



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Sunjit Kang: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

December 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	3
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher: Mr Sunjit Kang

Teacher ref number: 3550116

Teacher date of birth: 15 February 1985

TRA reference: 23758

Date of determination: 17 December 2025

Former employer: The Grangefield Academy

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually between 16 and 17 December 2025 to consider the case of Mr Sunjit Kang.

The panel members were Dr Martin Coles (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Anila Rai (lay panellist) and Ms Elizabeth Tongue (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Tom Walker of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Lee Bridges.

Mr Kang was not present nor represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 29 September 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Kang was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

Whilst working as Head of Department and subject teacher at The Grangefield Academy ('the Academy'):

1. In or around October 2023, you:

- a. inflated pupils' exam marks for the pupils set out in Schedule A; and/or
- b. in respect of the assessment titled 'R094 - Visual Identity and Digital Graphics', added to and/or amended pupils' work, purporting it to be their own, for the pupils set out in Schedule B; and/or
- c. completed and/or amended exam authentication forms, purporting them to have been completed by pupils as set out in Schedule C.

2. Your conduct at 1(a) and/or 1(b) and/or 1(c):

- a. lacked integrity; and/or
- b. was dishonest.

Schedule A

- 1. Pupil Q;
- 2. Pupil H;
- 3. Pupil E;
- 4. Pupil R;
- 5. Pupil S;
- 6. Pupil T;
- 7. Pupil U;
- 8. Pupil V;
- 9. Pupil W;
- 10. Pupil G;
- 11. Pupil X;
- 12. Pupil O;
- 13. Pupil Y;
- 14. Pupil Z;
- 15. Pupil AA;
- 16. Pupil AB;
- 17. Pupil AC;
- 18. Pupil AD;
- 19. Pupil AE;
- 20. Pupil AF;
- 21. Pupil AG;
- 22. Pupil N;
- 23. Pupil AH;
- 24. Pupil AI;
- 25. Pupil P;
- 26. Pupil AJ;
- 27. Pupil M;
- 28. Pupil L;
- 29. Pupil F;
- 30. Pupil AK;
- 31. Pupil AL;
- 32. Pupil AM;
- 33. Pupil K;
- 34. Pupil A;

35. Pupil AN;
36. Pupil AO;
37. Pupil J;
38. Pupil B; and/or
39. Pupil I.

Schedule B

1. Pupil B;
2. Pupil E;
3. Pupil G;
4. Pupil I;
5. Pupil K; and/or
6. Pupil M.

Schedule C

1. Pupil A;
2. Pupil B;
3. Pupil O;
4. Pupil P;
5. Pupil L; and/or
6. Pupil M.

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 5 to 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 8 to 21

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 22 to 33

Section 5: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 34 to 471

Section 6: Teacher documents – pages 472 to 475

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

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

Witnesses

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

- Witness A [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

By way of background, Mr Kang was employed by the Academy as Head of ICT and Business from 1 September 2022 until 31 March 2024. On 14 November 2023, a moderation team for the OCR exam board reported concerns about the authenticity of the work submitted on behalf of pupils. This resulted in an investigation into the conduct of Mr Kang in relation to the management and assessment of controlled work in one unit which he had submitted on behalf of pupils.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons.

Whilst working as Head of Department and subject teacher at The Grangefield Academy ('the Academy'):

1. **In or around October 2023, you:**
 - a. inflated pupils' exam marks for the pupils set out in Schedule A; and/or**
 - b. in respect of the assessment titled 'R094 - Visual Identity and Digital Graphics', added to and/or amended pupils' work, purporting it to be their own, for the pupils set out in Schedule B; and/or**
 - c. completed and/or amended exam authentication forms, purporting them to have been completed by pupils as set out in Schedule C.**

As regards allegation 1a. the panel reviewed a copy of the document recording the original marks awarded to pupils and the re-moderation marks by two senior Academy Trust employees. There were significant disparities between the marks. The marks given by Mr Kang were all significantly higher than the re-moderation marks.

Mr Kang was questioned about this by the Academy and in the course of the investigation stated that he had used 'best case scenario marks'. His case was based on a hypothetical scenario in which (in the case of Pupil C) what the pupil would have achieved if they attended the additional drop-down sessions scheduled to allow pupils to complete additional work. This scenario was fanciful and it was inappropriate to apply it to assessed work. The disparities were also significant and outside any reasonable margin of error or appreciation. The panel reviewed Schedule A and was satisfied that allegation 1a. was found proved on the basis of the pupils referred to therein.

As regards allegation 1b, it is said that Mr Kang submitted work on behalf of pupils which had not been completed by that particular pupil. The basis for this allegation was that Mr Kang had inflated the grades of pupils and was then required to provide work which evidenced the inflated grades. The panel reviewed a number of examples of work where the name and/or signature of one candidate is present in the work of another.

Mr Kang was questioned about this by the Academy and in the course of the investigation stated that this was an error and that he had not checked the individual pupil name and candidate number. However, the pattern of the way this had been done, and its repetition was not indicative of it being an error. Indeed, the actions were entirely consistent with an attempt to provide evidence to support grades which had been inflated. The panel reviewed Schedule B and was satisfied that allegation 1b. was found proved on the basis of the pupils referred to therein with the exception of Pupil B.

As regards allegation 1c. the panel heard evidence that the examination board required each candidate to sign a declaration to confirm that the work was their own and any assistance given and/or sources used, including AI tools, had been acknowledged. All students were to sign these authentication forms, which were then to be kept on file. The panel received a document recording the different signatures completed by some of the pupil candidates for the purposes of comparison.

In the course of the investigation, and in a meeting on 28 November 2023, Mr Kang was asked for copies of candidate authentication forms for pupils whose work he was responsible for submitting. It subsequently transpired that Mr Kang had printed off copies of these forms from his IT account after this meeting and thus long after the time when they should have been completed (ie prior to the submission of the assessments). The printer log displays records that multiple blank templates were printed.

The panel heard evidence that Mr Kang had asked colleagues for the unit code for the work, which would not have been required had the forms already been signed. A number of pupils stated that they did not sign an authentication form (Pupil A, B, L, and M). Other pupils stated that they signed a form but could not be exactly sure as to when they signed their forms. All the authentication forms are dated 22 September 2023, however there were a number of indicators that the authentication forms were not signed on that date, which included statements from pupils (such as Pupil K) that he had signed it in January 2024.

This is concerning as it does not follow the exam guidance required by JCQ and OCR, which states that before submitting their work, each candidate must sign a declaration to confirm the work is their own and any assistance given and/or sources used, including AI tools, have been acknowledged. The panel heard evidence that Head of Departments received a copy of these JCQ guidelines and this guidance was also circulated by the Subject Director. The panel also noted that Mr Kang was an experienced teacher who was, or should have been, aware of these guidelines.

The panel reviewed Schedule C and was satisfied that allegation 1c. was found proved on the basis of at least four of the pupils referred to therein (Pupils A, B, L and M), as there was no evidence to support that this had taken place with Pupils O and P. As regards Pupils A, B, L and M, the panel was satisfied that these authentication forms were submitted by Mr Kang as opposed to the pupils. The panel was not satisfied with the explanation given by Mr Kang in representations to the TRA and finds allegation 1c, proved.

2. Your conduct at 1(a) and/or 1(b) and/or 1(c):

- a. lacked integrity; and/or**
- b. was dishonest.**

The panel found each of the particulars of allegation 1 proven, and considered each separately. The panel carefully considered the account given by Mr Kang. Mr Kang refers to his experience as a teacher but also makes reference to [REDACTED] having an impact upon him at the time and states that any errors made in relation to the matters identified at allegation 1 were administrative and non-deliberate.

Mr Kang deliberately inflated the grades of pupils and did so without any justification. Even if his motivation was to secure a benefit to the pupils, such actions would tend to undermine the integrity of the assessment system and any such motivation was misguided. As regards allegation 1a, the panel takes the view that the actions represent a lack of integrity.

Mr Kang inter-changed one pupil's work for another and there are multiple examples of this. The panel found that this was done deliberately with an intent to achieve grades for pupils which were not justified. Mr Kang then compounded this by attempting to provide an audit trail of sorts to conceal his action by getting pupils to complete authentication forms after their work had been completed, which was inappropriate. It was also inappropriate as he involved learners in this activity. The actions of Mr Kang as regards allegations 1b. and 1c. also undermine the integrity of the assessment system and the panel takes the view that the actions of Mr Kang represent a lack of integrity.

At the time of the submission of the inflated grades, the submissions of one pupil's work in place of another, and the submission of authentication forms which had not been completed appropriately by pupils, Mr Kang could have had no genuine belief that his actions were justified, authorised or honest. There was no appreciable scope for any error. By the standards of ordinary decent people, his actions were clearly dishonest, and the panel finds allegations 2a. and 2 b proved with respect to allegations 1a. 1b. and 1c.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Kang in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mr Kang's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

Mr Kang was engaged in a deliberate attempt to mislead an examination board as to the actual performance of pupils and their involvement in the assessment process. Mr Kang engaged in a concerted effort to falsify pupils' grades and examination performance, and

compounded this through efforts to conceal what he had done. This undermines the integrity of the examination assessment process.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Kang 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 Kang was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

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

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

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Kang was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud and serious dishonesty were relevant.

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.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Kang's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Kang which involved falsification of exam entries and records, there was a strong public interest consideration in the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Kang 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 Kang 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 Kang in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Kang had experience as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Kang in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain 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 Kang.

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 ... of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);

- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences ... ;
- collusion or concealment including:
 - any activity that involves knowingly substantiating another person's statements where they are known to be false;
 - ... concealing inappropriate actions;
 - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing;
 - deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (or deliberate collusion in or deliberate concealment of such action) particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate. The panel noted and accepted that Mr Kang was under [REDACTED] at the time of the allegations due to his circumstances. Mr Kang was also an experienced teacher of good character. However, none of these factors were sufficient to amount to significant mitigation in the circumstances. Mr Kang has not displayed any real acknowledgement of his failures, or any insight or remorse.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Kang 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 Kang. The sustained pattern of dishonest conduct was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

This includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty ..

The panel is of the view that this category is engaged given the conduct of Mr Kang, and that a longer review period is appropriate. Given the circumstances of this case, the panel did not take the view that a prohibition be recommended without provisions for a review, but decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period should be set for not less than 3 years from the date at which any order takes effect.

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/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Sunjit Kang should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour ...
- 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 finds that the conduct of Mr Kang fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a teacher engaging in the falsification of exam entries and records as well as engaging in behaviour that was dishonest.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In assessing 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 Kang, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

The panel does not record having considered any evidence that Mr Kang's behaviour directly compromised the safety and wellbeing of pupils.

I have taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which it sets out as follows:

"Mr Kang has not displayed any real acknowledgement of his failures, or any insight or remorse."

In my judgement, the lack of evidence that Mr Kang has developed insight into and remorse for his actions means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel offers this observation:

"Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Kang were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the negative impact that such a finding is likely to have on the reputation of the profession and the public's confidence in the examination system.

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 Kang himself. The panel observes that:

“Mr Kang was also an experienced teacher of good character.”

However, it cites no character evidence or references to support this conclusion.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Kang 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 serious nature of Mr Kang’s misconduct. For example, it states that he engaged in a “...sustained pattern of dishonest conduct”. Elsewhere, it comments that “Mr Kang engaged in a concerted effort to falsify pupils’ grades and examination performance, and compounded this through efforts to conceal what he had done.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments regarding the absence of evidence of insight and/or remorse on Mr Kang’s part.

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a three-year review period.

In doing so, it has referenced the Advice:

"The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

This includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty ..

The panel is of the view that this category is engaged given the conduct of Mr Kang, and that a longer review period is appropriate."

I have considered the panel's concluding comments:

"Given the circumstances of this case, the panel did not take the view that a prohibition be recommended without provisions for a review, but decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period should be set for not less than 3 years from the date at which any order takes effect."

I have considered whether a three-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that I agree with the panel that allowing such a review period is sufficient and appropriate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious dishonesty found, the concerted nature of the misconduct in this case, the absence of evidence of any true insight and/or remorse and the negative impact on public confidence.

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

This means that Mr Sunjit Kang 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 7 January 2029, three 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 Kang remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Kang 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 "Mr Cawen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "C" at the beginning.

Decision maker: Marc Cavey

Date: 22 December 2025

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