him, as an experienced teacher who had been trained in safeguarding matters throughout his career and should have conducted himself accordingly.
- This was a protracted instance of misconduct and the volume and nature of messages, and the period of time over which they were exchanged, were aggravating features of this case. This was a significant and protracted breach of professional boundaries.
- Mr Turner did not disclose the full nature or extent of the email communications to the School.
- Insofar as Pupil A disclosed safeguarding concerns, formal processes were not followed which presented an obvious risk and amounted to a serious safeguarding failure.
- Mr Turner's actions were deliberate, and he was not acting under duress.
- Mr Turner had demonstrated very little insight. There was no evidence, for example, that he had reflected on events, understood the implications and impact of his actions or taken steps to remediate his behaviour. For these reasons, the panel could not be satisfied that there was no risk of the same or similar failings being repeated should Mr Turner find himself in a similar position in the future.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order.

Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr 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.

Not least, this was an instance of professional boundaries being breached over a prolonged period and with a vulnerable pupil. This meant there was a strong public interest in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

For the reasons outlined, particularly in terms of some of the content of the communications, Mr Turner's actions were highly inappropriate. As per the panel's findings, not only did Mr Turner's actions create a risk of dependency, it appeared that to at least some extent there was an element of dependency on his part. Whilst Mr Turner made some limited disclosures about the fact he was communicating with Pupil A, this was partial and lacked transparency.

Over and above this, Mr Turner had failed to take appropriate action in relation to serious safeguarding concerns. There was no evidence that Pupil A was directly harmed, however his actions presented an obvious risk of harm.

Further, the panel was not presented with evidence, in the form of insight and remediation, to conclude that the risk of repetition was sufficiently reduced.

Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered.

The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours were not relevant in this case.

Further, the Advice references other behaviour that, where relevant, would weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriated. Once again, none of these were relevant.

The panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period, for the following reasons in particular.

The panel had in mind, firstly, that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive.

Mr Turner's conduct took place in the context of a career in which no other regulatory concerns had been identified. The failings, whilst serious, occurred in the context of a single pupil in relation to whom it was not alleged he was improperly motivated. In that context and when the other mitigating factors were taken into account, the panel concluded that recommending no review period would not be appropriate and would be disproportionate.

Secondly, the panel considered that, in time, it would be possible for Mr Turner to undertake remediation, gain insight and demonstrate that he was suitable to return to the profession. He was clearly remorseful. He accepted that he had behaved inappropriately. The panel considered there was every likelihood that he could, in time, demonstrate that lessons had been learned, particularly noting that he was, ultimately, driven by concerns for Pupil A even if the manner in which he sought to address those concerns led to him disregarding his professional obligations and losing sight of the need to maintain professional boundaries.

The panel proceeded to consider the minimum period before which an application could be made, by Mr Turner, to have the prohibition order reviewed and set aside.

The panel concluded that a review period of two years was appropriate and proportionate in this case.

A period of two years will afford Mr Turner sufficient time and opportunity, should he wish to do so, to take steps to rehabilitate and remediate his conduct and demonstrate that he has gained insight into the nature, effect and implications of his conduct.

In the view of the panel, a period beyond two years would be disproportionate and was not necessary to meet the public interest considerations in this case.

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 Mr Garry Turner should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Turner, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Turner fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of inappropriate professional boundaries concerning a vulnerable pupil and a failure to adequately address safeguarding disclosures.

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 Mr Turner 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "Not least, this was an instance of professional boundaries being breached over a prolonged period and with a vulnerable pupil. This meant there was a strong public interest in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "Mr Turner had apologised for his actions and shown some regret and remorse. He recognised and accepted that he had fallen short of the standards expected of him and accepted responsibility for his actions." I have therefore given this element some 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 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." I am particularly mindful of the finding of failure to adequately address safeguarding disclosures concerning a vulnerable pupil in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct 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 Mr Turner himself and the panel comment "There was no evidence that he had made a notable or exceptional contribution to teaching. There was no evidence that he was to be regarded as an exceptional practitioner and no references or testimonials were available. However, no

doubt had been cast upon his abilities as a teacher and there was a suggestion that he was thought of as a good teacher. He had clearly been sufficiently well regarded to have been promoted to second in department. There was, therefore, some element of public interest in retaining him in the profession.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of full insight. The panel has said, “Mr Turner had demonstrated very little insight. There was no evidence, for example, that he had reflected on events, understood the implications and impact of his actions or taken steps to remediate his behaviour. For these reasons, the panel could not be satisfied that there was no risk of the same or similar failings being repeated should Mr Turner find himself in a similar position in the future.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “Mr Turner was in a position of trust and responsibility as well as a role model. The panel considered he ought to have known what was expected of him, as an experienced teacher who had been trained in safeguarding matters throughout his career and should have conducted himself accordingly.”

In addition I have placed weight on the following “This was a protracted instance of misconduct and the volume and nature of messages, and the period of time over which they were exchanged, were aggravating features of this case. This was a significant and protracted breach of professional boundaries.”

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 full 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 a two year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “A period of two years will afford Mr Turner sufficient time and opportunity, should he wish to do so, to take steps to rehabilitate and remediate his conduct and demonstrate that he has gained insight into the nature, effect and implications of his conduct.” The panel has also said “In the view of the panel, a

period beyond two years would be disproportionate and was not necessary to meet the public interest considerations in this case.”

I agree with the panel and have decided that a two year review period is proportionate and in the public interest for this case.

This means that Mr Garry Turner is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 18 July 2027, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Turner remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Garry Turner has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 15 July 2025

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