

Case Examiner Decision
Gemma Chapman – SW129003
FTPS-20996

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.....	17
Accepted disposal	19

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	17 February 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed - conditions of practice order (18 months)
Final outcome	9 April 2025
	Accepted disposal - conditions of practice order (18 months)

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1 and 1.2 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1 and 1.2 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1.1 and 1.2, 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 that the case could be concluded by way of accepted disposal.

As such, the case examiners requested that the social worker be notified of their intention to resolve the case with a conditions of practice order of 18 months duration. The social worker has accepted the proposal.

The case examiners have considered all of 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.

The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer, Blackpool Council.
Date the complaint was received	2 August 2022 – former employer 3 August 2022 – self referral
Complaint summary	Concerns were raised by a member of the public (Person 1) to Blackpool Council. Person 1 advised they had been in a relationship with Person 2, another member of the public and they alleged that both of their records had been accessed by the social worker. The social worker is alleged to have accessed records in respect of Person 1's involvement with Children's Social Care and passed this information to Person 2. The social worker also self-referred following their suspension from their employer.

Regulatory concerns

Original regulatory concerns as presented to the case examiners:

Whilst registered as a social worker between 20th July 2022 and 23 September 2022, you:

1. Did not treat information about people with sensitivity, when you:
 - 1.1. Accessed case records of Person 1 and/or Person 2 without professional reason to do so.
 - 1.2. Shared information about Person 1 with Person 2.

Regulatory concerns after the case examiners' amendments:

Whilst registered as a social worker between **22 January 2020** ~~20th July 2022~~ and 23 September 2022, you:

1. Did not treat information about people with sensitivity, when you:

1.1 Accessed case records of ~~Person 1 and/or Person 2~~ without professional reason to do so.

1.2 Shared information about Person 1 with Person 2.

Grounds of impairment:

The matters outlined in regulatory concern 1 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Anonymity and redaction

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

	
	

Preliminary issues

Investigation		
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has been notified of the grounds for investigation?	Yes	☒
	No	☐
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators?	Yes	☒
	No	☐
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	☒
	No	☐
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	☒
	No	☐

Requests for further information or submissions, or any other preliminary issues that have arisen

Amendment to the regulatory concerns:

The case examiners have made the following amendments to the regulatory concerns:

1. Whilst registered as a social worker between **22 January 2020** ~~20th July 2022~~ and 23 September 2022, you:

1. Did not treat information about people with sensitivity, when you:

1.1 Accessed case records ~~of Person 1 and/or Person 2~~ without professional reason to do so.

The case examiners note within the employer's investigation, there is evidence to suggest that the social worker accessed records on 22 January 2020 without a professional reason to do so as well on 20 July 2022. The case examiners have

therefore amended the regulatory concern to more accurately capture the gravity of the social worker's conduct.

The case examiners did carefully consider whether it was necessary and proportionate to pause their consideration of the case, in order to seek additional submissions from the social worker. However, they note that throughout the employer's investigation, the social worker has responded to both incidents when interviewed, furthermore, the social worker, in their submissions to the regulator, has addressed and accepted both episodes. The social worker has made reference to the length of the investigation by the regulator and the impact this is having on both them and their family.

The case examiners therefore considered it to be unnecessary and disproportionate to delay consideration of the case further by seeking additional submissions from the social worker in this instance. They consider that it would be fairer to the social worker to proceed, given that they have already admitted and addressed this matter in their submissions.

The case examiners have also considered whether the amendment to the regulatory concern has materially impacted on the sanction they would propose to the social worker. They concluded that, in light of their assessment of impairment, their proposal would remain the same even if the conduct from 2020 was not taken into consideration.

Necessity for further information:

The case examiners note that the evidence they have been provided in respect of the records which the social worker is alleged to have accessed is unclear as to which people this relates to, as there is no key provided. However, the case examiners note within the employer's investigation, there is a description of each of the records which has been accessed by the social worker in both 2020 and 2022, within this the employer has provided information which suggests this relates to [REDACTED]

Furthermore, the social worker in their submissions has accepted the concerns raised and to whom the records related.

The case examiners are therefore satisfied that the evidence provided is sufficient for them to proceed with their consideration of the case.

To conclude, the case examiners consider it is proportionate to continue to avoid further delay to the case and do not consider it necessary to delay their consideration.

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 1.1 and 1.2 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 22 January 2020 and 23 September 2022, you:

1. Did not treat information about people with sensitivity, when you:

1.1 Accessed case records without professional reason to do so.

The case examiners note that the concerns arose when a member of the public, Person 1, contacted the social worker's employer at the time, and advised that they were of the view that the social worker had shared information relating to them with Person 2. Person 1 and Person 2 had been in a relationship prior to this. Person 1 alleged that they ended the relationship due to information they had been provided with in respect of Person 2. However, they state that following the end the relationship, Person 2 had responded with information that Person 1 had not previously shared with them relating

to Person 1's involvement with children's social care and that Person 2 could have only had access to this information via the social worker.

The case examiners have seen the employer's investigation report dated 15 February 2023, which sets out the findings of a data request following the issues raised by Person 1. The initial data request suggests that the social worker had accessed records relating to Person 1 and 2 on 20 July 2022. The case examiners have also seen a copy of an audit, which is anonymised, however the times at which the access is alleged to have occurred are consistent with the descriptions within the employer's investigation report. Further, the case examiners note that the social worker within their employer's investigation and to the regulator has accepted that they accessed records relating to these individuals. The social worker within their submissions and within the employer's investigation has provided their reasoning for doing this, as they were attempting to provide information to Person 2 to assist them.

The case examiners have also seen the findings of a second data request, which was in response to the first interview with the social worker. The initial data request suggests that the social worker had accessed records relating to Person 2 and people related to them on 22 January 2020. The case examiners have also seen a copy of an audit, which is anonymised, however the times at which the access is alleged to have occurred are consistent with the descriptions within the investigation report. Further, the case examiners note that the social worker within their employer's investigation and to the regulator has accepted that they accessed records relating to these individuals. The social worker within their submissions and within the employer's investigation has suggested that they are unsure why they accessed the records. The social worker stated initially that this was early in their social work career and it was out of curiosity, however they also stated that they were concerned that there was a personal link with these people and therefore wanted to clarify if there was any current involvement with social care, which may mean they needed to declare this.

The case examiners note the social worker's training record, which suggests that the social worker undertook training in respect of General Data Protection Regulations on 27 August 2019 and then again on 15 February 2022. The case examiners note that on both occasions, this was approximately six months prior to the alleged conduct.

The case examiners have considered what would have been expected in the circumstances. They note guidance provided by the employer on 'safer working practice for adults who work with children and young people (2009)'. This states, *'adults may have access to confidential information about children and young people in order to undertake their responsibilities. In some circumstances, they may have*

access to or be given highly sensitive or private information. These details must be kept confidential at all times and only shared when it is in the interests of the child to do so’.

They note the information and ICT security acceptable use policy of the employer in relation to the general principles of use of devices and information which states, ‘*you must only access or attempt to access information on a ‘need to know’ basis for official council purposes’.*

The case examiners note the social worker’s comments within the employer’s investigation and within their submissions that they accessed the information in the first instance out of curiosity and to determine whether the people whose records they accessed been involved with children’s social care. On the second occasion, the social worker states that they accessed this information to assist Person 2.

The case examiners note that the social worker had no professional involvement with any of the people mentioned, furthermore, the evidence suggests that they had no professional reason to access any information in respect of these people. As such, the evidence suggests that the social worker did not treat this data sensitively, as they did not have a right to access this confidential information.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding this concern proven.

1.2 Shared information about Person 1 with Person 2.

The case examiners have seen the employer’s investigation report dated 15 February 2023, within which is a recorded interview with one of the managers who spoke with Person 1 about their concerns. The manager reported that Person 1 advised them that they sought information about Person 2 and following this advice, they advised Person 2 that they could no longer be in a relationship with them, as a social worker had told them that they would become involved with their family, if the relationship continued.

The manager stated that Person 1, had told them that Person 2 spoke to them and they had information that the social worker had accessed in relation to Person 1’s children. However, the manager said that Person 1 did not detail any specific information that was provided by Person 2, but that ‘*he just knew that I had social care involvement’.* Person 1 said that they had not previously shared this with Person 2.

The social worker within the employer’s investigation recorded interview stated after they had accessed the records, they told Person 2, ‘*I just said that I couldn’t see that there was anyone attached to the family’.* Within their submissions to the regulator,

the social worker has stated that, *‘the only information that was shared was that there was no allocated worker’*.

The evidence suggests that whilst the social worker may not have shared extensive information with Person 2 about Person 1, they have shared that there are records of Person 1 and their children, which may be considered sensitive information. In line with the guidance outlined above, information relating to people’s involvement with social care is private and confidential and should only be shared with a third party when there is a need to do so and it is in the best interests of a child, such as a concern relating to safeguarding. The evidence suggests in this instance, that there was no such reason and that the social worker did not treat this information sensitively.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding this concern proven.

Grounds

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 also 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, namely Social Work England professional standards (2019). The case examiners consider the social worker may have breached the following standards:

As a social worker, I will:

2.6 Treat information about people with sensitivity and handle confidential information in line with the law.

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 are aware that falling short of the standards may not always amount to misconduct. However, adjudicators in this instance may determine that the social worker has significantly departed from the standards expected.

Social workers in their roles, have access to a large amount of confidential and sensitive information about people. Therefore, members of the public need to be confident that when social workers access records, they do so in an appropriate way and for legitimate purposes. The evidence suggests that in this instance, the social worker has accessed records on two occasions, relatively shortly after undertaking specific training around data protection and confidentiality. Further, that they provided sensitive information to a third party, who was not entitled to this information. The case examiners consider that members of the public and adjudicators would view this alleged conduct as very serious.

Accessing records without a legitimate reason to do so and providing information to a third party would not align with standard 2.6 and 5.2.

If the matters were to be found proven, the case examiners conclude the alleged conduct is serious and is likely to suggest a significant departure from the professional standards detailed above.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding concern 1 amounts to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Impairment

Personal element

In considering the personal element of impairment, the case examiners have considered the test for personal impairment as set out in the case examiner guidance (2022), namely whether the conduct is remediable; whether the social worker has undergone remediation and demonstrated insight; and whether there is a likelihood the matters alleged will be repeated. The case examiners should also look at whether the social worker has admitted the allegations, any relevant previous history and any testimonials that have been provided.

The case examiners note there is no previous history in respect of this social worker.

The social worker has accepted concern 1 and has expressed some remorse and acknowledged that they should not have accessed the records, and their acknowledgement was from an early stage within the employer's investigation. Within the preliminary interview the social worker is recorded as stating, *'I shouldn't of [sic]*

done that I knew I shouldn't have done that I'm sorry'. Furthermore, they self-referred to the regulator and have fully engaged with the investigation.

However, in terms of insight, the case examiners consider that the social worker has demonstrated little insight, neither immediately following the incident during the employer's investigation, nor in the time since when they have provided submissions to the regulator. During the employer's investigation, they stated, *'what I've done is confirm that Person 1 is on our system and that's not ok.....but Person 2 was telling me things, I didn't feel like I was giving Person 2 new information'* and, *'I feel that I might have been manipulated into giving some kind of indication'*.

In their submissions to the regulator, dated 5 January 2025 the social worker states, *'I do agree that accessing and sharing information is a regulatory concern, however I was only accessing the record to see if there was an allocated worker. The only information that was shared was that there was no allocated worker'*. The case examiners are of the view, that despite more than two years since the alleged conduct, the social worker demonstrates very limited awareness of the seriousness of the alleged concern. Their submissions suggest that they are minimising the alleged conduct, and they have not reflected upon the fact that sharing information that a family has a record with social care is sensitive information and should not be shared without a legitimate and professional reason to do so. Furthermore, they have not demonstrated what they would do differently should similar circumstances arise in the future.

In terms of remediation, the social worker has provided no evidence of any remediation.

The case examiners have seen a brief reference from the social worker's current agency in April 2024, in respect of the social worker's practice, which states no concerns have been raised in respect of the social worker. However, the case examiners note that they have no reference from the social worker's direct employer who have oversight of the social worker's daily practice. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the current employer is aware of the regulatory concerns and has any measures in place. The case examiners therefore consider they cannot attribute much weight to the agency reference.

Considering the limited insight, and the lack of remediation in respect of the concerns, the case examiners consider the risk of repetition is high.

Public element of impairment

The case examiners next considered whether the social worker's alleged actions have the potential to undermine public confidence in social workers and whether this is a case where adjudicators may determine that public interest requires a finding of impairment. Public interest includes the need to uphold proper standards of conduct

and behaviour and the need to maintain the public's trust and confidence in the profession.

A social worker who is found to have accessed confidential information without a professional reason to do so on more than one occasion, has the potential to undermine public confidence. Trust is vital in social work and by accessing records inappropriately, there is the potential to undermine this and impact on people's engagement.

The case examiners are of the view that in these circumstances, members of the public would expect a finding of impairment if the concerns were found proven.

Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators making a finding of current impairment.

The public interest

Decision summary

Is there a public interest in referring the case to a hearing?	Yes	☐
	No	☒

Referral criteria

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

Additional reasoning

The case examiners have considered whether a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest. The social worker in their submissions does not accept that their conduct is impaired.

Where a social worker does not accept impairment, case examiner guidance suggests that a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest.

However, the case examiners note that the guidance states the social worker must accept the matter of impairment at the point of concluding the case and are of the view that this does not prevent them offering accepted disposal prior to this. The case examiners consider that it is reasonable to offer accepted disposal in this case because:

- There is no conflict in evidence in this case and the social worker has accepted the key facts.

- The case examiners recognise that not all professionals will have an innate understanding of how and when the public interest may be engaged, or how exactly this might impact upon findings concerning current fitness to practise.

- The accepted disposal process will provide the social worker an opportunity to review the case examiner’s reasoning on impairment and reflect on whether they accept this. It is open to the social worker to reject any accepted disposal proposal and request a hearing if they wish to explore the question of impairment in more detail.

The case examiners are also of the view that the public would be satisfied to see the regulator take prompt, firm action in this case, with the publication of an accepted disposal decision providing a steer to the public and the profession on the importance of adhering to the professional standards expected of social workers in England.

Interim order

An interim order may be necessary for protection of members of the public	Yes	☐
	No	☒
An interim order may be necessary in the best interests of the social worker	Yes	☐
	No	☒

Accepted disposal

Case outcome		
Proposed outcome	No further action	☐
	Advice	☐
	Warning order	☐
	Conditions of practice order	☒
	Suspension order	☐
	Removal order	☐
Proposed duration	18 months	

Reasoning
In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's sanctions guidance (December 2022) and reminded themselves that the purpose of sanctions is not to punish the social worker but to protect the public and the wider public interest. 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 are of the view the social worker's impairment continues to pose some current risk to public safety as there is insufficient evidence at this time of the social worker having developed insight into the data breach and how their alleged conduct has the potential to impact on the public, as well as public confidence in both themselves and in the wider profession. Further, whilst the case examiners have seen a positive testimonial from the social worker's agency, they have not been provided with any evidence from the employer who is working directly with the social worker. The social worker has provided no evidence of remediation that addresses the alleged concerns. As a result, the case examiners have concluded that there is a risk of repetition. Given this, the outcomes of no further action, advice, or warnings are considered inappropriate on the basis that these will not sufficiently protect the public. Further, they would not mark the seriousness with which the case examiners view the alleged conduct.

The case examiners next considered a conditions of practice order being imposed on the social worker's registration. They concluded that this was the most appropriate and proportionate outcome. Conditions will provide the social worker a supportive framework within which to demonstrate that they understand the seriousness of the alleged conduct and that they are safe to practise whilst protecting the public. It will also enable the regulator to maintain oversight and supervision of the social worker's practice. The case examiners note that the social worker is currently working and has done so since the alleged concerns arose. As mentioned above, the case examiners have seen a reference from the social worker's agency in April 2024, in which they confirm that no concerns have been raised about the social worker's practice, however the case examiners remain cautious, as it is unclear whether the current direct employer is aware of the specific concerns, particularly in respect of data protection. A conditions of practice order will enable the current employer to support the social worker with addressing the concerns.

The case examiners did consider whether the next available sanction, suspension, would be more appropriate in this case. However, it was their view that suspension would be unnecessarily punitive, and it would risk deskilling the social worker. Given the positive reference that the social worker has received in respect of their general practice, the case examiners consider it would be disproportionate to take the social worker out of practice. It would also be disproportionate as public protection can be achieved by a conditions of practice order.

The case examiners did consider the principles of fairness due to the amendments to the regulatory concerns and whether these amendments have altered their proposed outcome. Having worked through the sanctions guidance, they consider due to the lack of insight and remediation, their proposed outcome would remain the same, regardless of the changes, due to their determination that there is a risk of repetition.

In terms of duration, the sanctions guidance states that conditions can be imposed for up to three years at a time. When considering the timescale for the conditions, the case examiners have determined that a period of 18 months would be appropriate in this case. This period would allow the social worker to demonstrate that they have fully understood their responsibilities in terms of data protection and confidentiality. Eighteen months will allow the social worker sufficient opportunity to fully demonstrate that they understand the seriousness of their previous alleged conduct. This period would allow the social worker to demonstrate over a sustained period, including at least one appraisal cycle, that they are able to handle confidential information safely. The case examiners consider this is necessary given the fact there is evidence to suggest that there was at least two years between the two alleged incidents despite the social worker having undertaken specific training on this topic

within the six months prior to each incident. The case examiners consider a longer period than 18 months is unnecessary and disproportionate at this stage.

The case examiners will notify the social worker of their proposals in respect of conditions of practice and seek the social worker's agreement to dispose of the matter accordingly. Should the social worker 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.

The case examiners will give the social worker 21 days to respond to the offer of an accepted disposal. 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 conditions of practice

Conditions 1-16 (inclusive) should be in place for an 18-month period. In accordance with paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018, the regulator must review the conditions of practice order before its expiry. The social worker and/or Social Work England can seek early review if new evidence becomes available to suggest the current order needs to be varied, replaced or removed.

1. You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.

2. You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.

3. a. At any time, you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England's register.

b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.

4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 4 months and at least 14 days prior to any review and Social Work England will make these reports available to any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions on request.
5. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.
6. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.
7. You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.
8. You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days of the date of application [for future registration] or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect [for existing registration].
9.
 - a. At any time, you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England; you must place yourself and remain under the supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by you, and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register.
 - b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.
10. You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 4 months and at least 14 days prior to any review, and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.
11.
 - a. You must make arrangements for an audit to be carried out by your reporter in relation to accessing and sharing confidential information. The audit must be signed by your reporter.
 - b. You must provide a copy of this audit to Social Work England every 4 months and at least 14 days prior to any review.

12. You must work with your reporter or workplace supervisor to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:

- GDPR and accessing and sharing confidential records

13. You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 6 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.

14. You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019), and provide a written reflection 6 months after these conditions take effect, focusing on how your conduct in the matters relating to this case, namely the importance of maintaining confidential records, was below the accepted standard of a social worker, the potential impact of this, and the steps you will take to avoid repetition. The reflection should be a minimum of 1,000 words.

15. You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at 1-13, above:

- Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.
- Any locum, agency or out-of-hours service you are registered with or apply to be registered with in order to secure employment or contracts to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any organisation, agency or employer where you are using your social work qualification/knowledge/skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.

You must forward written evidence of your compliance with this condition to Social Work England within 14 days from the date these conditions take effect.

16. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1-15, to any person requesting information about your registration status.

Response from the social worker

The case examiners saw attempts by the regulator to contact the social worker and that the social worker did not initially respond to telephone calls or email communication in the timeframe set by the case examiners. However, the social worker contacted on 18 March 2025, which was slightly after the deadline proposed by the case examiners, suggesting that they had missed the communications and wanted to consider the accepted disposal. The case examiners allowed additional time for the social worker to consider the proposal.

The social worker responded on 9 April 2025 and confirmed that, *'I have read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide. I admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that my fitness to practise is impaired. I understand the terms of the proposed disposal of my fitness to practise case and accept them in full.'*

Case examiners' response and final decision

The case examiners are satisfied that the social worker has read and accepted the proposed accepted disposal of an eighteen month conditions of practice order.

The case examiners have again considered the public interest in this matter and, as they have not been presented with any new evidence that might change their previous assessment, they are satisfied that it remains to be the case that the public interest in this case can be fulfilled through the accepted disposal process.

The case examiners therefore direct that Social Work England implement an eighteen month conditions of practice order.