

Case Examiner Decision
Lyndsey Pinning – SW110510
FTPS-23063

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	11
The public interest.....	21
Accepted disposal	23

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	
First preliminary outcome	19 February 2025
	Information requested Submissions requested
Second preliminary outcome	30 July 2025
	Accepted disposal – conditions of practice order - 18 months
Final outcome	12 August 2025
	Accepted disposal- conditions of practice order - 18 months duration

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 1 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 1 being found to amount to the statutory ground of lack of competence and /or capability.
3. There is no realistic prospect of regulatory concern 1 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

4. For regulatory concern 1, 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 they consider 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.

On 7 August 2025 the social worker confirmed that they had read the case examiners decision and accepted their proposal to conclude this matter with a conditions of practice order of 18 months duration.

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, [REDACTED]
Date the complaint was received	13 December 2023
Complaint summary	The concerns relate to the social workers core responsibilities, and include potential issues with - visits to children, - not maintaining full and up to date records, - visits not being adequate or purposeful, - children being without a care or pathway plan or having plans that are outdated or that display a lack of progression. - it is further alleged that during their employment, the social worker may not have practised adequately for any sustained period of time.

Regulatory concerns

Regulatory concerns are clearly identified issues that are a concern to the regulator. The regulatory concerns for this case are as follows:

Regulatory concern 1

Whilst registered as a social worker you have not performed to the required standard, in that you:

- 1.1 Did not complete care and/or pathway plans for children in a timely manner and/or at all
- 1.2 Did not progress care and/or pathway plans for children in a timely manner and/or at all
- 1.3 Did not undertake visits to children and/or did not undertake visits at the required frequency
- 1.4 Did not write up visits to children to an adequate standard
- 1.5 Did not maintain full and/or up to date records
- 1.6 Did not complete reports for children in care meetings in a timely manner and/or in advance of the meeting

Grounds of impairment:

The matter outlined in regulatory concerns 1 (1.1-1.6) amount to the statutory ground of misconduct and/or lack of competence or capability.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct and/or lack of competence or capability.

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

On 19 February 2025, the case examiners paused their consideration of this matter. Their preliminary decision can be found below:

The case examiners are aware of the need to consider cases expeditiously and the need to ensure fairness to all parties. However, the case examiners consider, bearing in mind their investigatory function and statutory duty, that further information is needed to be able to reach a decision on this case.

The case examiners have noted the case examiner guidance, which states they should only request further information if it would not be possible to reach a decision without it. They are satisfied that their chosen course of action is consistent with the guidance.

The case examiner guidance states that case examiners must request information in writing and explain why it is required. As such, they request the following:

1. Further information, and/or a witness statement from person B, detailing the specific circumstances around them allegedly being advised not to continue to support the social worker, and their view on the impact of this. Please also request a timeline/detail of the support Person B did provide to the social worker.

The case examiners, appreciate that person B has spoken with investigators and has expressed reservations about potential repercussions of them providing a statement in respect of this matter. Despite this, Person B's final position appears to be that they are willing to engage. The case examiners consider that support being withheld from the social worker, if proven, could represent significant mitigation to the issues of concern. As such they have determined that it is essential for further detail to be sought from Person B, in order to ensure fairness to the social worker.

2. Further information from person A about the timeline of their support to the social worker.

The case examiners have noted the information already provided by person A; however, it is unclear of the time period that their evidence relates to. The case examiners consider it important to cross-reference the evidence already available to them with a clear sense of when the social worker was receiving support from the advanced practitioner (person B) and the wellbeing coach (person A), and when this was allegedly removed.

5. Stress Risk Assessment Tool

The social worker was referred for Occupational health assessments on two occasions in April and June 2023 and both reports from these consultations recommend that the employer completes the Stress Risk Assessment Tool. The case examiners have seen one completed Stress Risk Assessment Tool dated 20 June 2023, this document is incomplete, as such the case examiners would request that the employer is asked whether this was completed on any other occasion and for copies of these documents to be made available.

On receipt of the above requested information the case examiners would request that the social worker is given the opportunity to make further submissions.

The case examiners would also invite the complainant to make further submissions once the further evidence requested has been obtained by investigators.

This matter was returned to case examiners on 30 June 2025. The case examiners were presented with further information from person A and person B.

The local authority reviewed their evidence and confirmed they had provided all information available in respect of the stress risk assessment tool.

The social worker and the complainant were invited to make further submissions but did not do so.

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 concern 1 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory grounds of lack of competence and/or capability, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

Reasoning

Facts

Regulatory concerns are clearly identified issues that are a concern to the regulator. The regulatory concerns for this case are as follows:

Regulatory concern 1

Whilst registered as a social worker you have not performed to the required standard, in that you:

1.1 Did not complete care and/or pathway plans for children in a timely manner and/or at all

1.2 Did not progress care and/or pathway plans for children in a timely manner and/or at all

1.3 Did not undertake visits to children and/or did not undertake visits at the required frequency

1.4 Did not write up visits to children to an adequate standard

1.5 Did not maintain full and/or up to date records

1.6 Did not complete reports for children in care meetings in a timely manner and/or in advance of the meeting

The case examiners will address the sub particulars of regulatory concern 1 collectively as they will rely on the same evidence. The case examiners will refer to the following evidence, case records completed by the social worker and a file review completed by the local authority on 21-28th December 2023.

The case examiners have also been supplied with the local authority's policy and procedure document for looked after children which suggests the required visiting timeframes for a social worker to visit children would be every six weeks as a minimum standard. Where there are concerns about whether a placement is meeting the welfare needs of the child the social worker should contact the Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO).

File review

A file review of all children allocated to the social worker was undertaken by the local authority 21st-28th December 2023. The local authority also reviewed the progress of child in care decisions during supervision on 5th January 2024.

The local authority reported the following headlines from their review of the social worker's files:

27 case notes had been added by the social worker in total since the social worker's phased return-to-work in June 2023. Case notes are said to not reflect daily activity, care planning progression/progress of child in care review decisions, but record incoming/outgoing light touch communication.

Of the 16 children allocated, it is said that:

- 5 children have 0 case notes
- 3 children have 1 case note added.
- 5 children have 2 case notes

- 2 children have 3 case notes
- 1 child has 4 case notes
- 1 child has 6 case notes.

44 visits are recorded by the social worker across files in total since their return to work in June 2023. There is said to be ‘*no evidence of adequately purposeful visiting content/recording.*’ All visit recordings are said to be ‘*light touch, do not refer to IRO decisions or care plans. Children are said to repeatedly decline showing the social worker their bedroom.*’

- 4 children allegedly have 0 visits recorded.

The file review suggests that many children allocated to the social worker did not have a care plan, or where there is a care plan this had been completed late. 5 care plans were said to have been completed by the social worker since their return to work in June 2023, all of them were allegedly completed late and as a result of Independent Reviewing Officers (IRO’s) escalating the need for these to be completed. 7 care plans were said to be overdue and outside of minimum timescales for completion.

Concerns are raised in the review of the social worker’s files that there is a high level of IRO escalations, it is explained that these occur when there are concerns about social worker’s not completing core statutory documentation. Escalations are said to relate to occasions where there is no plan, no action, no safer me assessment, and no progress being made against the care plan. There were allegedly 20 IRO escalations across 11 children for the social worker subject to these concerns.

The case review also allegedly showed an absence of evidence to support the social worker progressing actions from child review meetings.

Case records

The case examiners have seen a selection of the social worker’s case records (12 in total).

In respect of child A, the case examiners note that within the records available there is no reference to the care plan, and the analysis section which should include action points, and an analysis of risk contains very limited information.

According to case records child C tells the social worker during a visit on 22 August 2023 they have concerns that their foster carers express racist views. The analysis section of the case record outlines an action point to discuss this with the

supervising social worker. An additional case record confirms that this action point was progressed, and a conversation with the supervising social worker did take place but not until 5 October 2023. There is no analysis of the potential impact of the alleged racist comments on the child. There is no reference to the care plan, despite the child saying on an earlier visit (14 July 2023) that they are '*depressed*' with their current living situation and '*do not feel safe in foster care.*' There is nothing in the case records to suggest the social worker discussed this with the IRO as would be expected.

Child E's case notes are in the opinion of the case examiners exceptionally brief.

The case examiners agree with the local authorities expressed view that the social worker's case files demonstrate a limited commitment to seeing the children's bedrooms during visits, and that links to the care plan for the child are not made in their case records. There is only one description of a child's bedroom contained within the case notes, in respect of child F. Similarly, when the social worker says that they completed life story work, there is no description of what they did, the purpose of this and/or the potential impact on the child.

The case examiners are satisfied that the case records they have seen are not compliant with the local authority policy and procedure document for recording visits to looked after children.

In submissions dated 8 November 2024 the social worker broadly accepts the regulatory concerns. The social worker explains that they returned to work on 12 June 2023 on a phased return where in their first week of return they were required to work 20 hours and increase this by 5 hours each week until they were back to working full-time hours. The social worker says that in week 1 they were advised not to undertake any visits, however they say they had been allocated 11 children who all needed to be visited by 7 July 2023, they say that they completed these visits but accept that their '*write ups*' were limited due to work related pressures.

The social worker accepts that their case records were not as robust as they might have been and reports were not completed in a timely manner or before child in care review meetings.

The case examiners are satisfied that the evidence suggest the social worker did not perform to the required standard as set out in the policy and procedure document.

The case examiners consider there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding regulatory concern 1 (1.1-1.6) proven

Grounds

This case has been presented on the grounds of misconduct and/or a lack of competence or capability. The case examiners' guidance encourages them to (where possible) identify the appropriate statutory ground to proceed on, as this provides clarity as to the basis of Social Work England's case against the social worker. The case examiners are reminded, however, that in some cases they may not always be in the best position to identify one ground over another.

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 Social Work England Professional standards which were applicable at the time of the concerns. Those of relevance are:

As a social worker I will:

1.3: Work in partnership with people to promote their wellbeing and achieve best outcomes, recognising them as experts in their own lives.

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.

Whilst the case examiners note there is evidence that the social worker's actions fell below an acceptable standard, in the view of the case examiners, the departure from standards would be unlikely to amount to misconduct. This is because the evidence suggests that the concerns are more closely associated with the social worker's performance as this had been under review since their appointment, they had been subject to a number of informal improvement plans, and assessments via occupational health. The evidence suggests that the social worker did make improvements when provided with appropriate support, however, there is evidence to support a view that the local authority may not have implemented support advised

via occupational health assessments, and that colleagues were told specifically to stop supporting the social worker, which the case examiners would consider to be a mitigating factor.

Mitigating factors:

The case examiners have seen two witness statements from individuals who provided support to the social worker at the relevant time, these will be referred to as person A and person B.

Person A was employed as a wellbeing coach at the relevant time. The wellbeing coach role was for the workforce as a whole and not unique to social workers. The wellbeing coach role/service was set up to provide a listening ear to employees and they were trained to notice wellbeing concerns such as burnout, depression, and anxiety. Person A suggests in an email to the Social Work England Investigator, dated 7 January 2025, that the social worker was set unrealistic targets and did not receive support that they were promised as a result of occupational health assessments. Person A suggests that the social worker was openly denied support by their manager at the time and describes an environment in which there was open favouritism towards certain members of the team. In an email to the Social Work England Investigator, dated 30 December 2024, they say that during the relevant time they were told not to support the social worker, they say that they were threatened with disciplinary action if they continued to support the social worker, and as a result of this they resigned from their post.

Person B, an advanced practitioner at the relevant time, has also confirmed in an email to the Social Work England Investigator, dated 20 March 2025, that they were asked in July 2023 not to continue to support the social worker. Person B continued to support the social worker until September /October 2023 despite being asked not to. Person B says that the social worker felt '*overwhelmed and unsupported*;' and the volume of work given to the social worker did not appear to correlate to the number of hours they had been given to complete it.

In light of the above, the case examiners have determined that the correct ground to proceed upon is lack of competence and/or capability. It would appear that the social worker did show some signs of improvement whilst subject to performance plans and whilst support was in place, but the witness statements support claims made by the social worker that they may have been set unrealistic work goals and alienated from individuals who had offered to provide practical and emotional support.

Given the mitigating circumstances, the case examiners have determined that there is no realistic prospect of the grounds of misconduct being engaged

Lack of competence and/ or capability

The case examiner guidance says that lack of competence or capability suggests a standard of professional performance which is unacceptably low. It means a social worker has demonstrated that they may lack the knowledge and skills to do their work in a safe and effective manner. This must usually be demonstrated over a fair sample of a social worker's work. There is no set definition of 'fair sample,' but it suggests a sample sufficient to show the social worker's usual standard of work over a period of time. The case examiners consider that they have been presented with a fair sample of the social worker's work. The case notes contained in the evidence bundle would not appear to be compliant with the local authority policy and procedures with regards to both visiting children and case recording, and the standard of work would appear to be below what would be expected of an experienced registered social worker.

The case examiners are also aware that the evidence suggests the social worker had been subject to a number of performance plans during their period of employment [REDACTED]. The evidence suggests that the social worker was subject to improvement plans on 24 October 2018, 14 December 2018, 23 November 2022, 6 December 2022, 19 January 2023, and 23 June 2023. A capability summary completed by the local authority suggests that the social worker had been employed [REDACTED] since 2016 and there had been concerns about their performance from this date, and spanning at least 5 different line managers.

The case examiners have seen informal capability plans dated 24 October 2018, 14 December 2018, 23 November 2022, 6 December 2022, and 19 January 2023. On 19 January 2023 it was agreed the informal performance plan in place at that time should end as the social worker had completed the required work to get up to date. It is recorded that the social worker '*is able to complete the necessary work.*' In supervision notes dated 8 February 2023, it is recorded that the social worker's case records were considered to be generally up to date. Following this period of improvement, it would appear that the social worker had a period of sickness absence in April 2023 when they were referred to consult with occupational health and again in June 2023 when they were again seen by occupational health. Supervision records show that the social worker returned to work on 12 June 2023 having had a 2-month period of sickness absence. The occupational health assessments recommended the implementation of a stress risk assessment; this assessment was completed on 20 June 2023. In the stress risk assessment tool, completed by a manager, it is noted that the social worker is experienced and is clear

what their responsibilities are, particularly around legal and statutory duties. The stress risk assessment tool also notes that workplace buddies will support the social worker. However, given the witness statements of person A and B it seems that workplace buddies did not support the social worker and that those assigned to offer support were actively told to stop this. The statement of person B also supports the social worker's view that they were set unrealistic targets in terms of the work allocated to them.

The case examiners consider that the evidence suggests that the social worker was considered to have the knowledge and skills required to complete their work on some occasions, but that a combination of factors may have led to them being unable/incapable of achieving what was expected of them at the relevant time.

The case examiners consider that the grounds of lack of competence and/ or capability is the appropriate ground to proceed on and has a realistic prospect of being found proven by adjudicators.

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

In principle the issues of concern are capable of being remediated through the social worker engaging in further training, reflecting on what they could have done differently and engaging in supervision. The social worker says in submissions that they are working [REDACTED] and that stepping away from social work has given them time to reflect and regain confidence.

██████████ The social worker also mentions in submissions (2024) that further assessments were ongoing in respect of other potential support needs ██████████ the outcome of these assessments are unknown to the case examiners. The social worker states in submissions that their relationship with managers at the time in question was ‘caustic’ and that they are feeling more able to contribute to social work effectively having worked in a supportive environment for a period of time.

Insight and remediation

The social worker says in submissions that they are able to see that they were overwhelmed at the time in question, they reflect on the need to communicate better with managers and provide young people with the best possible service. The social worker accepts that their case records were not robust, and that incomplete or missing reports and records might have increased risk to young people. The case examiners note that there is some limited insight into the issues of concern, and some attempt by the social worker to outline what they might do differently if presented with a similar set of circumstances again. Having consulted their guidance the case examiners have determined that the social worker has yet to fully consider their role and responsibilities in relation to the events in question particularly in respect of the potential risk of harm presented to young people when statutory tasks may not have been completed to a satisfactory standard and, or in line with local policy and procedure.

Risk of repetition

The social worker has not recently been employed in a social work role but attests to feeling more confident due to taking a break from not being employed as a registered social worker. The social worker has attempted to address personal issues which they feel may have impacted on their fitness to practise at the relevant time and outlined the mitigating circumstances which they feel contributed to their performance issues. The social worker broadly accepts the concerns and shows some limited insight, however the case examiners consider that their ability to practise safely remains unknown/ untested at this stage and as such the risk of repetition remains.

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.

The case examiners have considered the risk of harm to children and young people presented by the social worker's alleged actions. Whilst there is no sense that any of the young people the social worker was allocated to support were harmed, there is a risk of harm when social worker's do not visit children with the necessary timescales, do not record potential risks to children, and do not follow up any issues with relevant professionals. The case examiner guidance paragraph 123 is clear that the risk of harm should also be viewed seriously as an action that (by luck) has not caused harm may still represent an unacceptable risk of serious harm if repeated.

The case examiners consider that despite the mitigating circumstances outlined the social worker has shown limited insight and remediation at this stage and as such the risk of repetition remains.

The case examiners consider that the public may expect a finding of impairment to be made in circumstances where a social worker may not have performed to the required standards expected of a social worker or complied with policy and procedures with regards to visiting children and recording those visits.

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 must now turn their minds to whether it is in the public interest for this matter to be referred to a final hearing to be considered by adjudicators. Whilst the case examiners have determined there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would find the public interest is engaged in this case, they are of the view that the public interest can be satisfied by their decision, and the reasons for that decision, being published on Social Work England's public register which can be found on its website. The case examiners are satisfied that:

- The matter is not so serious that consideration needs to be given by adjudicators with regard to removing the social worker from the register.
- There is not a dispute regarding facts at the core of this case.
- This is not the type of case where public confidence in the profession will be damaged by not holding a public hearing.

- The publication of this decision will provide the social worker with an opportunity to reflect on and gain further insight into the circumstances of this case.
- The publication of this decision will also highlight behaviour that falls short of acceptable standards in social work and will act as an example to other members of the profession.
- The publication of this decision demonstrates that swift and appropriate action is taken in cases of alleged wrongdoing, thus enhancing the public's confidence in the social work profession.

Lastly, public interest also entails the need for proportionate decision-making. The case examiners consider it is in the public interest to bring this matter to a prompt conclusion, whilst also ensuring the public remains adequately protected.

For the reasons stated, the case examiners have decided it is not in the public interest to refer this matter to adjudicators; rather they will write to the social worker and ask them to agree to dispose of this case without the need for a hearing via an accepted disposal.

Interim order

An interim suspension order is already in effect.

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 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. The case examiners considered taking no further action but considered that this would not be appropriate in this instance as it would not satisfy the wider public interest.

The case examiners next considered whether offering advice would be sufficient. Offering 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 believe that issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they view the social worker's conduct.

The case examiners next considered whether a warning would be sufficient. A warning order would not however directly restrict practice and may not be sufficient to protect the public where there have been longstanding concerns about the quality of a social worker's practice, and the risk of repetition remains.

The case examiners next considered a conditions of practice order. The sanctions guidance (114) says that this may be appropriate when:

- 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

The case examiners have therefore determined that this option could deliver public protection by some restriction of practice, whilst offering the social worker the opportunity to develop insight and acquire the knowledge and skills to practise safely with support and supervision in place. The case examiners consider that there is no evidence to suggest that the social worker would not comply with conditions of practice and they feel that this would be a route for the social worker to return to the profession should they wish to do so.

The case examiners looked at a suspension order to check their proposed way of dealing with this matter was most proportionate. They are satisfied in this instance that there are workable conditions which would negate the need for a suspension order. Furthermore, the case examiners do not consider that the concerns are so serious to marginally fall short of removal from the register.

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a Conditions of practice order of 18 months duration. The case examiners consider that this timeframe will allow sufficient time for the social worker to demonstrate strengthened practice and will include a full appraisal cycle. The case examiners are of the view that any timeframe above 18 months would be disproportionate.

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.

On 7 August 2025 the social worker signed a declaration to confirm that they had read the case examiners decision and the accepted disposal guide. They agreed to

terms proposed and to conclude this matter with an accepted disposal- conditions of practice order for 18 months duration.

Content of the conditions of practice

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 3 months and at least 10 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. You must work with your reporter to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:
 - Adhering to local policy and procedure with regarding to visiting and recording visits.
 - Ensuring that you assess, analyse and respond to risk in line with policy and procedure
10. 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 2 weeks prior to any review.
11. You must not undertake any agency, locum, out-of-hours, or on-call duties.
12. a. You must undertake 14 hours of CPD in relation to analysing and assessing risk.

b. You must provide evidence of CPD undertaken to Social Work England within 10 months of these conditions taking effect.
13. You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019), and provide a written reflection 4 months after these conditions take effect, focusing on how your conduct, for matters relating to this case, was allegedly below the accepted standard of a social worker, outlining what you should have done differently. Your reflection should focus on the following:
 - The importance of adhering to local policy and procedure with regarding to visiting and recording visits.
 - The importance of ensuring that you assess, analyse and respond to risk in line with policy and procedure
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 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.

Response from the social worker

On 7 August 2025 the social worker confirmed that they had read the case examiners decision and accepted their proposal to conclude this matter with a conditions of practice order of 18 months duration.

Case examiners' response and final decision

The case examiners have reviewed their decision, paying particular regard to the overarching objective of Social Work England: protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the social work profession and upholding professional standards. The case examiners are satisfied that an accepted disposal conditions of practice order (18 months) is a fair and proportionate way to address the concerns and is the minimum necessary to protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest.

The case examiners note that there is an interim order currently in effect, which will be revoked upon enactment of the agreed order.