

Case Examiner Decision
James Thomas - 107178
FTPS-21358

Contents

The role of the case examiners.....	3
Decision summary.....	4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns	6
Preliminary issues	7
The realistic prospect test.....	8
The public interest	15
Accepted disposal	17

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	16 February 2024
	Accepted disposal proposed - conditions of practice order (2 years)
Final outcome	29 February 2024
	Accepted disposal - conditions of practice order (2 years)

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 2 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 2 being found to amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1 and 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 was notified of their intention to resolve the case with a conditions of practice order of 2 years' duration, subject to the social worker's agreement.

The proposed disposal was accepted by the social worker on 29 February 2023, and having reviewed their decision, the case examiners remain of the view that an accepted

conditions order of 2 year's duration, remains the appropriate disposal for this case, and is in the public interest.

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.

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.

Family A & B	[REDACTED]
Family C	
Family D	

The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer
Date the complaint was received	11 October 2022
Complaint summary	The employer referred the social worker in relation to allegations of plagiarism and poor record keeping.

Regulatory concerns

As anonymised by the case examiners.

Whilst registered as a social worker and employed by Oxfordshire County Council

- 1) In 2021, you copied and pasted information from previous assessments into assessments you were completing, including:
 - i. family A & B
 - ii. family C
 - iii. family D
- 2) Your conduct in regulatory concern 1 above was dishonest.

Ground of impairment

The matters set out at RC.1 and RC.2 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

By reason of misconduct, your fitness to practise is impaired.

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	☐

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 and 2 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

Reasoning

Facts

Whilst registered as a social worker and employed by Oxfordshire County Council

- 1) In 2021, you copied and pasted information from previous assessments into assessments you were completing, including:
 - i. family A & B
 - ii. family C
 - iii. family D

The case examiners have carefully considered all of the information presented to them in relation to concern 1, and have particularly noted evidence indicating that:

A children and family (CAF) assessment completed by the social worker dated June 2021 for family A & B, contains information which appears to have been copied from an

assessment by a different social worker around 18 months earlier, in November 2019 . The copied information includes, for example, health and educational details relating to a number of children, as well as observations with regards to the children's presentation, well-being and engagement with their parents. The case examiners are of the view that this information would be highly relevant to the subsequent analysis of safeguarding and intervention needs for the families concerned. They note that should the information not be up to date, the analysis and conclusion are likely to be flawed. In this case the social worker concluded that no action from social services was required and that a manager authorised and supported the social workers' conclusions on 18 June 2021. In authorising the conclusions, it is fair to assume the manager would have expected the information to accurately reflect the period of time the assessment covered and not be based on information from earlier assessments.

At the time of concerns being raised with regards to Family C and Family D, the social worker was subject to a live employer's final written warning (issued on 11 November 2021). The written warning was issued in response to wide-ranging performance and conduct issues.

Following receiving the employers final written warning, the social worker was made subject to a performance plan, formulated on 22 November 2021. This plan highlights the areas of concern about the social worker's performance, including:

- case notes in relation to interactions with or about a family not being recorded;
- not updating child in need (CIN) and child protection (CP) plans;
- not recording the purpose of CIN and CP visits;
- not keeping their electronic calendar up to date;
- a lack of understanding of the impact of neglect on children, and the immediate actions required to improve the lived experience of a child;
- not attending 'Workbook training'.

In relation to CIN and CP cases, the plan sets a specific objective for the social worker in relation to CIN and CP cases and reviews *"to be updated and not copied across"*.

On 6 and 7 December 2021 the social worker was allocated two families (C and D) and required to complete initial CAF assessments. While the expectation was for CAF assessments to be updated with current information from home visits and partner agencies, the evidence indicates that the social worker copied information from two previous assessments, once completed by another social worker in August 2021, and the other being an early help assessment (not conducted by a social worker), from October 2021. The case examiners have had sight of the previous assessments and the information alleged to have been copied across and again note that the information alleged to have been copied was highly relevant to a CAF assessment, and to subsequent

safeguarding decisions, For example, the apparent copied information did not reflect that a child had transitioned to secondary school since the previous assessment.

The social worker's team manager noted that the information submitted by the social worker in relation to the two CAF assessments had been copied from previous assessments and returned them to the social worker highlighting the information plagiarised from the previous assessments, and missing information. However, the social worker does not appear to have updated the CAF assessments following their return, thus not following management direction.

In the employer's investigation report into the social worker, having copied information relating to families C and D, the social worker is recorded as not denying having plagiarised information. The social worker is recorded as observing that in relation to the information copied from an early help assessment, the assessment was completed only two months prior to their assessment.

In their submissions to Social Work England, 1 December 2023, the social worker appears to accept at least some of the facts of concern 1, stating that they *"accept both cases where I have used information from a previous assessment and used it in the current assessment I was undertaking. I have never disputed this and took full accountability for this"*.

The case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of case examiners finding the facts of concern 1 proven.

2. Your conduct in regulatory concern 1 above was dishonest.

When considering dishonesty, the case examiners have applied two tests, in line with relevant case law. Firstly, they have assessed the evidence to establish what adjudicators may determine the social worker's actual state of knowledge or belief was at the relevant time (the subjective test). Secondly, they have considered whether the social worker's conduct could be deemed as dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people (the objective test).

With regard to the subjective test, the case examiners note that the social worker does not comment on the allegation of dishonesty in their submissions. However, the case examiners consider, from the evidence presented to them, that the social worker purposefully presented information within a CAF assessment as their own, when it had been copied from assessments conducted by others. The information copied was not up to date, and as such, created a false picture of the presentation of children, including of their

current health and education. The case examiners also note that the social worker had specifically been advised not to copy information from other assessments or records.

The case examiners are also of the opinion that, as an experienced social worker, it is reasonable to assume that the social worker would have known that, where assessments were being conducted, it was vitally important to conduct and submit reports which were accurate and up to date, and that knowingly submitting information and views copied from others, but which were presented as their own to be their own, amounted to a falsification of records that was dishonest in nature.

With regards to the objective test, the case examiners have concluded that ordinary decent members of the public would consider that a social worker consciously duplicating outdated records into new assessments, presenting out of date views and information as their own, when that was not the case, would amount to dishonesty.

As such, the case examiners consider there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding concern 2 proven.

Grounds

The case examiners have been asked to consider the grounds of misconduct. They are aware that misconduct is generally considered to 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 relevant professional standards in place at the time, Social Work England: Professional Standards (2019).

From the evidence presented to them and considered above, they are of the view that a number of professional standards may have been breached, including the following:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair

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

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

5.2 Not behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.

5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others

The case examiners are aware that if dishonesty is subsequently found proven, it represents a particularly serious departure of standards; honesty is a fundamental tenet of social work and is critical to public safeguarding and the confidence held in social workers.

Further, social worker are entrusted with assessing the lived experiences of vulnerable service users and making recommendations regarding whether support or interventions are required to ensure that they are properly safeguarded. Allegations that a social worker has not conducted this role professionally, and has presented outdated and therefore inaccurate, information about service users as if it was current, have the potential to harm service users e.g. by depriving them of required support and/or safeguarding, and bring the reputation of social work into disrepute.

The case examiners have taken account of the mitigation presented by the social worker, who indicates that their actions were as a result of “a personal issue” between themselves and their service manager, and that this impacted on their health. However, the case examiners are not of the view that there is evidence to indicate that the social worker’s manager did not act appropriately. They also do not consider there to be evidence of any personal or health issue such as would justify the social worker placing children at risk of harm by repeatedly submitting work as their own, but which had been copied and pasted from other professionals, including information dating back over a year.

The case examiners are of the view that if the facts of the concerns are subsequently upheld, then there is also a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the grounds of misconduct proven.

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 give consideration to 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

The case examiners are aware that where dishonesty is alleged, if subsequently found proven this can be considered a character flaw which is difficult to remediate. In this case, there is some evidence to indicate that the social worker was repeatedly dishonest by copying and pasting outdated information on more than one occasion when undertaking assessments. However, the case examiners do consider that if the social worker was able to demonstrate an understanding of the seriousness of dishonesty and the safeguarding risks caused by their alleged actions, remediated through training such as attending courses on ethics and plagiarism, and presented compelling reflections on how they would avoid a repetition of such behaviours, that this could assist.

Insight and remediation

The social worker has admitted concern 1, at least in part (as they refer to “*both cases*” whereas there are more than two cases referred to in the concern), and has demonstrated some limited insight into the risks that their alleged actions presented. They state in their submissions that they “*acknowledge that not providing up to date information can lead to assessments not being accurate and could potentially put children and young people at risk and have never done this again*”.

However, in terms of understanding why they acted as they did, the social worker focuses on what they present as a difficult “personal relationship” with their manager at the time, and pressure on them to return to work after the alleged concerns came to light. They also advise that their manager had “*signed off*” the assessments in which the social worker had copied information from previous assessments. The case examiners do not consider that these submissions present evidence of insight, and they are not reassured that the social worker appreciates the gravity of their alleged actions, or properly understands why they acted as they did. For example, information presented to the case examiners in the Management Report for Disciplinary and Capability Hearing (October 2021) suggests that a number of managers also had issues with the social worker while employed at the local authority, with previous managers reporting difficulties in supervising the social worker due to their responses to challenge and an inability to reflect on their behaviour.

The social worker has presented limited submissions, and does not provide any evidence of remediation. They do not refer to the allegation of dishonesty, and contend only that they *“have continued to practice since this incident which is over two years ago without any concerns”*.

Risk of repetition

The case examiners note that the alleged concerns with regards to families C & D occurred while the social worker was subject to an employer’s final written warning, which was given in response to similar issues, including similar actions in relation to families A & B. They have found limited evidence of insight into concern 1, and no insight into concern 2. They have not been provided with any clear evidence of remediation.

The case examiners therefore consider the risk of repetition to be high.

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.

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.

Dishonest conduct, if found proven, has the potential to seriously undermine public trust in social workers and to damage the reputation of the profession.

The case examiners are of the view that in all the circumstances of this case, taking into account the gravity of the alleged conduct, the potential for harm to young children, and the absence of clear insight and remediation, 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 carefully considered whether a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest. The case examiners have noted the following:

- There is no conflict in evidence in this case and, while the social worker has not made submissions in relation to concern 2 (alleged dishonesty), they have not disputed the key facts of concern 1, from which concern 2 arises.
- While the social worker has not indicated directly whether they accept that their conduct is impaired, they indicate that they may not do so, as they state that they have continued to practice since the concerns arose, *“over two years ago without any concerns”*. The accepted disposal process will provide the social worker with the opportunity to review the case examiners reasoning on 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 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. Furthermore, the publication of an accepted disposal decision will provide a steer to the public and the profession on the importance of adhering to the professional standards expected of social workers in England.

Accepted disposal

Case outcome		
Proposed outcome	No further action	☐
	Advice	☐
	Warning order	☐
	Conditions of practice order	☒
	Suspension order	☐
	Removal order	☐
Proposed duration	2 years	

Reasoning
The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 2 being found proven by adjudicators. Furthermore, they have found a realistic prospect that the concerns, if proven, would amount to the statutory ground of misconduct. The case examiners have also found a realistic prospect that adjudicators would find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired. The case examiners have decided however, that it is not in the public interest to refer this matter to a final hearing. In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners have 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. Furthermore, the guidance requires that decision makers select the least severe sanction necessary 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 sanctions in ascending order of seriousness. Firstly, the case examiners considered taking no further action but concluded this would not be appropriate in this instance as it would be insufficient to address the seriousness of the concerns, in that they relate to fundamental tenets of social work, honesty and safeguarding. Next, the case examiners considered whether offering advice would be sufficient. An advice order will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings. The case examiners are of the view that

the evidence suggests the social worker was aware of what was required of them, and therefore issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they view the social worker's alleged conduct.

The case examiners then considered a warning order. A warning order implies a clearer expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct than an advice order. As the case examiners consider the social worker poses a current risk to the public through a risk of repetition, they do not consider offering advice or a warning to be appropriate.

The case examiners next considered a conditions of practice order. The case examiners, after careful deliberation, concluded that the appropriate and proportionate outcome was for a Conditions of Practice Order to be imposed on the social worker's registration; they note that conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where (all of the following):

- the social worker has demonstrated insight
- the failure or deficiency in practice is capable of being remedied
- appropriate, proportionate, and workable conditions can be put in place
- decision makers are confident the social worker can and will comply with the conditions
- the social worker does not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice

While the case examiners have determined that the social worker has demonstrated only limited insight, they have noted that the social worker has admitted key facts and acknowledged that their actions could potentially have placed service users at risk. As the concerns include alleged dishonesty, the case examiners also do not consider them to be easy to remediate and have not been presented with evidence to assure them the social worker has done so, however, the case examiners have not been made aware of any further concerns being raised while the social worker has continued to practice for another authority. The case examiners also note that the social worker has engaged with Social Work England's investigation. The case examiners note that the concerns appear to be limited to the social worker's professional practise, and are of the view that appropriate, proportionate and workable conditions can be put in place which would enable the regulator to maintain oversight and supervision of the social worker's practice. While this would be dependent on the social worker being able and willing to comply with those conditions, given that the social worker does not appear to have had any fitness to practise issues raised in the years since the concerns arose, the case examiners consider it likely that the social worker will be prepared to do so. Finally, the case examiners are satisfied that any risk of harm to the public will be sufficiently mitigated by the social worker being in restricted practice.

The case examiners are mindful that the length of time conditions of practice orders are in place should be long enough for the social worker to complete any necessary remediation. Given the limited insight and remediation demonstrated by the social worker to date, and the repetitive nature and period of time over which the concerns arose, the case examiners consider two years to be the minimum period necessary for them to be assured that no risk of repetition remains. This timeframe would allow the social worker two clear appraisal cycles in which they could demonstrate their insight, remediation and ability to maintain professional standards.

The case examiners next gave careful consideration to suspension, which would prohibit the social worker from practising for a period of time. The case examiners concluded that, in all the circumstances of this case, the appropriate sanction fell marginally short of suspension. While they are of the view the concern represents a serious breach of the professional standards, they are of the view that as the social worker has continued to practise without further issues being raised with the regulator, and that conditions over a period of two years would be workable, suspension from the register would be a disproportionate and punitive outcome in this case. In reaching this conclusion the case examiners were mindful that although the allegations are serious and include dishonesty, the social worker accepted key facts when first challenged by their employer, and has also shown some insight which, albeit limited, the case examiners consider could be significantly developed over the course of restricted practice. The case examiners do not consider suspension is appropriate as they consider there are workable conditions to protect the public or the wider public interest.

The case examiners finally considered the sanction of removal, particularly as they are aware that where allegations include dishonesty, removal is likely to be a sanction carefully deliberated by adjudicators. However, the case examiners are aware that a subsequent finding of dishonesty does not inevitably lead to a removal order, and in all the circumstances of this case, the case examiners are satisfied that, as the risk to the public and public confidence could be managed by way of a two-year conditions of practice order, a removal order would be disproportionate.

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a conditions of practice order of two year's 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 21 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 conditions of practice

Conditions 1-15 (inclusive) should be in place for a two-year period. In accordance with paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), 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. Your workplace supervisor must review your practice at least once every month in one-to-one meetings and/or case-management supervision. These meetings must be focused on all areas of the concerns identified in the conditions.
 - c. 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. These reports should include specific reference to whether your supervisor has any concerns about your record keeping and ability to produce independent reports which contain up to date, relevant information which informs your analysis, conclusion and subsequent recommendations.

11.

- a. You must make arrangements for an audit to be carried out by your workplace supervisor in relation to your case recording and completion of required actions in line with policy and procedures. The audit must be signed by your workplace supervisor.
- 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, or alternatively confirm that there have been no such cases

12. You must, within 4 months of these conditions coming into effect , provide Social Work England with a reflective piece in relation to how the use of outdated information, for example through plagiarism of past assessments, presents a safeguarding risk in social work assessment. Furthermore, how a finding of dishonesty can impact on the public perception of social work.

13.

- a. You must undertake 8 hours of CPD, 4 of which focus specifically on assessment skills and record keeping, and 4 of which focus on honesty, integrity and values in professional practice.
- b. You must provide evidence of CPD undertaken to Social Work England within 4 months of these conditions taking effect

14. 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 to 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.

15. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 14 to any person requesting information about your registration status.

Conditions 1-15 (inclusive) should be in place for a two-year period. In accordance with paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), 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.

Response from the social worker

The case examiners have had sight of the social worker's completed response form dated 29 February 2024. The social worker has signed a declaration to confirm that they:

- have read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide;
- admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that their fitness to practise is impaired;
- and understand the terms of the proposed disposal of their fitness to practise case and accept them in full.

Case examiners' response and final decision

The case examiners note that the social worker has accepted the proposed disposal as outlined by them. The case examiners then proceeded to further consider whether the proposed disposal of a conditions of practice order of 2 year's duration remains the most appropriate means of disposal for these matters.

The case examiners have reviewed their decision, paying particular regard to the overarching objectives of Social Work England, i.e., the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the social work profession, and the maintenance of proper standards.

The case examiners are of the view they have not been presented with any new evidence that might change their previous assessment. The case examiners remain satisfied that an accepted disposal by way of a conditions of practice order of 2 year's duration is the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.