



Case Examiner Decision  
Michelle Morgan – SW122147  
FTPS-24068

## Contents

The role of the case examiners .....	3
Decision summary .....	4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns.....	6
Preliminary issues .....	8
The realistic prospect test.....	10
The public interest.....	20
Accepted disposal .....	22

### The role of the case examiners

The case examiners perform a filtering function in the fitness to practise process, and their primary role is to determine whether the case ought to be considered by adjudicators at a formal hearing. The wider purpose of the fitness to practise process is not to discipline the social worker for past conduct, but rather to consider whether the social worker's current fitness to practise might be impaired because of the issues highlighted. In reaching their decisions, case examiners are mindful that Social Work England's primary objective is to protect the public.

Case examiners apply the 'realistic prospect' test. As part of their role, the case examiners will consider whether there is a realistic prospect:

- the facts alleged could be found proven by adjudicators
- adjudicators could find that one of the statutory grounds for impairment is engaged
- adjudicators could find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired

If the case examiners find a realistic prospect of impairment, they consider whether there is a public interest in referring the case to a hearing. If there is no public interest in a hearing, the case examiners can propose an outcome to the social worker. We call this accepted disposal and a case can only be resolved in this way if the social worker agrees with the case examiners' proposal.

Case examiners review cases on the papers only. The case examiners are limited, in that, they are unable to hear and test live evidence, and therefore they are unable to make findings of fact.

## Decision summary

Decision summary	
Preliminary outcome	10 October 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed - warning order - 3 years
Final outcome	15 October 2025
	Warning order – 3 years (published)

## Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 being found proven by the adjudicators. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3, there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

The case examiners did not consider it to be in the public interest for the matter to be referred to a final hearing and determined that the case could be concluded by way of accepted disposal.

The social worker has subsequently agreed to the terms of the proposed accepted disposal.

The case examiners direct that this case can now be resolved with a warning order of 3 years duration.

The case examiners have considered all the documents made available within the evidence bundle. Key evidence is referred to throughout their decision and the case examiners' full reasoning is set out below.

### Anonymity and redaction

Elements of this decision have been marked for redaction in line with our Fitness to Practise Publications Policy. Text in [REDACTED] will be redacted only from the published copy of the decision and will therefore be shared with the complainant in their copy. Text in [REDACTED] will be redacted from both the complainant's and the published copy of the decision.

In accordance with Social Work England's fitness to practise proceedings and registration appeals publications policy, the case examiners have anonymised the names of individuals to maintain privacy. A schedule of anonymity is provided below for the social worker and complainant and will be redacted if this decision is published.

#### Anonymity Schedule:

Family A -

Family B -

Family C -



## The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint	
The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer [REDACTED]
Date the complaint was received	26 September 2024
Complaint summary	Concerns were raised by the social worker's former employer in relation to their standard of their practice and their alleged omission to carry out statutory work. It was alleged that their actions put service users at risk.

Regulatory concerns
<p>Regulatory concerns are clearly identified issues that are a concern to the regulator. The regulatory concerns for this case are as follows:</p> <p>Whilst registered as a social worker between May 2024 and September 2024 you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Failed to maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records</li><li>2. Failed to carry out relevant care needs assessments and/or reviews on cases allocated to you.</li><li>3. Failed to communicate appropriately and/or accurately with service users on your case load, including:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3.1 Family A</li><li>3.2 Family B</li><li>3.3 Family C</li></ol></li></ol>
[REDACTED]

Grounds of impairment:




The matters outlined in the regulatory concerns 1-3 amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct [REDACTED]

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Preliminary issues

Investigation		
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has been notified of the grounds for investigation?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that they have all relevant evidence available to them, or that adequate attempts have been made to obtain evidence that is not available?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that it was not proportionate or necessary to offer the complainant the opportunity to provide final written representations; or that they were provided a reasonable opportunity to do so where required.	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Requests for further information or submissions, or any other preliminary issues that have arisen
<p>To further protect anonymity and to realign the tabulated evidence in this investigation, the case examiners have made the following amendments to regulatory concern 3:</p> <p><i>Regulatory concern 3</i></p> <p><i>Failed to communicate appropriately and/or accurately with service users on your case load, including:</i></p> <p>3.1 Family A </p> <p>3.2 Family B </p> <p>3.3 Family C </p>



The case examiners are satisfied that the amendments are not material and have considered it to be unnecessary to delay consideration of the case further by seeking additional submissions from the social worker.

## The realistic prospect test

### Fitness to practise history

The case examiners have been informed that there is no previous fitness to practise history.

### Decision summary

Is there a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired?

Yes



No



The case examiners have determined that there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory ground of misconduct, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

### Reasoning

#### Facts

Whilst registered as a social worker between May 2024 and September 2024 you:

1. Failed to maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records

In the complainant's original concern, the local authority state that during their employment, the social worker did not complete '*...case notes on a lot of cases, where case notes were written they were not up to date*'.

The case examiners have reviewed further evidence on this matter which was requested by the case investigators. This has included:

- a wide range of sampled cases;
- a descriptive case audit;

- screen shots of relevant cases, evidencing where the social worker allegedly failed to complete case notes;
- a comprehensive case audit spreadsheet outlining outstanding and completed work;
- further evidence in relevant appendices;
- supervision notes recorded prior to the social worker leaving their employment;
- sample emails from relevant families;
- relevant policies and procedures relating to case management and case recording requirements.

There appears to be a reasonable body of evidence which suggests that the social worker may have failed to maintain any case recordings, case notes or up to date records on a substantial range of cases which were allocated to them during the cited four-month period. While some cases had records of intervention and casework, around 6 of 22 allocated cases had no case recordings at all. A significant proportion of these cases appear to have had no evidence of any recorded interventions or evidence of any case management.

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern. They state that at times, their record-keeping fell below the required professional standard.

The case examiners conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 1.**

2. Failed to carry out relevant care needs assessments and/or reviews on cases allocated to you.

Evidence from the local authority, provided in their initial complaint includes a detailed commentary of Person / Families A, B, and C as evidence of where the social worker appears to have failed to carry out relevant care needs assessments and / or reviews.

In addition to this, the case examiners have reviewed:

- a wide range of sampled cases, including a descriptive case audit;
- screen shots of relevant cases, evidencing where the social worker allegedly failed to complete case notes;

- a comprehensive case audit spreadsheet outlining outstanding and completed work;
- further evidence in relevant appendices;
- supervision notes recorded prior to the social worker leaving their employment;
- sample emails from relevant families
- relevant policies and procedures relating to case management and case recording requirements.

There appears to be a reasonable body of evidence which suggests that the social worker may have failed to conduct care needs assessments and reviews on a significant number of cases. In addition to Families A, B and C, it is also alleged by the local authority that 11 of the social worker's 22 allocated cases did not have the required care assessments or reviews; this is supported by a detailed commentary of acts of omission in each case, with a spreadsheet outlining cases where assessments had not been completed within the required 28 days.

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern. They state they regret that some assessments and reviews were delayed. While they cite prior health issues and the need for an occupational support plan, which they say was not implemented, they also recognise how their actions could have negatively affected service users' access to support.

The case examiners conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 2.**

3. Failed to communicate appropriately and/or accurately with service users on your case load, including:

3.1 Family A

3.2 Family B

3.3 Family C

Evidence from the local authority provided in their initial complaint, includes a detailed commentary of Persons / Families A, B, and C as evidence of where the social worker appears to have failed to communicate appropriately or accurately.

In summary, case A was a woman with a physical disability, who was receiving four commissioned care visits a day; their care needs were insufficient as the woman was incontinent of urine. It is alleged that during the four-month allocation, the social worker made no case entries, assessments or reviews. Due to the alleged non-contact, it is argued that the service user experienced a significant impact on their wellbeing, dignity and health, which potentially amounted to an abuse of trust, as the alleged lack of performance placed them at risk of harm and neglect.

In summary, case B, an elderly woman with dementia, was discharged from a general hospital to a care home for short term assessment or care needs only. During the four-month allocation, it is alleged that only one case note was entered, and the situation had not been progressed. It is alleged that on speaking with Family B's daughters, the social worker incorrectly told them this was a permanent placement arrangement, thus incurring a substantial cost to the local authority. This allegedly caused the family anger, distress and worry.

In summary, case C, an elderly man with Parkinson's disease, was allocated to the social worker for a statutory assessment of care needs as they had recently been discharged from hospital. It is alleged that while the social worker was allocated this case, a request from the Emergency Duty Team necessitated a duty visit, which found the man to be in a state of significant neglect. The social worker was tasked to review their care needs while in respite care, but it is alleged that this did not occur, and only limited contact occurred between the social worker and the man's son.

Additional evidence with respect to these three cases are again provided in the form of:

- a case audit;
- screen shots of relevant cases, evidencing where the social worker allegedly failed to complete case notes;
- a comprehensive case audit spreadsheet outlining outstanding and completed work;
- further evidence provided in relevant appendices;
- supervision notes recorded prior to the social worker leaving their employment;
- sample emails from relevant families;

- relevant policies and procedures relating to case management and case recording requirements.

The case examiners have reviewed the email statements in relation to two of the respective families. One family stated that they never had any contact with the social worker despite calling them on numerous occasions. Another family stated that nothing stood out with regards to regular contact because they didn't think that they got to that point.

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern. They acknowledge that their communication with service users was at times inconsistent and not always as clear or timely as it should have been. They state that they were under considerable stress, having to manage a caseload without effective supervision.

In review of the information available, the case examiners conclude that there is a substantial body of evidence which suggests that the social worker may have failed to communicate at all with the cited families. Where they did communicate, the evidence suggests that the quality of this information was in deficit and not sufficient to avoid distress and anxiety to the families in question.

The case examiners therefore conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3**

### Grounds

Summary of facts with a realistic prospect of being found proven: **1, 2 and 3 (3.1, 3.2 and 3.3)**

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1-3 amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct [REDACTED]

**Misconduct:** The case examiners are aware that there is no legal definition of misconduct, but it generally would consist of serious acts or omissions, which suggest a significant departure from what would be expected of the social worker in the circumstances. This can include conduct that takes place in the exercise of professional practice and conduct which occurs outside the exercise of professional practice but calls into question the suitability of the person to work as a social worker.

To help them decide if the evidence suggests a significant departure from what would be expected in the circumstances, the case examiners have considered the following standards, which were applicable at the time of the concerns:

*As a social worker, I will:*

*1.3 Work in partnership with people to promote their well-being and achieve best outcomes, recognising them as experts in their own lives.*

*2.3 Maintain professional relationships with people and ensure that they understand the role of a social worker in their lives.*

*2.5 Actively listen to understand people, using a range of appropriate communication methods to build relationships.*

*3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.*

*3.2 Use information from a range of appropriate sources, including supervision, to inform assessments, to analyse risk, and to make a professional decision*

*3.3 Apply my knowledge and skills to address the social care needs of individuals and their families commonly arising from physical and mental ill health, disability, substance misuse, abuse or neglect, to enhance quality of life and wellbeing.*

*3.4 Recognise the risk indicators of different forms of abuse and neglect and their impact on people, their families and their support networks.*

*3.8 Clarify where the accountability lies for delegated work and fulfil that responsibility when it lies with me.*



*3.11 Maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions.*

*3.12 Use my assessment skills to respond quickly to dangerous situations and take any necessary protective action.*

*As a social worker I will not:*

*5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.*

The available evidence suggests that the regulatory concerns, if proven, would amount to a significant and serious departure from the listed professional standards, which could arguably amount to a dereliction of professional duty. While there were no complaints from service users or their families, the local authority has provided evidence which suggests that a range of service users were left in a vulnerable and sometimes serious state of neglect which left them at actual risk of harm.

Furthermore, there exists a set of supervision notes, written shortly prior to the social worker's departure, where the social worker assures and stresses to their line manager that all actions in relation to service users would be completed. There appears to be significant evidence to suggest that they were not.

With reference to the departure from the listed professional standards, there appears to be clear evidence that the social worker may have failed to work directly with individuals and families, primarily caused by a lack of communication. This lack of communication resulted in an inability for families to understand the role of a social worker and how this could have improved their wellbeing outcomes. As the social worker did not appear to have completed statutory care assessments, they would not have followed the relevant ethical and legal frameworks relating to Care Act assessments. This would have resulted in situations where the social worker may have failed to consider adequate risk assessment frameworks arising from situations where service users were in a state of neglect. The alleged failure to complete adequate case recordings also resulted in a lack of accountability, aggravated by the fact that content in supervision notes suggested that the social worker was completing requested actions, but may not have been doing so.

The case examiners consider that the departure from the professional standards are significant, wide-ranging and serious. They therefore conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators making a finding of misconduct as a statutory ground.**

## Impairment

Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:

1. The personal element, established via an assessment of the risk of repetition.
2. The public element, established through consideration of whether a finding of impairment might be required to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

### Personal element

With regards to the concerns before the regulator, the case examiners have given thought to their guidance, and they note that they should consider whether the matters before the regulator are easily remediable, and whether the social worker has demonstrated insight and/or conducted remediation to the effect that the risk of repetition is highly unlikely.

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied: This type of conduct is potentially remediable. The social worker could engage in relevant training related to adequate record keeping, how to prioritise actions in relation to caseload management, how to manage competing priorities and how to engage effectively with service users.

Insight and remediation: The social worker appears to have demonstrated a reasonable level of insight. In their acceptance of the regulatory concerns, they evidence a level of regret and remorse for their alleged actions. They also appear to have reflected on the issues of concern. They apologise for the impact their practice had on service users and accept responsibility for their actions. Another learning point is they acknowledge is that they should have responded earlier to feelings of stress; in the future they would ensure that they escalate their concerns more assertively. They have also reflected on how to improve service user communication while under pressure. They appear to have implicitly accepted a level of historical impairment but dispute any current impairment.

The social worker has engaged in a reflective approach in relation to their future learning in practice. This has resulted in a significant level of remediation which has included relevant training to improve their record-keeping, which they say is now a strength of their practice. They state that their formal training has also focussed on clarity of case recording, timeliness and confidentiality. They state that they have reviewed their knowledge of local and national policies and procedures including safeguarding, assessment frameworks and communication standards. They state they have participated in reflective supervision and mentoring, focusing on workload management and maintaining professional boundaries. They state they have

engaged in personal time-management strategies including prioritisation frameworks and structured daily / weekly planning. They have practised and sought feedback on improving communication skills with service users.

The case examiners consider that the social worker may have engaged in a high level of remediation, however none of this is evidenced by any verifiable certificates or positive professional testimonials.

Risk of repetition: Given that the social worker has offered a significant amount of insight and remediation, and remains in practice without further professional concern, the case examiners consider that the risk of repetition from the perspective of personal impairment could be seen as low. However, given the lack of properly evidenced remediation, the case examiners are not of the opinion that this has made any risk of repetition highly unlikely.

### **Public element**

The case examiners have next considered whether the social worker's actions have the potential to undermine public confidence in the social work profession, or the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

If proven, the regulatory concerns represent a significant and sustained breach of the cited professional standards. While the social worker has fully accepted their role and failures with respect to the regulatory concerns, the consequence for service users could have been very serious. A significant number of vulnerable service users were left without access to important statutory care assessments which had a significant, negative and distressing impact on them, their carers and families.

The case examiners consider that an informed member of the public would be very concerned to learn that the social worker's inactions may have been the cause of this. Such a member of the public would likely be keen to ensure that proper standards for social workers are maintained, to minimise future risks to service users. The case examiners are of the view that a member of the public would also be keen to avoid any further undermining of public confidence in the social work profession.

The case examiners therefore conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators making a finding of impairment in this case.**

## The public interest

### Decision summary

Is there a public interest in referring the case to a hearing?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Referral criteria

Is there a conflict in the evidence that must be resolved at a hearing?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the social worker dispute any or all of the key facts of the case?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is a hearing necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession, and/or to uphold the professional standards of social workers?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Additional reasoning

The case examiners guidance reminds them that wherever possible and appropriate, case examiners will seek to resolve cases through accepted disposal. The case examiners note that the social worker disputes current impairment but accepts responsibility for their prior actions.

The accepted disposal process will provide the social worker with an opportunity to review the case examiners reasoning on facts, grounds and impairment, and reflect on whether they do accept a finding of impairment. It is open to the social worker to reject any accepted disposal proposal and request a hearing in public if they wish to reject the case examiners finding on the facts and grounds or explore the question of impairment in more detail.

The case examiners are aware that a case cannot be concluded through an accepted disposal process where a social worker does not agree that they are currently impaired. At this stage, however, the case examiners' proposal for an accepted disposal process does not mark the conclusion of the case, as that would require a response from the social worker for the case examiners' consideration. It is also

subject to a final review of the case by the case examiners, who may determine to send the matter to a hearing in public following any response received.

#### Interim order

An interim order may be necessary for protection of members of the public	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
An interim order may be necessary in the best interests of the social worker	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Accepted disposal

Case outcome		
Proposed outcome	No further action	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Advice	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Warning order	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Conditions of practice order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Suspension order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Removal order	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed duration	Warning Order (published) – 3 years	

## Reasoning

In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's Sanctions Guidance (2022) and reminded themselves that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker but to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The case examiners are reminded by this guidance that they should consider mitigating and aggravating factors when considering which sanction may be appropriate or proportionate. In relation to his case, the case examiners consider there to be several mitigating factors, comprising:

- Personal mitigation with regards to their life challenges during the period prior to the regulatory concerns.
- Significant efforts taken by the social worker to remediate to try and prevent any similar behaviour occurring.
- An absence of any fitness to practise history.

The case examiners have also identified the following aggravating factors:

- A sustained period of alleged 'inaction' by the social worker which resulted in evidence of actual harm to a number of service users.
- The existence of supervision notes where the social worker provides repeated assurances that all relevant case actions would be completed prior to their departure but appeared to have failed to do so. This potentially caused a

further delay where risks to vulnerable people were not being identified and addressed.

In determining the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case, the case examiners considered the available options in ascending order of seriousness.

The case examiners commenced by considering whether it may be appropriate to reach a finding of impairment, with no requirement for any further action. The case examiners were satisfied that in this case, while there might be a low risk of repetition with respect to personal impairment, considering the seriousness of the concerns raised, a finding of no further action would be insufficient to protect public confidence.

The case examiners next considered whether offering advice would be sufficient in this case. Advice will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings. The case examiners were of the view that offering advice to the social worker would be inappropriate in this case as it would not be sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they viewed the social worker's conduct and would not be sufficient to protect public confidence.

The case examiners went on to consider a warning order, which would provide a clearer expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct. The case examiners' guidance reminds them that a warning order is likely to be appropriate where the fitness to practise issue is isolated or limited, there is a low risk of repetition, and the social worker has demonstrated some insight. A warning order is also appropriate in cases where there are errors or failings in practice which the social worker has addressed, so that there is a lower risk of repetition. The case examiners are of the view that this level of sanction would be appropriate in this case as while the alleged conduct was not isolated, it does appear to be limited to a period of four months, in an otherwise unblemished career. The case examiners have also identified that the social worker has demonstrated a good level of insight and remediation and consider the risk of repetition to be low. The case examiners are of the view that a warning would serve to protect the public and provide a marker for the social worker that any such future actions should not be repeated.

To test their decision on sanction, the case examiners went on to consider whether a conditions of practice order might be more appropriate. Given the mitigation and significant degree of insight and remediation identified to date, they did not consider that this was a case requiring restrictions on practice. The social worker is already in current practice with no issues of current professional concern having been raised. Therefore, a conditions of practice order could be overly restrictive and unnecessary.

In reverting back to a warning order as the most appropriate outcome, the case examiners therefore moved on to consider the length of the warning order proposed. Warning orders can be imposed for one, three or five years. A one-year warning order is appropriate for an isolated incident of relatively low seriousness. Given that the incident was of high seriousness, one year in duration is not likely to be appropriate. A one-year order is not likely to satisfy the public element of impairment and assure public confidence, where vulnerable people have been found by the case examiners to have been exposed to actual harm.

A three-year warning order is more appropriate for more serious concerns. This helps to maintain public confidence and highlight the professional standards. The period also allows more time for the social worker to show that they have addressed any risk of repetition. A three-year order would be likely to satisfy public confidence that adequate standards of practice are to be maintained and that the actions that led to these concerns are not repeated.

A five-year order might be appropriate for serious cases that have fallen only marginally short of requiring restriction of practice. In reviewing a conditions of practice order, the case examiners have already concluded that there are no issues of current professional concern and do not consider that this is a case that has fallen marginally short of requiring restriction. As such, an order would, in the opinion of the case examiners, be overly restrictive and unnecessary.

For these reasons, the case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a warning order of 3 years' duration. They will now notify the social worker of their intention and seek the social worker's agreement to dispose of the matter accordingly. The social worker will be offered 14 days to respond. If the social worker does not agree, or if the case examiners revise their decision regarding the public interest in this case, the matter will proceed to a final hearing.

### Content of the warning order

The case examiners formally warn the social worker as follows:

Your conduct represented a significant breach of the following professional standards:

*As a social worker, I will:*



*1.3 Work in partnership with people to promote their well-being and achieve best outcomes, recognising them as experts in their own lives.*

*2.3 Maintain professional relationships with people and ensure that they understand the role of a social worker in their lives.*

*2.5 Actively listen to understand people, using a range of appropriate communication methods to build relationships.*

*3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.*

*3.2 Use information from a range of appropriate sources, including supervision, to inform assessments, to analyse risk, and to make a professional decision*

*3.3 Apply my knowledge and skills to address the social care needs of individuals and their families commonly arising from physical and mental ill health, disability, substance misuse, abuse or neglect, to enhance quality of life and wellbeing.*

*3.4 Recognise the risk indicators of different forms of abuse and neglect and their impact on people, their families and their support networks.*

*3.8 Clarify where the accountability lies for delegated work and fulfil that responsibility when it lies with me.*

*3.11 Maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions.*

*3.12 Use my assessment skills to respond quickly to dangerous situations and take any necessary protective action.*

*As a social worker I will not:*

*5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.*

The case examiners warn that, as a social worker, you are required to adhere to these professional standards in your future practice.

Any similar conduct or matters brought to the attention of the regulator are likely to result in a more serious outcome.

### Response from the social worker

The case examiners have received an 'accepted disposal response form' from the social worker dated 13 October 2025. This states that they have read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide. They admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, accepting that their fitness to practise is impaired. They also understand the terms of the proposed disposal of their fitness to practise case and accept them in full.

### Case examiners' response and final decision

In the light of the social worker's acceptance of the proposed disposal, the case examiners have reconsidered whether a warning order of 3 years' duration remains the appropriate outcome. The case examiners remain of the view that there is no requirement for this case to be referred to a hearing as the social worker accepts that their fitness to practise is impaired. They have also reviewed their decision regarding the overarching objectives of Social Work England, i.e. protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the social work profession, and the maintenance of proper standards. Having done so, they remain of the view that a warning order of 3 years' duration is a fair and proportionate disposal and is the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The case examiners therefore direct that this case be resolved by an accepted disposal of a 3-year warning order.