



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Oliver Glass: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

February 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

Teacher: Mr Oliver Glass

Teacher ref number: 0936729

Teacher date of birth: 15 February 1987

TRA reference: 166237

Date of determination: 24 February 2022

Former employer: [redacted]

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 4 June 2021, to consider the case of Mr Oliver Glass.

The panel members were Mr Ian Carter (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Fiona McLaren (lay panellist) and Mr Chris Major (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 Glass that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Glass provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Glass or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 15 February 2022.

It was alleged that Mr Glass was guilty of having been convicted of the following relevant offences:

1. Cause/incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over abuse of position of trust on 27/06/19. Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i)

Disposal: Imprisonment 22 months. Sex Offenders Notice 10 years. Sexual Harm Prevention Order 10 years. Victim surcharge £140 Date/Court: 16/12/20. Reading Crown Court.

2. Cause/incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over abuse of position of trust on 28/06/19. Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i)

Disposal: Imprisonment 22 months Date/Court: 16/12/20. Reading Crown Court.

3. Cause/incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over abuse of position of trust on 19/08/19 – 22/08/19. Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i)

Disposal: Imprisonment 22 months Date/Court: 16/12/20. Reading Crown Court

Mr Glass admitted the facts of the allegations and that his conviction was for a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 5 to 14

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 15 to 20

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 21 to 92

Section 5: Teacher documents – page 19

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts, which was agreed by Mr Glass pursuant to his email dated 31 January 2022.

Decision and reasons

The panel's decision and reasons are as follows:

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Glass 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.

The panel proceeded to consider the case carefully, having read all of the documents, and reached a decision. It accepted the legal advice provided.

Mr Glass was previously employed as head of mathematics and head of the maths and science faculty at [redacted] ("the School"). He started work at the School in September 2016.

In June 2019, Mr Glass resigned from the School ahead of a proposed relocation and proceeded to serve a period of notice.

Subsequently, a report was received from a pupil alleging she had engaged in sexual activity with Mr Glass.

The pupil in question was referred to as Pupil A for the purposes of these proceedings.

The relevant chronology was as follows:

- On 12 September 2019, Pupil A reported the sexual activity with Mr Glass.
- That same date, Mr Glass was arrested by Thames Valley Police.

- On 13 September 2019, Mr Glass was formally suspended by the School and a LADO referral was made.
- On 31 October 2019, Mr Glass' contract with the School came to an end.
- In the summer of 2020, Mr Glass was formally charged by the police.
- On 7 October 2020, Mr Glass pleaded guilty at Reading Magistrates Court to three counts of Abuse of Position of Trust – cause / incite sexual activity with a girl 13-17.
- On 12 December 2020, Mr Glass was sentenced at Reading Crown Court, including 22 months imprisonment.

The School formally referred Mr Glass to the TRA on 17 November 2020.

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. **Cause/incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over abuse of position of trust on 27/06/19. Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i)**

Disposal: Imprisonment 22 months. Sex Offenders Notice 10 years. Sexual Harm Prevention Order 10 years. Victim surcharge £140
Date/Court: 16/12/20. Reading Crown Court.
2. **Cause/incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over abuse of position of trust on 28/06/19. Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i)**

Disposal: Imprisonment 22 months Date/Court: 16/12/20. Reading Crown Court.
3. **Cause/incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over abuse of position of trust on 19/08/19 – 22/08/19. Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.17(1)(e)(i)**

Disposal: Imprisonment 22 months Date/Court: 16/12/20. Reading Crown Court

The panel considered allegations 1, 2 and 3 together.

The panel was presented with a statement of agreed facts, confirmed by Mr Glass electronically, in which all of the allegations were admitted.

The panel noted that Pupil A was 16 when she became Mr Glass' mentee and was in his tutor group.

Pupil A was a vulnerable individual who was receiving support and medication for mental health issues. Pupil A had made a previous [redacted].

Within school, Mr Glass was responsible for Pupil A's medication and, as her mentor, was fully aware of her vulnerabilities.

At some point, Mr Glass started to communicate with Pupil A using a non-school email address and other private social media applications. This escalated to sexual contact.

The offences in question relate to 3 separate sexual activities with Pupil A. The offences took place in Mr Glass' car and involved aggressive acts on his part.

The panel was presented with the sentencing remarks of His Honour Judge [redacted], summarising the offences, the reasons for the sentence imposed and addressing the impact of these events on Pupil A.

The panel was also presented with a certificate of conviction from Reading Crown Court, confirming that Mr Glass was convicted, on 7 October 2020, of each of the offences particularised in allegations 1, 2 and 3.

On 16 December 2020, he was sentenced to:

- a. Imprisonment for 22 months;
- b. A sex offenders notice for a period of 10 years;
- c. A sexual harm prevention order for 10 years; and
- e. A victim surcharge of £140.00.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offences by Mr Glass.

In light of this and Mr Glass' admissions, it accordingly found allegations 1, 2 and 3 proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Glass' conviction was for a relevant offence, which he admitted.

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 Mr Glass' conduct in relation to the facts found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Glass 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.
- 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.

Mr Glass' behaviour in committing these offences had a direct and extremely serious impact on the pupil in question. Each of these serious offences were very disturbing in nature and were such that Mr Glass abused a position of trust to have sexual relations with an extremely vulnerable pupil in his care. The precise circumstances were such that, on any assessment, Mr Glass' actions were at the most serious end of the spectrum and his behaviour in committing these offences clearly engaged child protection and public protection issues.

This was a case involving the following offences that the Advice states are likely to be considered a relevant offence:

- violence, with reference to the commission of aggressive sexual acts;
- sexual activity;
- sexual communication with a child; and
- with reference to the images said to have been exchanged, any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents.

The panel took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Glass' behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children. By virtue of his position, Mr Glass was in a position of trust and responsibility in relation to Pupil A. He abused that position.

The panel also took account of the fact that Mr Glass' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The child protection and public protection issues engaged by Mr Glass' actions were demonstrated by the Court's sentence.

The panel did not consider there to be any relevant mitigating circumstances in relation to the commission of these offences.

In conclusion and for all these reasons, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was directly relevant to Mr Glass' ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of relevant offences, it was necessary for it 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 and protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and

- that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the nature of the offences for which Mr Glass was convicted, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and other members of the public. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns, as was clearly recognised by the Court when imposing sentence.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession would undoubtedly be very seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Glass was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. This was conduct that was, very clearly, at the most serious end of the spectrum.

For the same reasons, the panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present.

No doubt had been cast upon Mr Glass' abilities as a classroom teacher. Indeed, he was described in positive terms in that respect. However, given the nature of the allegations in this case the panel concluded that there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.

Notwithstanding 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 Glass. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations present as well as the interests of Mr Glass. 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 are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils);

- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. 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;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- 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;
- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- collusion or concealment including:
 - encouraging others to break rules.

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 that the following mitigating factors are present in this case:

- Mr Glass appeared to have had an otherwise good record. Prior to these events, he was described as someone having an "*exemplary character*".
- The panel was presented with some positive evidence about Mr Glass as a teacher, which it considered.
- Mr Glass had engaged with the TRA, to some extent, and made full admissions.
- There was reference within the papers to some challenging personal circumstances at the relevant time.
- The sentencing remarks alluded to steps taken by Mr Glass to "*change what went wrong in [his] life last year*", including extensive therapy.

Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case were that:

- Mr Glass' actions were deliberate and involved three offences on separate occasions. The relationship was one that was described by the Court as having evolved:

"... in a way that at any stage you could have stopped it and you chose not to. And, really, from the moment you chose not to stop it, you knew exactly what you were doing and from there on, it was targeted."

The Court added that Mr Glass did not stop because:

"... you hoped and worked on it developing towards sexual contact. That is where you wanted it to go. That is where you took it because you were the one who could have stopped it and you didn't. You exchanged sexually explicit texts with her."

- His actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and raised serious public protection and child protection concerns.
- Mr Glass has been convicted of very serious offences concerning a vulnerable child in his care and was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 22 months, a sex offenders notice and a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years.
- His actions involved harm and abuse to Pupil A. Mr Glass had sexual relations with a vulnerable pupil, incredibly serious in and of itself. Further, the sexual acts in question involved aggression on his part for sexual gratification and in a manner that the Court described as *"particularly unpleasant"*.
- Mr Glass was specifically charged with having responsibility for aspects of Pupil A's care and to support her as an extremely vulnerable pupil.
- Mr Glass' actions were such that he was deemed to have undertaken a grooming process. The sentencing remarks record:

"She was a particularly vulnerable child; and child, she was. You set up a private email account, so that you could communicate with her off the school system. You did that as part of a grooming process because you knew that the emails you wanted to send her and the way you wished to communicate with her would contain language that you didn't want to be picked up on school emails, which would be monitored. You contacted her through other social media."

- Mr Glass was in a leadership position and a position of trust and responsibility. He was also a role model. He had fallen very far short of the standards expected of him in that regard.

- Mr Glass' actions had a severe, detrimental impact on Pupil A. As her victim statement recorded, she will carry these events with her for the rest of her life and there were clear references to a continuing impact upon her, [redacted].
- There would inevitably have been a consequential impact on the School, its pupils and the local community.
- In these proceedings, there was little evidence of regret, remorse or insight on the part of Mr Glass. To the contrary, from Mr Glass' limited engagement in these proceedings it appeared he focussed on himself and his desire to move on with his life.

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 Glass of prohibition.

Mr Glass was convicted of three offences of sexual activity with a vulnerable pupil in his care. These actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. This was conduct of the most serious nature. The nature and gravity of these offences was a matter of significant concern. There were, accordingly, particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of protecting the public, protecting learners, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.

Mr Glass' behaviour led to him receiving a sentence of imprisonment for a term of 22 months, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence. The panel noted the following remarks from the sentencing judge in particular, which amply demonstrate both the seriousness of Mr Glass' actions and the public protection and child protection issues this gives rise to:

- *"... cases where it is far more serious is where a significantly older person uses their position of trust to have sexual relations with a child who is incredibly vulnerable and where the harm caused can be catastrophically life-changing and where the person in the position of trust knew that and went ahead and behaved as they did for their own sexual gratification. Those section 17 cases are far more serious and your case, Mr Glass, falls into that category. It actually falls into being one of the most serious section 17 cases that I've had to deal with."*

- *"I have to assess the culpability and the Sentencing Council properly sets down categories which place cases into category A or category B; and here, there's no doubt there was specific targeting of a vulnerable child, a particularly vulnerable child, and there were sexual images exchanged, so it goes into category A. But the culpability of this case is not really about the words that are contained within the guidance: it's the fact that you knew her vulnerabilities; you knew the risk that you were taking for causing her serious injury; and you went ahead."*
- *"In my view, this case is such that it goes outside the range and there are three matters that I place on record that, in my view, take it outside the category range. Firstly, [Person A]'s very specific and serious vulnerability. This has two effects: one, it greatly increases the harm caused to her, as set out in her victim personal statement; and, secondly, it greatly increases your culpability because you knew, better than anybody else, the state of her vulnerability and what your actions would cause to her. Secondly, I take into account the very disturbing sexual aggression used within these three incidents."*
- *"The appropriate punishment for this offending and your culpability, and the harm done to [Person A], can only be achieved by an immediate prison sentence. This sort of offence is so serious that it must be marked by the court, to ensure that members of society understand how seriously it is treated."*

The panel was therefore of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Glass.

Accordingly, it 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 include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;

- any sexual misconduct involving a child;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

These behaviours were directly applicable in this case.

Accordingly, the panel decided that its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate.

Although the panel took account of the mitigating factors identified above, the public interest considerations that Mr Glass' conviction gives rise to were such that this was necessary, appropriate and proportionate.

Whilst Mr Glass appeared to have taken some steps to remediate his behaviour, there was no evidence of insight, remorse or regret on his part in the course of this referral.

The panel repeats that, as someone convicted of having sexual activity with a vulnerable pupil in his care on 3 separate occasions, Mr Glass' actions are fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. His actions involved a serious breach of trust and serious harm to Pupil A and the nature and seriousness of the offences necessitated the prohibition order to be recommended without provision 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 a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Glass 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.
- 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 took account of the Advice and the behaviour relevant in this case, which involved “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).”

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction of three offences of sexual activity with a vulnerable pupil in his care.

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 Glass, 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. The panel has observed, “Mr Glass' actions were at the most serious end of the spectrum and his behaviour in committing these offences clearly engaged child protection and public protection issues.” 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, “In these proceedings, there was little evidence of regret, remorse or insight on the part of Mr Glass. To the contrary, from Mr Glass' limited engagement in these proceedings it appeared he focussed on himself and his desire to move on with his life.” In my judgement, the lack of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils'. 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, "Mr Glass' behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children. By virtue of his position, Mr Glass was in a position of trust and responsibility in relation to Pupil A. He abused that position." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction related to sexual activity involving 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, 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 Glass himself and the panel comment "Mr Glass appeared to have had an otherwise good record. Prior to these events, he was described as someone having an *"exemplary character"*.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Glass 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 public and child protection issues. The panel has said, "Mr Glass' behaviour led to him receiving a sentence of imprisonment for a term of 22 months, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence. The panel noted the following remarks from the sentencing judge in particular, which amply demonstrate both the seriousness of Mr Glass' actions and the public protection and child protection issues this gives rise to:

- *"... cases where it is far more serious is where a significantly older person uses their position of trust to have sexual relations with a child who is incredibly vulnerable and where the harm caused can be catastrophically life-changing and where the person in the position of trust knew that and went ahead and behaved as they did for their own sexual gratification. Those section 17 cases are far more serious and your case, Mr Glass, falls into that category. It actually falls into being one of the most serious section 17 cases that I've had to deal with."*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “His actions involved harm and abuse to Pupil A. Mr Glass had sexual relations with a vulnerable pupil, incredibly serious in and of itself. Further, the sexual acts in question involved aggression on his part for sexual gratification and in a manner that the Court described as *“particularly unpleasant”*.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Glass 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 remorse and 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 “The panel repeats that, as someone convicted of having sexual activity with a vulnerable pupil in his care on 3 separate occasions, Mr Glass’ actions are fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. His actions involved a serious breach of trust and serious harm to Pupil A and the nature and seriousness of the offences necessitated the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offence, and the lack of insight and remorse.

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 Oliver Glass 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 Glass 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 Oliver Glass 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 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line extending from the start of the signature.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 28 February 2022

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