

Case Examiner Decision
Tina Goodby – SW72869
FTPS-21075

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.....	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	
Preliminary outcome	15 July 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed - Conditions of Practice Order – 12 months
Final outcome	24 September 2025
	Accepted disposal agreed – Conditions of Practice Order – 12 months

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 (partial), 1.4, 1.5 and 2 being found proven by the adjudicators. [REDACTED]

2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 (partial), 1.4, 1.5 and 2 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

3. For regulatory concerns 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 (partial), 1.4, 1.5 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 determined that the case could be concluded by way of accepted disposal. The social worker subsequently agreed to the terms of the proposed accepted disposal.

The case examiners direct that this case can now be resolved with a Conditions of Practice Order of 12 months' duration.

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

Anonymity and redaction

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

In accordance with Social Work England's fitness to practise proceedings and registration appeals publications policy, the names of individuals have been anonymised to maintain privacy.

The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's current employer [REDACTED] and by way of a self-referral by the social worker.
Date the complaint was received	Social worker-18 August 2022 Employer-01 September 2022
Complaint summary	The social worker was subject to a disciplinary investigation by their employer, where it is alleged that they breached professional boundaries by failing to maintain a professional relationship with a service user, Person A. Following further investigation, it is also alleged that the social worker failed to maintain accurate records.

Regulatory concerns

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

(As amended by the case examiners)

Whilst registered as a social worker between November 2021 and August 2022, you:

1. Did not maintain a professional relationship with Person A, when you:

- 1.1. Remained in regular contact with Person A without professional reason to do so.
- 1.2. Remained in contact with Person A against management direction.

1.3. Disclosed to Person A that you were being investigated for being too close to them; [REDACTED]

1.4. Offered to take a letter and/or deliver a present to Person A's children on Person A's behalf.

1.5. Informed Person A that you were aware that they made a serious allegation against you to other professionals.

2. Did not maintain accurate and up to date records in relation to Person A.

Grounds of impairment:

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1, 2 [REDACTED] amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

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



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, 1.2, 1.3 (partial), 1.4, 1.5 and 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 November 2021 and August 2022, you:

1. Did not maintain a professional relationship with Person A, when you:
 - 1.1. Remained in regular contact with Person A without professional reason to do so.

The social worker, as a team manager, allocated the case of Person A to themselves rather than a delegated member of their team. The case examiners have reviewed a comprehensive range of evidence, which takes the form of witness interviews, emails, case notes and the content of an employer investigation. In doing so, the case examiners have summarised the following areas of intervention where they consider there to be evidence to suggest that there was no professional reason for the excessive volume of contact the social worker had with person A:

- The presence of an email with recorded case notes and a staff witness interview following a conversation from a General Practitioner (GP). These state that the social worker had been requesting increased pain relief medication for Person A, and more specifically *'CBD oil'*. The GP was concerned that the social worker was *'too close'* to Person A, over-involved and not necessarily acting in their best interests, but *'acting on [Person A's] want not need'*. The GP described the social worker as having *'not been able to see the wood from the trees'*; they expressed concern that the social worker could be vulnerable as Person A could be *'manipulative and sexually disinhibited'*.
- Evidence from witnesses suggesting a high, frequent and excessive level of contact between Person A and the social worker; this was up to 20 times a day. Communication appeared to be daily, and on occasions with near constant text communication for significant periods. There is evidence to suggest that the primary motivator for the social worker engaging in these levels of contact was that if Person A did not get their needs met, they would threaten to complain or make attempts and threats to kill themselves.
- Two witness interviews, which included one with the manager of the home where Person A resided, stating that the social worker would also visit Person A at weekends; this is disputed by the social worker.
- Witness evidence to suggest that the nature of the frequent communication between the social worker and Person A was overly colloquial with unprofessional use of language and overfamiliar *'banter'*. Some of the terminology used by the social worker could be considered unacceptable, even given the context, provided by the social worker by way of explanation. In the opinion of the case examiners, the social worker's communication style with Person A indicates a failure to maintain a professional relationship brought about by the erosion of boundaries in language and behaviour. Evidence in the employer investigation references phrases used by the social worker, and sent to Person A in their emails:

'Oh shit your injections didn't come I should have checked with you Leave it with me I will sort it'

'Bastard'

'That's a big bugger watch out it might bit your bum'

'Bloody hell I need one I have put that on lol My belly is getting bigger'

'I am at work lol and shit the bed'

'why are you ignoring me'

'Ring me NOW stop ignoring me you have got the wrong end of this'

'oh bugger no you can order that lol'

- Evidence of unnecessary micro-management in Person A's life. The evidence suggests that these interventions could and should have been managed by care staff, nurses and managers at the care home. Examples ranged from:
 - a) the purchasing of tobacco and other products using Person A's bank account details and discussion around potential transactions for personal items [REDACTED] There is evidence that Person A could make online transactions and purchases for themselves.
 - b) evidence of unnecessary interference in the daily running of the residential establishment where Person A lived. This involved discussions and interventions about medication, pain relief, self-care and physical care.
 - c) Frequency of visits to Person A including evidence that the social worker may have visited Person A alone in their bedroom. For example, visitor log entries, indicate that the social worker appeared to have visited Person A on up to three occasions in one day.
 - d) Evidence from emails indicating that the social worker was involved in decisions relating to use of cameras which were being used by Person A at the care home. Further examples from case notes show that decisions were also being made by the social worker relating to bedroom emergency pull cords, sanitary bins and decisions on GP visits.
- Evidence from case notes record that the social worker was *'very reluctant to have Person A recalled to prison'* even though they may have been involved in illicit drug distribution – a decision which was a matter for the probation service.
- Evidence from the chronologies that there were multiple points where the social worker as team manager could have allocated Person A to appropriate members of staff within their team. On each occasion they failed to continue to do this due to potential complaints and concerns expressed by Person A.

The case examiners give significant weight to clear evidence that demonstrates that the social worker made substantial efforts to involve mental health services in the

management of Person A's care. However, it appears that due to the service pressures on care teams because of Covid-19, and ongoing professional disputes about the mental health status of Person A, they were not accepted by mental health services. Notwithstanding these efforts to transfer Person A from their case load, there is clear, cogent and consistent evidence to demonstrate that the social worker remained in contact with Person A without a clearly defined professional reason to do so. This indicates a lack of professional boundary maintenance in the social worker's practice.

In their response to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern.

The case examiners conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 1.1.**

1.2. Remained in contact with Person A against management direction.

There appears to be clear evidence from the employer investigation that on 02 February 2022, the social worker was informed they should not contact Person A. They were also told that any further communication should be directed to the newly allocated social worker. Following this, there is evidence that the social worker resumed contact with Person A from 16 February 2022.

In their responses to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern.

The case examiners conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 1.2.**

1.3. Disclosed to Person A that you were being investigated for being too close to them; [REDACTED]

Given a realistic prospect of a finding of fact for regulatory concern 1.2, it has already been established that there is evidence to suggest that the social worker contacted Person A after the investigation had begun. Witness testimony also alleges that Person A was aware that there was an ongoing investigation into the social worker on the basis that their relationship had been too close. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker disputes this regulatory concern. They state they did not disclose to Person A that they were subject to an investigation. However, the case examiners have noted evidence indicating that

2. Did not maintain accurate and up to date records in relation to Person A.

The case examiners have read detailed case entries and associated care records as recorded by the social worker. While there appear to be regularly recorded entries, these do not appear to reflect the level, frequency and contact as evidenced in the employer investigation.

The case examiners acknowledge, as submitted by the social worker, that the level of contact between them and Person A was so frequent that it would not have been possible to record the detail and nature of all communications between them.

However, as well as not providing an accurate summary of contact, the evidence provided to the case examiners indicates that significant information, including the detail of some financial transactions made by the social worker on behalf of Person A, and threats made by Person A to harm themselves, were not recorded by the social worker in case records.

In their responses to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern.

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

Grounds

The case examiners have been asked to consider the grounds of misconduct for facts which they have found a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding proven, i.e. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 (partial), 1.4, 1.5 and 2.

The case examiners are aware that there is no legal definition of misconduct, but it generally would consist of serious acts or omissions, which suggest a significant

departure from what would be expected of the social worker in the circumstances. This can include conduct that takes place in the exercise of professional practice and conduct which occurs outside the exercise of professional practice but calls into question the suitability of the person to work as a social worker.

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

As a social worker, I will:

1.7 Recognise and use responsibly, the power and authority I have when working with people, ensuring that my interventions are always necessary, the least intrusive, proportionate, and in people's best interests

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

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

3.7 Recognise where there may be bias in decision making and address issues that arise from ethical dilemmas, conflicting information, or differing professional decisions.

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

4.8 Reflect on my own values and challenge the impact they have on my practice.

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 guidance for social workers in relation to their professional standards reminds them that they should maintain clear and professional relationships with people. As social work is fundamentally about people and relationships, it is important that social workers are alert to relationships becoming inappropriate. With the authority, knowledge and influence a social worker has in their professional relationships, there is almost always an imbalance of power. This is important to acknowledge, alongside the importance of personal values, views and motivations, to ensure that they do not influence a professional relationship.

Social workers should recognise that people may read more into a professional relationship with a social worker to try to have their personal needs met. When this

happens, it is essential that social workers maintain professional relationships and report this to their employer.

In relation to this case, the case examiners are concerned about the extent and nature of the social worker's contact with Person A, including when informed by a manager to have no further contact with them; apparent attempts to interfere with the care being provided to them by other professionals; sharing with them their knowledge of Person A having made a complaint against them; and offering to assist them in communicating with their estranged children. These represent a significant and serious breach of the required professional standards, including 1.7, 2.3, 3.1, 3.7, 3.11, 4.8 and 5.2.

The guidance for social workers also reminds them that maintaining accurate, clear, objective, and up-to-date records is an essential part of social work practice. Documenting decisions and actions provides a clear record of work with people. These records are open to scrutiny and help to provide a continuity of support if people are transferred between social workers. They can help to protect people and social workers. In this case, the case examiners are of the view that the evidence of the social worker failing to keep accurate case records, which included failing to adequately record safeguarding concerns in relation Person's A's threats to self-harm, had the potential to place Person A at risk of further harm. Further, failing to comprehensively record financial transactions that they conducted on behalf of Person A, had the potential to place them at risk of allegations of misusing Person A's financial information.

Regulatory concern 2, if proven, represents a significant breach of standards 3.11, and 4.8.

The case examiners acknowledge the mitigation of the social worker; in that they did not feel qualified to work with people with complex and serious mental health needs such as Person A. The case examiners have also noted that the social worker sought to engage relevant mental health services, without success. This appears to have been exacerbated due to the caseload pressures of Covid-19.

Despite this mitigation, the case examiners are of the opinion that the departure from the required professional standards were significant, serious and wide-ranging.

The case examiners conclude a realistic prospect of the adjudicators making a finding of misconduct with respect to all the regulatory concerns.

Impairment

Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:

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

Personal element

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

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied: The maintenance of professional boundaries is an essential tenet of social work practice. Such conduct could be remediated by further reflection and specific training on professional boundaries. They could also be remediated by further education and training on managing people with complex personality disorders, mental health needs and offending behaviours. This could be reinforced (in the future) via robust structures of supervision and caseload management.

Insight and remediation: The social worker appears to be developing insight into the matters which caused problems in the management of Person A. They accept their failings together with most of the regulatory concerns. They recognise the importance of additional peer reflection. While they dispute current impairment, their submissions appear to acknowledge that they may have been impaired at the time of these concerns.

For the 2.5 years that the social worker has been away from practice, they have engaged in further support; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] they have recognised the need to avoid personal disclosures to service users.

With respect to specific professional remediation, this appears to the case examiners to have been more limited. The social worker has been away from frontline practice for 2.5 years; however, they do work in an allied discipline for the same Council. The social worker states that they have completed various continuing professional development (CPD) activities but has not provided any specific detail or evidence of this, stating that they don't have any 'practice type' evidence available. The case examiners have reviewed the reflective CPD which was submitted to Social Work England as part of the social worker's ongoing registration requirements. While

this serves to demonstrate some insight, it does not demonstrate evidence of current practice proficiency, or evidence any recent professional updates in their knowledge.

Risk of repetition: Considering the lack of available CPD, or recent practice experience, endorsed by positive professional testimonies, or any further professional training, the case examiners are unable to be confident that any future risk of repetition would be low, should the social worker choose to return to practise.

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 consider that a fully informed member of the public would be concerned to learn of these professional practice concerns. While they are historical in nature, such a member of the public would be very concerned to learn how the alleged behaviours of the social worker became so enmeshed with the life of a service user; this was to the extent that there was a risk of potential harm. Such a member of the public would be keen to ensure that professional standards were maintained in the future, to ensure confidence in the social work profession.

The case examiners conclude a realistic prospect of the adjudicators making a finding of 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 conclude that offering accepted disposal is proportionate for the following reasons:

- The social worker is clear that they accept that their conduct fell short of the standards expected of them.
- The accepted disposal process will provide the social worker an opportunity to review the case examiners reasoning on impairment and reflect on whether they are able to accept a finding of impairment. It is open to the social worker to reject any accepted disposal proposal and request a public 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.

- There is no conflict in evidence in this case and the social worker accepts most of the facts.

Accepted disposal

Case outcome

Proposed outcome	No further action	☐
	Advice	☐
	Warning order	☐
	Conditions of practice order	☒
	Suspension order	☐
	Removal order	☐
Proposed duration	12 months	

Reasoning

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of the regulatory concerns being found proven by adjudicators. Furthermore, they found a realistic prospect that the concerns, if proven, could amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct. The case examiners have also found a realistic prospect that adjudicators could find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In review of this case, the case examiners have identified the following aggravating and mitigating factors:

Aggravating:

- The social worker has provided limited evidence of insight and remediation. For example, they have been out of practice for over 2.5 years but have not provided any professionally certificated CPD.
- The alleged departures from the Professional Standards took place over a sustained period.
- Their alleged actions had the potential to place a service user at risk of harm.

Mitigating:

- The social worker has fully engaged with the regulatory investigation.

- There appear to have been significant additional service pressures on case management of Person A caused by the lack of availability of more appropriate services (mental health); these were due to the pressures of Covid-19.
- The social worker appears to have had limited experience of working with people with complex mental health needs and personality disorders.

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

No further action: The case examiners considered taking no further action. However, the case examiners considered that this would not be appropriate in this instance because they are not satisfied that a finding of impairment alone would protect the wider public interest. Furthermore, the case examiners have concluded there is a lack of remediation, and therefore some restriction to practice may be necessary.

Advice or Warning: The case examiners next considered whether offering advice or a warning would be sufficient. 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 alleged misconduct, and again it would not adequately protect the public. A warning order implies a clearer expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct than an advice order. However, the case examiners are not satisfied that a warning order would send a strong enough message to the social worker, and particularly, the wider social work profession. Furthermore, a warning order is not likely to be appropriate where there is a risk of repetition, and again it would not adequately protect the public.

Conditions of practice: The case examiners then considered a conditions of practice order. The case examiners have consulted their guidance, which states conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where (all 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.

Whilst the social worker has insight, the case examiners note the social worker has not had an opportunity to apply this to their practice. They have shown some good reflection into the circumstances of the case, and conditions of practice could offer an opportunity to develop this via the provision of effective structures of supervision and support. The case examiners are of the view that workable conditions can be formulated that would support the social worker to develop the requisite practice skills to remediate their practice. Additionally, the order is subject to review, which can be extended or replaced with a different order if necessary.

Having concluded that a conditions of practice order is the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners went on to consider the length of time for the order. The case examiners consider that 12 months would allow the social worker sufficient time to demonstrate strengthened practice within an appropriate appraisal cycle. It would also be the minimum and least restrictive period necessary to allow the social worker to demonstrate that they are able to practice without further restriction. They consider that any longer period, given that some insight already been demonstrated, would be unnecessary and punitive.

Suspension or Removal Order: The case examiners went on to test the suitability of the conditions of practice order by considering the more severe sanctions, a suspension order and a removal order. Having considered their guidance, the case examiners did not consider these orders to be proportionate. Although, the concerns are serious, the case examiners consider that the public can be protected with an appropriate conditions of practice order.

To conclude, the case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a conditions of practice order of 12 months' 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 28 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 to 13 (inclusive) should be in place for a 12-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 your employer 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.

5a. 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 your employer 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.

6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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].
10. 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:
 - The importance of making professional relationships and maintaining professional boundaries with service users.
 - The impact on service users when professional boundaries are not maintained.
 - The importance of management oversight when via caseload management and supervision.
11. You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 4 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.
12. 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 12, 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.

13. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 12, to any person requesting information about your registration status.

Response from the social worker

08 September 2025:

The case examiners have received an 'accepted disposal response form' from the social worker received on 08 September 2025. This states that they have read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide. They admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, accepting that their fitness to practise is impaired. They also understand the terms of the proposed disposal of their fitness to practise case and accept them in full.

Case examiners' response and final decision

In the light of the social worker's acceptance of the proposed disposal, the case examiners have reconsidered whether a Conditions of Practice Order of 12 months' duration remains the appropriate outcome. The case examiners remain of the view that there is no requirement for this case to be referred to a hearing as the social worker accepts that their fitness to practise is impaired. They have also reviewed

their decision regarding the overarching objectives of Social Work England, i.e. protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the social work profession, and the maintenance of proper standards. Having done so, they remain of the view that a Conditions of Practice Order of 12 months' duration is a fair and proportionate disposal and is the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The case examiners therefore direct that this case be resolved by an accepted disposal of a Conditions of Practice Order of 12 months' duration.