



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Dr Aldo Olivieri: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

May 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Video link	5
Amending the allegations	5
Privacy	6
Admission of further evidence	6
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
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:	Dr Aldo Olivieri
Teacher ref number:	0667321
Teacher date of birth:	08 November 1978
TRA reference:	19564
Date of determination:	12 May 2022
Former employer:	Milton Keynes Academy

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 11 and 12 May 2022 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Dr Olivieri.

The panel members were Ms Susanne Staab (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr David Raff (lay panellist) and Mr John Armstrong (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Ben Schofield of Blake Morgan LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Louisa Atkin of Capsticks Solicitors LLP.

Dr Olivieri was present and was represented by Mr Colin Henderson of The Reflective Practice.

The hearing took place in public (save for the parts of hearing held in private) and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 31 January 2022 and amended at the start of the hearing on 11 May 2022:

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the teaching profession into disrepute in that, between around October 2019 and February 2020, whilst a teacher at the Milton Keynes Academy ("the School") you:

1. Sent one or more of the messages set out in the attached Schedule to a former pupil, Miss A.
2. Your conduct at 1 above was:
 - a) in breach of the Creative Education Trust's E-Safety policy;
 - b) in breach of the Creative Education Trust's Code of Conduct;
 - c) sexually motivated.

The Schedule:

- a) "they be mad to be passing you by" or words to that effect;
- b) "well I mean your photo says it all they'd be mad" or words to that effect;
- c) "let me know I might pop say hi if you can" or words to that effect";
- d) "oh I love when a lady has a high sex drive" or words to that effect;
- e) "can't get enough myself" or words to that effect;
- f) "I wish I was some sort of monk. Then I'd have peace of mind 101" or words to that effect;
- g) "you got a nice rack to die for" or words to that effect;
- h) "I'm into old fashioned sex 101" or words to that effect;
- i) "Just fucking sucking and all that hahaha" or words to that effect;
- j) "I do like it sucked balls deep hahaha" or words to that effect;
- k) "do you spit or..." or words to that effect;
- l) "I mean if hypothetically we ever fucked" or words to that effect;
- m) "would love to have my face buried in those melons" or words to that effect.

In an agreed statement of facts dated 3 May 2022, Dr Olivieri admitted the conduct alleged in allegations 1 and 2.

Dr Olivieri admitted this was conduct which could bring the profession into disrepute but disputed the conduct could amount to unacceptable professional conduct, as it occurred outside of the school environment. During the course of the hearing, Dr Olivieri further admitted that his conduct did, in fact, amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Preliminary applications

The panel considered the following applications:

Video link

Both parties applied for their respective witnesses (save for Dr Olivieri who was present at the hearing venue) to appear remotely by video link when giving oral evidence to the panel. Both parties relied on similar grounds in that the witnesses were employed in educational settings and would have to take time away from those duties to travel to the hearing venue to give their evidence. Also, there was not any expected difficulties in the witnesses being able to provide their evidence to the panel in this fashion. Neither party oppose the other's application.

The panel agreed with the parties' submissions. The panel also considered that as the factual allegations were not disputed, it was unlikely that a reason would arise that would require their physical presence at the hearing venue. The panel was satisfied that there was no unfairness to either party, that the application supported the efficient and effective progression of the hearing, and accordingly granted the applications.

Amending the allegations

The presenting officer made an application to amend the allegations. The proposed amendments were: to remove the word 'text' which appeared before the word 'messages' in allegation 1, on the grounds it inferred the messages were SMS messages, when they were actually sent via Facebook Messenger; removing reference to 'E-Safety' in allegation 1b, on the grounds it was a simple drafting error; and remove allegation 1c (which was drafted as: in breach of the Creative Education Trust's Child Protection Policy), as the misconduct alleged was already sufficiently addressed in allegations 1a and 1b. Mr Henderson did not oppose the application.

The panel was satisfied there is a public interest in allegations being drafted accurately and precisely to the misconduct before the panel. The panel was also satisfied that there was no material change to the case being put forward by the presenting officer and that no unfairness would be caused to Dr Olivieri if the allegations were amended. Accordingly, the panel granted the application.

Privacy

Mr Henderson made an application for parts of the hearing to be held in private. Specifically, parts of the hearing dealing with [REDACTED] The application was not opposed by the presenting officer.

The panel considered that the areas covered in the application legitimately related to aspects of Dr Olivieri's private life and there was no contrary public interest in those areas being discussed in public. The hearing was still being held in public and these were discrete and limited areas which would not undermine the public's ability to otherwise understand the case. The panel therefore granted the application.

Admission of further evidence

Mr Henderson made an application to admit a one page document which was omitted from the original agreed bundle. It was a duplicate of the final page of Dr Olivier's witness statement which bore his signature as the unsigned version of the statement was in the bundle. The presenting officer did not oppose the application.

The panel considered the document relevant and that it was fair to admit it into the evidence. The panel therefore granted the application.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 24

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 25 to 31

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 32 to 192

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 193 to 233

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Signed final page of Dr Olivieri's statement – page 234

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

Witnesses

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

- [REDACTED]

The panel also heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the teacher:

- Dr Aldo Olivieri (the teacher)
- [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.

Dr Olivieri was employed at the School from 2 September 2014 as a science teacher.

- On 24 February 2020, a teacher at the School approached [REDACTED]

(the School's Director of Attendance and Safeguarding) to explain that a pupil had shown him screenshots of what appeared to be Dr Olivieri messaging a former pupil of the school which had been placed on social media.

Additionally, on that morning, a number of concerned parents had contacted the school about the screenshots.

[REDACTED] commenced an investigation which included speaking to Miss A, the former pupil and Miss B, who was a current pupil at the school and a friend of Miss A. The screenshots were also obtained, although the messages from Miss A had evidently been edited out, so that only the messages from Dr Olivieri could be seen.

Following the investigation, a referral was made to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. Sent one or more of the messages set out in the attached Schedule to a former pupil, Miss A.

In the agreed statement of facts, Dr Olivieri admitted this allegation and also confirmed this in his oral evidence. The panel also noted the screenshots in the bundle were consistent with the messages listed in the allegation schedule.

In October 2019, Miss A sent Dr Olivieri a message via Facebook Messenger. In that message she apologised for her behaviour whilst she was a pupil and told him he was a great teacher. Dr Olivieri recognised Miss A as being a former pupil when she sent him this message. At first, the exchange of messages was sporadic and the topics of discussion varied including music and parenting amongst others. Around January 2020, the messages became more flirtatious and then of a sexual nature, as set out in the allegation schedule.

The panel was satisfied that Dr Olivieri's admissions were unequivocal and wholly consistent with the surrounding evidence in the bundle.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that it was more likely than not that these messages were sent and found this allegation proved.

2. Your conduct at 1 above was:

a) in breach of the Creative Education Trust's E-Safety policy;

b) in breach of the Creative Education Trust's Code of Conduct;

c) sexually motivated.

In the agreed statement of facts, Dr Olivieri admitted all three elements of this allegation and also confirmed this in his oral evidence. The panel also viewed the relevant sections of the E-Safety policy and Code of Conduct.

Some of those sections included:

"All members of staff are advised not to communicate with [. . .] any current or past pupils [. . .] via any personal social media sites, applications or profiles." And "staff must not [. . .] attempt to initiate a relationship which is of a sexual nature, with a recent ex-pupil."

Whilst the panel noted that the word 'recent' could be open to interpretation, it was clear from the evidence that only two or three years had passed from when Dr Olivieri last taught Miss A and he was aware she was friends with a current pupil that he still taught. In those circumstances, the panel formed the view that Miss A could rightly be considered a rather recent ex-pupil and that the conduct guidance therefore applied.

Having found allegation 1 proved, the panel considered the most likely explanation for sending messages of this sexual nature would be for sexual gratification as was admitted by Dr Olivieri.

The panel was satisfied that Dr Olivieri's admissions to all three elements of this allegation were unequivocal and wholly consistent with the surrounding evidence in the bundle.

Accordingly the panel was satisfied that it was more likely than not that Dr Olivieri had breached the policy, code of conduct and sent the messages for sexual gratification and accordingly his conduct was sexually motivated. Therefore, the panel found this allegation proved.

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

Having found all 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 Dr Olivieri, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Dr Olivieri 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.

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

Dr Olivieri's conduct was not an isolated incident, but persisted for a number of months. It was clear from the content of some of those messages (such as "I shouldn't say all this to you either [...] It's very unprofessional") that Dr Olivieri had an understanding at the time that his conduct was wrong. Dr Olivieri's conduct could not be classified as a momentary lapse of judgement.

The panel also considered whether Dr Olivieri's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on page 12 of the Advice. The panel found the offence of 'sexual communication with a child' to be 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 the messages were mostly sent outside the school setting, although Dr Olivieri admitted to sending one of the messages during a school break time, clarifying that that particular message was not of a sexual nature. Nonetheless, the nature of the exchange must be considered in the context of his relatively recent professional relationship with Miss A in the educational setting.

Furthermore, the panel heard evidence from [REDACTED] that Miss B, a current pupil, was concerned about the impact this situation might have on her in terms of her academic performance as she was taught by Dr Olivieri. A number of other pupils and parents also saw the sexualised messages which had been posted on social media and their reaction to learning this was described by [REDACTED] as very difficult for the school to manage.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Dr Olivieri 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 panel heard evidence from [REDACTED] about the impact these messages had on the school community. A number of parents contacted the School by phone on the morning of 24 February 2020, concerned by what they had seen on social media. One parent said they would remove their child from the School if the teacher remained. Staff members also raised concerns about the impact this would have on the reputation of the School and their own, as staff members of that School.

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 of the profession.

The panel further found that Dr Olivieri's conduct also amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct
- the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession

In the light of the panel's findings against Dr Olivieri which involved sending messages, some of which were of a sexual nature to a recent former pupil, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

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

However, the panel decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he is able to make a valuable contribution to 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 Dr Olivieri.

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 Dr Olivieri. 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;
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

The behaviour which was admitted and found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order might be appropriate. There was no evidence to suggest that Dr Olivieri was acting under duress or that his actions were not deliberate.

The panel went on to consider the mitigating factors, which if present, may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel heard oral evidence from Dr Olivieri's current head teacher, [REDACTED]. The witness explained that she understood the nature of the allegations from early in the recruitment process and that Dr Olivieri had been open and frank with her from the outset. The witness further explained that as a result of these disclosures, further investigations were made with Dr Olivieri's former school. After seeking advice from safeguarding leads, the witness was satisfied that the school would be able to implement sufficient measures to ensure the safety of their pupils. Some of these measures included regular meetings with the Designated Safeguarding Lead, fortnightly pastoral meetings with senior leadership and undertaking ongoing safeguarding training.

Dr Olivieri has been at his current school since September 2020. The witness confirmed there have been no issues raised about Dr Olivieri in this time period, and that she had no concerns about Dr Olivieri. She remained satisfied that safeguarding measures in place had proved effective and continued to be so. The witness also explained the contributions Dr Olivieri has made to the school, including his particular strengths in teaching examination classes and students of high ability, due to his exceptionally high level of qualification and expertise in industry.

[REDACTED]

In Dr Olivieri's evidence, he explained the background issues to this case. [REDACTED]

The panel also considered five-character references for Dr Olivieri. Four of those references were from current teachers, all of whom supported [REDACTED] view that he was an effective, supportive, and committed teacher. One of the teachers stated:

"Aldo has regretted his action so much there is no words to describe it. If he could undo this texting, he would have done it a heartbeat."

The fifth reference was from Dr Olivieri's rector at his church, who stated:

"Aldo... has changed a great deal over the 3 years I have known him. I truly believe Aldo to be repentant about what has happened and is now much more self-aware."

The oral evidence of [REDACTED] confirmed that Dr Olivieri had not sought to minimise his conduct or place any blame on anyone else but himself during the school's investigation. That was consistent with the evidence Dr Olivieri placed before the panel.

The panel was satisfied that Dr Olivieri has demonstrated meaningful insight and genuine remorse into the harmful conduct he undertook, including the effect it had on Miss A and the wider school community, how he had let that behaviour occur. Dr Olivieri was also able to evidence the tangible steps he has taken to make sure it would not happen again.

In light of the above evidence, the panel considers the risk of repetition of such conduct in this case to be very low.

The panel then went on to consider the wider public interest.

The panel was in no doubt that the facts of this case require a robust regulatory response in order to uphold proper standards and to maintain public confidence in the profession.

The panel was obligated to consider the messages, their frequency and content, in the wider factual context of the evidence bundle and the oral evidence at the hearing. The panel was mindful that all misconduct, including sexual misconduct, can be evaluated on a wide spectrum of seriousness. Whilst the Advice makes clear that sexual misconduct is a factor tending to suggest that a Prohibition Order is likely to be appropriate, the panel was mindful this should not be reduced to a simple tick-box exercise. The panel found no evidence to suggest that Dr Olivieri was grooming Miss A or acting in a predatory manner. The panel considered that on the spectrum of sexual misconduct that is often presented before professional conduct panels, this case fell towards the lower end of that spectrum.

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.

This a finely balanced case. Notwithstanding the factors that might weigh in favour of prohibition, the panel placed particular weight on the combination of the following:

- Dr Olivieri's actions were not pre-planned
- There is a very low risk of repetition
- The sexual misconduct was at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness
- Dr Olivieri's positive contribution to the profession is that of an effective and committed teacher
- Dr Olivieri demonstrated a high level of insight and remorse
- Dr Olivieri has been successfully employed at his current school and there has been no suggestion of any concerns in the last two years

The panel considered that the careful balancing of these factors taken together with the wider public interest meant that a prohibition order would neither be a proportionate nor necessary response. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it

had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

The panel therefore recommended to the Secretary of State that no prohibition order should be imposed.

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 sanction.

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 Dr Olivieri should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Dr Olivieri 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.

The panel finds that the conduct of Dr Olivieri fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct involved sending messages, some of which were of a sexual nature to a recent former pupil, conduct that breached policy and code of conduct.

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 Dr Olivieri, 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/or safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Dr Olivieri which involved sending messages, some of which were of a sexual nature to a recent former pupil, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils." 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, "The panel was satisfied that Dr Olivieri has demonstrated meaningful insight and genuine remorse into the harmful conduct he undertook, including the effect it had on Miss A and the wider school community, how he had let that behaviour occur. Dr Olivieri was also able to evidence the tangible steps he has taken to make sure it would not happen again." The panel has also commented "the panel considers the risk of repetition of such conduct in this case to be very low." I have therefore given this element 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 Dr Olivieri were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual motivation involving a former 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, 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 Dr Olivieri himself and the panel comment “Dr Olivieri has been at his current school since September 2020. The witness confirmed there have been no issues raised about Dr Olivieri in this time period, and that she had no concerns about Dr Olivieri. She remained satisfied that safeguarding measures in place had proved effective and continued to be so. The witness also explained the contributions Dr Olivieri has made to the school, including his particular strengths in teaching examination classes and students of high ability, due to his exceptionally high level of qualification and expertise in industry.”

A prohibition order would prevent Dr Olivieri from continuing that work. 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 unprofessional conduct. The panel has said, “Dr Olivieri's conduct was not an isolated incident, but persisted for a number of months. It was clear from the content of some of those messages (such as "I shouldn't say all this to you either [.] It's very unprofessional") that Dr Olivieri had an understanding at the time that his conduct was wrong. Dr Olivieri's conduct could not be classified as a momentary lapse of judgement.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding “that the panel was satisfied that it was more likely than not that Dr Olivieri had breached the policy, code of conduct and sent the messages for sexual gratification and accordingly his conduct was sexually motivated.”

I have given considerable weight in my decision to the public perception of the profession “The panel heard evidence from [REDACTED] about the impact these messages had on the school community. A number of parents contacted the School by phone on the morning of 24 February 2020, concerned by what they had seen on social media. One parent said they would remove their child from the School if the teacher remained. Staff members also raised concerns about the impact this would have on the reputation of the School and their own, as staff members of that School.”

I have carefully considered the seriousness of the misconduct found proven in this case and the weight the panel have given to mitigation. I have taken into account, Dr Olivieri's [REDACTED], the insight and remorse shown and the steps he has taken to make sure it would not happen again. However, considering the Advice published by the Secretary of State, I have concluded that the panel have given disproportionate weight to the references provided and Dr Olivieri's contribution to the profession. Due to the seriousness of the findings, which involved sending messages to a former pupil for sexual gratification, which itself was not an isolated incident, and took place over a

number of months, the panel could have given greater weight to the negative impact on the public's perception of the profession.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Dr Olivieri has and is making 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, involving sexually motivated conduct with a former pupil, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons I disagree with the panel's recommendation, and 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 decided that a two year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Dr Aldo Olivieri 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 2024, 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, Dr Olivieri remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Dr Aldo Olivieri 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S Buxcey', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 24 May 2022

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