



Mr Sai Krishnan Santhosh Kumar: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	14
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

Teacher: Sai Krishnan Santhosh Kumar

Teacher ref number: 4242008

Teacher date of birth: 4 January 1990

TRA reference: 25209

Date of determination: 17 July 2026

Former employer: Meadow Park School, Whitley, Coventry.

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened between 14 July 2026 and 17 July 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Kumar.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Lucy Conley (teacher panellist) and Dr Lee Longden (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Jamila Bernard-Stevenson of Blake Morgan.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Mark Millin of Kingsley Napley solicitors.

The teacher was present but was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 17 April 2026:-

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

1. From in or around December 2024, he amended and/or added to pupils' coursework, purporting it to be their own, in respect of the 'Pearson BTEC Tech Award Level1/2 in Enterprise':

a. module 1a, for the following pupil(s):

- i. Pupil A
- ii. Pupil B
- iii. Pupil C
- iv. Pupil D
- v. Pupil E
- vi. Pupil G
- vii. Pupil I
- viii. Pupil K
- ix. Pupil L
- x. Pupil M
- xi. Pupil N
- xii. Pupil O
- xiii. Pupil P
- xiv. Pupil Q
- xv. Pupil R
- xvi. Pupil T
- xvii. Pupil U
- xviii. Pupil V
- xix. Pupil W

b. module 2a, for the following pupil(s):

- i. Pupil A
- ii. Pupil C
- iii. Pupil E
- iv. Pupil G
- v. Pupil I
- vi. Pupil L
- vii. Pupil O
- viii. Pupil P
- ix. Pupil Q

2. His conduct at paragraph 1a) – 1b) above was:

a. Dishonest; and/or

- b. Lacking in integrity.

Mr Kumar admitted the facts of allegations 1 (a) and 1(b). Mr Kumar denied all the remaining allegations.

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 8 to 10

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 11 to 22

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 23 to 36

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 37 to 666

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 667 to 681

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

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A [REDACTED]

Witness B [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.

At the material time Mr Kumar was employed as an ICT teacher who also taught a wider range of subjects including the BTEC Tech Award Level1/2 in Enterprise at Meadow Park

School ('the School'). As part of his role as a teacher at the School, Mr Kumar was also a form tutor.

The BTEC Enterprise course is split into parts. Module 1a, 1b, 2a and 2b are assessed by way of coursework. Module 3 is assessed by way of an examination. Module 1a consisted of producing a report which considers two micro-enterprise ideas; module 1b consisted of completing a business plan template by adding information regarding their chosen micro-enterprise idea; module 2a consisted of producing and delivering an electronic presentation which summarised the business plan and module 2b involved watching the video of the recording of the delivery of the electronic presentation and the production of a report reviewing it.

It was a requirement that an assessment record, including a declaration, was produced for every pupil which was signed by both pupil and teacher in order to confirm that the work was the student's own work.

During the live recording of Pupil E delivering their electronic presentation, when Witness B loaded Pupil E's PowerPoint presentation onto the computer, Pupil E did not recognise the presentation. As a result of this, Witness B made further enquiries and discovered that several pupils who Mr Kumar had taught had very similar PowerPoint presentations. Upon a further review of Pupil E's presentation, Witness B observed that Mr Kumar's initials appeared within the presentation. Witness B observed that Mr Kumar was in the process of editing the presentation.

Witness B reported his concerns to Witness A ([REDACTED] at the School) and they agreed to inform the moderator that there was an issue with some coursework at the school and that submissions of further coursework would be on hold. At this time, Witness B also consulted Individual A who advised that a formal investigation ought to be conducted. Witness A was responsible for conducting this investigation and producing an investigation report.

During the investigation, Witness A conducted fact-finding meetings with Mr Kumar on 13 December 2024 and 13 January 2025.

On 13 January 2025, Mr Kumar was suspended.

During the investigation, Witness A was able to identify 23 pupil folders which contained work that Mr Kumar had amended.

On 20 January 2025, Mr Kumar resigned from his role at the School.

As a result of the concerns identified with the coursework of 23 pupils, the decision was made to disregard module 2A and to aggregate the pupils' grades from the two unaffected components.

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. From in or around December 2024, you amended and/or added to pupils' coursework, purporting it to be their own, in respect of the 'Pearson BTEC Tech Award Level 1/2 in Enterprise':

a. module 1a, for the following pupil(s):

- i. Pupil A
- ii. Pupil B
- iii. Pupil C
- iv. Pupil D
- v. Pupil E
- vi. Pupil G
- vii. Pupil I
- viii. Pupil K
- ix. Pupil L
- x. Pupil M
- xi. Pupil N
- xii. Pupil O
- xiii. Pupil P
- xiv. Pupil Q
- xv. Pupil R
- xvi. Pupil T
- xvii. Pupil U
- xviii. Pupil V
- xix. Pupil W

b. module 2a, for the following pupil(s):

- i. Pupil A
- ii. Pupil C
- iii. Pupil E
- iv. Pupil G
- v. Pupil I
- vi. Pupil L
- vii. Pupil O
- viii. Pupil P
- ix. Pupil Q

The panel considered allegations 1 (a) and 1(b) together.

At the outset of the hearing, Mr Kumar admitted allegations 1(a) and 1(b).

During the hearing, the panel heard evidence from Witness B. In his evidence, Witness B explained that his suspicions were aroused regarding the authenticity of Pupil E's PowerPoint presentation as they did not recognise the presentation when it was loaded on the computer. This led to Witness B scrutinising the presentation more closely and observing that Mr Kumar appeared to be accessing and editing it in real time.

Witness B's evidence was supplemented by the evidence of Witness A who explained in her witness statement that she was tasked with completing an internal investigation. During this investigation, Witness A explained that she compiled a spreadsheet which detailed the names of the pupils whose folders she determined had been accessed by Witness B. These pupils were then interviewed in order to confirm whether they had been responsible for all of their coursework in module 1a and module 2a.

During the hearing, the panel also heard oral evidence from Witness A. She explained that during her investigation she observed that a range of amendments had been made to the pupils' work. Some of these changes included producing entire PowerPoint presentations and some of the amendments involved adding information to the business proposal section of the course work. In her evidence, Witness A confirmed that if the concerns regarding the authenticity of the coursework had not been identified, Pearson (the awarding organisation) may not have discovered that the pupils had not been responsible for the work.

The panel was presented with work samples of the coursework of Pupils A, B, C, D, E, G, I, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and W from module 1(a). The panel was also presented with work samples of coursework of Pupils A, C, E, G, I, L, O, P and Q from module 2(a). These work samples showed that edits had been made to one or more documents. The panel was also presented with screenshots which showed the 'version history' of the document and demonstrated that at times a user by the name Sai Krishnan had accessed the documents and made changes.

In addition to this document, the panel was presented with signed questionnaires from the pupils' interviews, confirming that they were not responsible for producing all of the work that had been attributed to them. The panel noted that as the pupils were not present at the hearing, the content of these questionnaires amounted to hearsay evidence. The panel determined that as the questionnaires were not the sole and decisive evidence pertaining to allegations 1(a) and 1(b) and that as this evidence was unchallenged by Mr Kumar, it would be fair to admit this evidence.

During the hearing, the panel heard evidence from Mr Kumar who explained that he accessed the coursework specified in allegation 1(a) and 1(b) via Microsoft Teams with his own login and made several additions and amendments.

The panel determined that Mr Kumar's admission was consistent with the evidence before it.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 1(a) and 1 (b) proven.

2. Your conduct at paragraph 1a) – 1b) above was:

a. Dishonest; and/or

Having found the facts of allegation 1(a) and 1(b) proved, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Kumar's conduct was dishonest.

The panel approached the task of determining whether Mr Kumar had behaved dishonestly by first determining Mr Kumar's knowledge or belief at the material time before determining whether Mr Kumar's actions in these circumstances was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel considered Mr Kumar's evidence that at the material time his genuine belief was that he was providing permissible support to pupils.

The panel heard evidence that the BTEC Tech Award Level 1/2 in Enterprise qualification was a qualification that had been recently restructured by Pearson to introduce the PSA assessment. The panel was concerned that although the PSA (Pearson Set Assignment) guidance had been circulated, there appeared to be a lack of centre guidance and a lack of systematic embedding (by management) of the requirements of the new assessment and qualification regime. Notwithstanding this, the panel rejected Mr Kumar's assertion that his genuine belief was that by amending and adding to pupils' work he was providing permissible support.

Mr Kumar's attempts at providing 'support' extended to completing the entirety of Pupil E's presentation. As Pupil E would be expected to give an oral presentation based on the content of the PowerPoint presentation, the suggestion that Mr Kumar's genuine belief was that it was permissible to complete this presentation in its entirety (without her knowledge) was untenable. Moreover, the panel noted that there were inconsistencies between the account provided by Mr Kumar during the internal investigation and the account that Mr Kumar provided to the panel. During the internal investigation, Mr Kumar appeared to acknowledge that he had received PSA guidance and was aware that the coursework was an assessed part of the qualification. However, in his evidence to the panel, Mr Kumar accepted that he had received the guidance but denied that he had read it and denied that he was aware that the entirety of the coursework would be assessed.

The panel determined that based on the evidence before it, that at the material time:-

- Mr Kumar had been provided with the PSA guidance via email prior to the completion of modules 1(a) and 1(b). This guidance stated that marks were to be awarded for the completion of the coursework in modules 1(a) and 1(b). The inclusion of this information in the PSA guidance indicated that these modules would be assessed.

- Mr Kumar was familiar with the content of the PSA guidance, having been taken through it. This conclusion is supported by Mr Kumar's responses during his second fact-finding interview on 13 January 2025 in which he admitted that he recalled attending a meeting with Witness B in which he was told how to deliver and carry out the coursework with students.
- Mr Kumar was aware that the coursework that he had edited and/or added to would be assessed. This is indicated by his responses during the first fact-finding interview on 13 December 2024 in which he stated that he understood that coursework makes up part of the exam. Mr Kumar provided similar responses during the second fact-finding interview of 13 January 2025 in which he stated that coursework was *'the work that students do, the examination, it counts towards their final result'*.
- Prior to being tasked with overseeing the completion of the BTEC Enterprise coursework, Mr Kumar had overseen pupils' completion of Creative iMedia coursework under controlled conditions and therefore would have been familiar with pupils producing coursework (unaided) under such conditions.
- Mr Kumar was familiar with the content of the declaration (which had to be completed upon submission of the coursework) which stated that the coursework was the pupils own work as he been exposed to similar declarations whilst overseeing the completion of the Creative iMedia qualification.
- As an experienced teacher with approximately 13 years of experience, Mr Kumar knew that producing, editing and adding to pupils' coursework was not allowed.

After determining Mr Kumar's knowledge and belief at the material time, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Kumar's actions in those circumstances were dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel determined that Mr Kumar's actions were dishonest. Mr Kumar produced, edited and added to the coursework of several pupils without their knowledge and consent. Mr Kumar allowed this work to be presented as their own and if his actions had not been detected by Witness B, Pearson would have been led to believe that the pupils credited for the coursework were responsible for producing it. The panel considered Mr Kumar's contention that he had not taken steps to conceal his conduct and that he had not undertaken this conduct for personal gain. However, the panel determined that Mr Kumar's motivation was not relevant to the panel's determination as to whether Mr Kumar's conduct was dishonest.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 2(a) proven.

b. Lacking in integrity.

As regards a lack of integrity, the panel considered the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Wingate v SRA; SRA v Mallins [2018] EWCA civ 366*. It recognised that integrity denotes adherence to the standards of the profession and the panel therefore considered whether, by his actions, Mr Kumar failed to adhere to those standards.

At the material time, Mr Kumar had approximately 13 years of experience as a teacher.

In addition to this, Mr Kumar had overseen pupils' completion of coursework in connection with the Creative iMedia coursework assessment (under controlled conditions) the previous year. The evidence indicated that Mr Kumar was aware that producing, amending and adding to pupils' coursework was not allowed. The panel determined that Mr Kumar's motivation was not relevant to the panel's determination regarding whether Mr Kumar's actions were dishonest. However, the panel was of the view that it is likely that Mr Kumar's conduct was undertaken in order to improve the performance of pupils in the relevant cohort. This would have caused unfairness to pupils who had completed the work unaided and had not received additional support. In the event that Mr Kumar's interference with the completion of the assessed coursework had not been detected, these pupils would have gained an unfair advantage. The panel rejected Mr Kumar's assertion that if the pupils had realised that the work was not their own, they could have decided not to sign the declaration. The panel was of the view that this was an attempt by Mr Kumar to try and transfer responsibility for adhering to the assessment requirements from himself to the pupils.

In the panel's view, Mr Kumar's actions were dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

For the same reasons as set out above, the panel determined that Mr Kumar's actions, in relation to each of these allegations also amounted to a lack of integrity. By behaving in the manner outlined in the allegation, Mr Kumar has disregarded his duties and responsibilities as a trusted employee and educator.

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 the teacher, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Kumar 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.

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.

Behaviours associated with offences

The panel also considered whether Mr Kumar'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.

The panel determined that by behaving in the manner outlined in the allegations, Mr Kumar's conduct undermined the examination process. The panel was of the view that Mr Kumar's conduct amounted to academic misconduct. A singular incident of academic misconduct was very serious; however, Mr Kumar's conduct was not isolated, it was widespread and sustained. The panel was of the view that Mr Kumar's conduct amounted to a pattern of behaviour.

The panel determined that Mr Kumar breached the trust of his employers and also pupils (who have a right to expect that teachers will act ethically and with integrity). Mr Kumar's actions resulted in the entirety of the affected module being discounted.

Owing to the length of time that it took Pearson to investigate the '*malpractice maladministration*,' the deadline for the submission of coursework lapsed. This in turn resulted in pupils' marks from the unaffected modules having to be aggregated in order to determine their final grade. The panel accepted Witness A's evidence that as the affected module had been scheduled to be completed at a later point in the course, it is likely that many of the pupils would have performed better in this module than earlier modules. She explained that this was because by the time that the affected module had been scheduled to be completed, the pupils would have been studying the subject for a longer

period. She further explained that in her experience, pupils who completed the coursework after studying the subject for a longer period of time, performed better in their assessments. Therefore, by discounting this module entirely, many pupils would have ended up with a lower grade. The panel noted that this outcome could have negatively affected the future career prospects of these pupils.

The panel heard further evidence that Mr Kumar's conduct led to some pupils becoming discouraged and disengaging from their studies.

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

In relation to whether Mr Kumar'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 Kumar'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 Kumar was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel determined that Mr Kumar's conduct could have had a measurable impact on the future employment prospects of the pupils.

As a result of Mr Kumar's conduct undermining the PSA process, he had also undermined public confidence in the School and the education system more widely.

Mr Kumar's conduct could have negatively affected the School's reputation and could have led to the School having its examination privileges revoked by Pearson.

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 Kumar'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 a 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.
- the declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Kumar, which involved conduct that was dishonest and lacked integrity in the context of producing, editing and adding to pupils' coursework, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Kumar was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was also 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 Kumar 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 Kumar in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Kumar has experience as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Kumar in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he abused his position of trust.

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 should maintain a high level of integrity and adherence to ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that abuses their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Kumar.

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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity...especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences...
- 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 determined that the following mitigating factors were present in this case:

- Mr Kumar had no adverse regulatory history.
- Mr Kumar made admissions to allegation 1(a) and 1(b) at the outset of proceedings.
- During the hearing, Mr Kumar apologised to those affected by his conduct.
- Mr Kumar co-operated with the internal investigation into his conduct.
- Mr Kumar demonstrated limited insight into his conduct.

Although the panel saw evidence of good character, it noted that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher.

Weighed against these matters, the panel considered there were some aggravating factors present, including:

- Mr Kumar's conduct amounted to a pattern of behaviour (albeit limited to the pupils in one cohort, one school and one academic year).
- A significant number of pupils were affected.
- At the material time, Mr Kumar had approximately 13 years of teaching experience.
- Mr Kumar's editing of pupils' coursework extended to producing the entirety of some pieces of coursework such as Pupil E's PowerPoint presentation.

The teacher did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

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 Kumar 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 Kumar. The nature of the conduct, the impact of the conduct on the pupils and the school and Mr Kumar's limited insight were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice 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:

These include:

- fraud or serious dishonesty;

The panel was of the view that portraying the coursework that he had amended and/or produced as the pupils' own coursework was a fraudulent act. Mr Kumar's conduct was exacerbated by the fact that the conduct amounted to a pattern of behaviour. However, this was limited in scope to one cohort, one year group and one school. Although, the panel determined that Mr Kumar had shown insight, the panel determined that this insight had developed at a late stage and was limited in nature.

Notwithstanding this, the panel determined that Mr Kumar's conduct was remediable and that Mr Kumar would benefit from appropriate training, supervision and mentoring. The panel was of the view that the outcome of these proceedings will serve as a salutary lesson for Mr Kumar and that a three-year review period will provide him sufficient time to reflect on his conduct. The panel determined that once his insight had fully developed, it is likely that the risk of repetition would be low.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of three years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Kumar 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.

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 has found that the conduct of Mr Kumar fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include dishonesty and a lack of integrity in contravening the requirements of assessments for an externally awarded qualification.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Kumar, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel does not mention having considered any evidence that Mr Kumar's behaviour placed the safety of his pupils in jeopardy. However, it has said that "many pupils would have ended up with a lower grade" and "that this outcome could have negatively affected the future career prospects of these pupils." It has also said that it "heard further evidence that Mr Kumar's conduct led to some pupils becoming discouraged and disengaging from their studies."

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse. The panel has said that "Mr Kumar apologised to those affected by his conduct" and that "Mr Kumar demonstrated limited insight into his conduct." In my judgement, the lack of full insight 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 has observed that "In light of the panel's findings against Mr Kumar, which involved conduct that was dishonest and lacked integrity in the context of producing, editing and adding to pupils' coursework, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Kumar was 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 impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Kumar himself. The panel has commented that it "saw evidence of good character" but that "no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher." The panel also commented that Mr Kumar "did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Kumar 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 dishonesty involved in Mr Kumar's conduct which undermined the examination process, and which amounted to a pattern of behaviour and affected a significant number of pupils. The panel has said that the "nature of the conduct, the impact of the conduct on the pupils and the school and Mr Kumar's limited insight were significant factors" in forming its opinion that a prohibition order should be imposed.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Kumar has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

The panel has noted that, in cases involving fraud or serious dishonesty, the Advice indicates that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. The panel has found that Mr Kumar's conduct was "a fraudulent act" and "was exacerbated by the fact that the conduct amounted to a pattern of behaviour" albeit that it "was limited in scope to one cohort, one year group and one school."

The panel has also commented that although Mr Kumar insight "was limited in nature" it was "remediable and that Mr Kumar would benefit from appropriate training, supervision and mentoring" and that "a three-year supervision period will provide him sufficient time to reflect on his conduct."

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 allowing a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the dishonesty in contravening examinational requirements, the lack of full insight and the risk of repetition.

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 Sai Krishnan Santhosh Kumar 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 27 July 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 Kumar remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Kumar 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 'D. Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 22 July 2026

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