

Case Examiner Decision
Lucy Cartwright – SW127316
FTPS-21958

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	9
The public interest	20
Accepted disposal	22

The role of the case examiners

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

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

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

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

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

Decision summary

Decision summary	
Preliminary outcome	12 August 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed – conditions of practice for 24 months
Final outcome	16 September 2025
	Accepted disposal -conditions of practice -24 months.

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. 
3. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.
4. There is no realistic prospect of regulatory concern 2 being found to amount to the statutory ground of lack of competence and capability.
5. For regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3, there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

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

On 9 September 2025, the social worker confirmed that they had read the case examiners decision and the accepted disposal guide. The social worker confirmed that they accepted the terms of the accepted disposal in full and agreed to their fitness to practise case concluding by way of a conditions of practice order of 24 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.

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.

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	8 February 2023
Complaint summary	The concerns raised relate to the social worker's professional boundaries, in particular in relation to one service user referred to as service user A. There are additional concerns about the social worker's record keeping and the failure to appropriately report a car accident which occurred whilst the social worker had service user A in their car.

Regulatory concerns [REDACTED]

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 between May 2022-February 2023 you:

1. Have not maintained professional boundaries with service users on your caseload.

Regulatory concern 2

Whilst registered as a social worker between May 2022-February 2023 you:

2. Have not kept full and accurate case records.

Regulatory concern 3

Whilst registered as a social worker on or around 25 January 2023 you:

3. Failed to appropriately report a car accident that occurred whilst service user 'A' was a passenger in your vehicle.

Grounds of impairment:

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1 & 3 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

The matter outlined in regulatory concern 2 amounts to the statutory ground of misconduct and/or a lack of competence or capability.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct and/or a 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	☐

The realistic prospect test

Fitness to practise history

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

Decision summary

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

Yes
☒

No
☐

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

Reasoning

Facts

Regulatory concern 1

Whilst registered as a social worker between May 2022-February 2023 you:

Have not maintained professional boundaries with service users on your caseload

Concerns about the social worker not maintaining professional boundaries were initially raised by a member of the public (complainant C), with whom service user A was living at the time in question.

The case examiners will refer to the following evidence:

Minutes from the employer led investigation

The case examiners highlight the following points from the above-mentioned minutes:

- Complainant C, with whom A was living, said in their witness interview they had witnessed late night calls between service user A and the social worker 2-3 times per week.
- On 1 March 2023, the employer-led investigator met with service user A to retrieve screen shots of messages and phone logs, it was confirmed that these contained evidence of late-night calls and over familiar language with kisses at the end of messages sent by the social worker.
- The social worker is said to have confirmed during their investigative interview that they did often speak to service user A late at night, and their phone logs evidence this. The investigator concluded that the social worker did not appear to demonstrate an understanding in interview that this was '*not normal working practice.*'
- Another service user (T) complained to the local authority that the social worker had transported them to a new home in their car on a Bank Holiday (it transpired without the approval of the manager), and the social worker's children had been present in the car.
- In the hearing outcome letter, there is a reference to service user J and the social worker sending unprofessional and non-social work related messages to them. The case examiners have had sight of such messages.
- There were further allegations that the social worker's children were present in the car when the social worker's friend came to collect service user A and the social worker after a car accident (referred to in more detail at regulatory concern 3).
- In their investigatory interview it is noted that the social worker accepted they had shared personal information with service users, including information relating to their health [REDACTED] details about their parents and relationships, and information pertaining to [REDACTED]

- At the conclusion of their suspension meeting on 2 February 2023, the social worker disclosed they were storing service user A's belongings at their home.

Social worker's submissions dated 28 February 2024

- In the aforementioned submissions, the social worker addresses allegations they took their child to service user A's home to deliver medication when service user A had left their bag with medication in it in their car, following a car accident (see regulatory concern 3). The social worker explains the importance of service user A taking their medication but accepts on reflection that their actions in taking their child with them was *'breaking boundaries, completely unprofessional, and inappropriate,'* and concluded that they would never do this again.

Social worker's submissions dated 11 March 2025

- In the aforementioned submissions, the social worker has reflected on allegations that they overshared personal information with service user A and had their children with them whilst in contact with A. They appear to accept that this was an error of judgement and that, there were issues with maintaining professional boundaries at the time in question.

The case examiners have seen screenshots of messages and call logs between the social worker and service user A; they are satisfied that calls did take place late into the evening and that the content of these could represent a departure from professional boundaries. The social worker broadly accepts that their conduct at the relevant time may not have been professional or represent what would be expected of a qualified registered social worker practitioner. **The case examiners are therefore satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 1 being found proven by adjudicators.**

Regulatory concern 2

Whilst registered as a social worker between May 2022-February 2023 you:

Have not kept full and accurate case records

The case examiners refer to the following evidence:

Minutes from the employer led investigation

- The social worker's case records were accessed as part of the employer led investigation and are said to have shown an absence of recording for four

months. Records were available from September/ October 2022 but no more had been completed until the social worker's suspension in February 2023.

Social worker's submissions dated 11 March 2025

- The social worker accepts that their case notes were not up to date on the system. The social worker states that their manager was aware of issues with their case recording, and problems with 'glitches' in the system that meant they would often type up case notes in the evening. The social worker accepts that they *"fell into a bad habit"* of recording on a word document with the intention of uploading at a later date, but *'time ticked by without them realising how much time had passed.'*
- In their initial submissions the social worker states that they asked their manager for support with managing their [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as it affected their ability to complete case records. The social worker suggests that despite this being discussed with their manager at length, it appears that no action was taken.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 2 being found proven by adjudicators.

Regulatory concern 3

Whilst registered as a social worker on or around 25 January 2023 you:

Failed to appropriately report a car accident that occurred whilst service user 'A' was a passenger in your vehicle

The case examiners have seen the local authority's Incident Reporting policy document; this sets out what was expected of the social worker in terms of reporting incidents or accidents internally. The Incident Reporting document states that *"managers must ensure employees are made aware that all incidents (injuries, fire, violence, and aggression, near miss or occupational disease) must be reported to them, as soon as possible after the occurrence and no later than 24 hours after the occurrence."*

The case examiners have seen evidence to suggest that the social worker uploaded details of the car accident to the relevant portal on 26 January 2023 and recorded the car accident/incident as occurring at 6pm the previous day. As the accident is said to have occurred at 6pm in the evening, reporting the following day, and within 24 hours would seem to be appropriate.

In submissions the social worker accepts that the decision they took to call a friend after the car accident was *'inappropriate and not the right course of action,'* they accept with hindsight that they should have attempted to call a manager and sought guidance from them. The social worker accepts that calling their friend *'crossed boundaries'* and was *'entirely wrong.'*

In the employer led investigation interview the social worker accepted that they had not reported the car accident to the police as they had not thought that they had committed a crime. In a Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) allegations meeting, dated 25 April 2023 a police representative is recorded as stating that the car accident had not been reported to the police, but should have been under the obligations of the Road Traffic Act, as damage had been incurred and there were reports of the passenger complaining of a headache following the collision. The evidence suggests there was some confusion about how the incident should be reported, however it was eventually reported to the police on 23 June 2023.

The social worker appears to accept, with hindsight that failing to call their manager following the car accident was inappropriate. Delays in notifying the police and health professionals to check on service user A following the accident would also appear to represent potential failures to report an accident appropriately, as such, **the case examiners have concluded there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 3 being found proven by adjudicators.**

Grounds

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

To help them decide if the evidence suggests a significant departure from what would be expected in the circumstances, the case examiners have considered Social Work England professional standards, which were applicable at the time of the concerns. They consider there may have been a departure from the following:

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

2.7 I will consider where conflicts of interest may arise, declare conflicts as early as possible and agree a course of action.

3.8 I will clarify where the accountability lies for delegated work and fulfil that responsibility when it lies with me.

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

3.12 I will use my assessment skills to respond quickly to dangerous situations and take any necessary protective action

5.2 I will 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.

The case examiners consider there is substantial evidence from a number of different sources to suggest that the social worker may not have maintained professional relationships during the relevant time. The social worker's alleged actions in visiting and calling service user A outside of working hours could have compromised the safety of both the social worker and the service user, furthermore the social worker taking their children to visit service users creates issues with confidentiality and could have put their own children at risk of harm. The local authority investigation suggested that the social worker's conduct could have been perceived by vulnerable service users as 'friendship' as opposed to a professional service.

The case examiners have found a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 3 being found proven by adjudicators. The case examiners consider that as the accident occurred on a work-related journey, the social worker could/should have known that the correct procedure would be to call their manager to log the incident and seek advice. The case examiners consider that in calling their friend to the scene, who arrived with the social worker's children would constitute a significant departure from what would be expected in the circumstances. A professional response to the car accident would most likely have been to take the following actions:

- Call their line manager,
- Call the police,
- Ensure that both passenger and driver are health checked.

Regulatory concern 2 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.

Regulatory concern 2 alleges the social worker did not keep full and accurate records; the case examiners have found a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding this concern proven.

The case examiners have seen a small sample of the social worker's case records. There are 5 records made available to the case examiners. The social worker is said to have had a caseload of 24/25 and so the sample provided, could be said to represent a small but 'fair sample' of the social worker's work over a period of time.

The case examiners consider that some of the earlier case records made available would not suggest that the social worker lacks the knowledge or skills to produce case records, the records available would appear to be detailed and contain content appropriate to what would be expected under the circumstances. The issue with the social worker's subsequent lack of case recording would appear to be related to their ability to keep up to date and comply with policy and procedures with regard to record keeping. The case examiners consider that the lack of recording represents a departure from what would be expected under the circumstances and as such the correct ground to proceed upon would be misconduct.

Accordingly, the case examiners consider that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding regulatory concerns 1,2 and 3 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

The case examiners have found no realistic prospect of regulatory concern 2 amounting to the statutory ground of lack of competence and/or capability.

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 regard 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.

In principle, issues with case recording could be remediated by the social worker undertaking further training in this area and through support and supervision.

Issues which relate to character, such as breaching professional boundaries might be considered to be more difficult to remediate. However, in submissions the social worker has reflected in detail with regard to the sharing of personal information with service users, and decisions they made to take their children with them to work related events where service users were present. The social worker says that on reflection they now understand that:

“such behaviour and decisions can cause confusion and uncertainty for the young person, encourage over familiarity, provide misleading or confusing expectations and that this can negatively impact their understanding and sense of an appropriate professional relationship, their trust in me and the profession as whole, their ability to engage effectively in future. ”

The social worker goes on to express regret and remorse for their actions. In recent submissions the social worker says they were feeling ‘*overwhelmed and pressured*’ at this time, and they struggled to manage their workload. The social worker recognises that they were over involved with work and were worrying about it which resulted in them losing perspective. The social worker appears to recognise that working weekends, and not setting boundaries for themselves and their service users was problematic.

In submissions the social worker also reflects on their health. The social worker had been diagnosed with [REDACTED] in April 2022 (date changed by case examiners from April 2023 to April 2022, as they assumed this was a typing error on the part of the social worker in their submissions) just before they commenced their locum/agency employment with [REDACTED]. The social worker informed their manager that they had been diagnosed with [REDACTED] and also requested support for [REDACTED] the social worker was informed they would be referred to [REDACTED] however, it would appear that this referral was not made until the social worker had been suspended. In the disciplinary hearing outcome letter dated 25 September 2023, it is accepted by [REDACTED] that a referral to [REDACTED] was not actioned as agreed and that supervision between the social worker and their manager was not recorded as would have been expected. The social worker says in their initial submissions that their ability to complete reflection and remediation work had been hampered by [REDACTED]

In summary, the case examiners consider that the social worker has begun the process of developing insight, they have provided detailed submissions which go some way to demonstrate their acceptance of the facts and their remorse. The social worker has put forward some mitigating circumstances in respect of their requests for support from their manager which appear not to have been recorded or actioned, for example, a referral to [REDACTED]. The case examiners consider that the social worker was [REDACTED] which might have been mobilised through an [REDACTED] which did not occur, and potentially left the social worker disadvantaged.

It is also acknowledged by the employing authority that when the social worker's employment status changed from agency to a permanent member of staff there was a failure to complete a corporate induction. The social worker was not shown additional policies and procedures relating to the change of employment status, and there are no records to confirm a probationary process was implemented.

The social worker has not been employed in a social work role since their suspension and says they have struggled with their [REDACTED] health. The social worker's health appears to have impacted on their ability to complete remediation. Given these factors the case examiners have concluded that although insight is developing the risk of repetition remains given that the social worker has not begun the process of remediation and their ability to work in a social work role with support for their [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in place is as yet untested.

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 workers do not record potential risks to children, blur their professional boundaries by visiting outside of usual working hours and introducing their children to service users.

There is a further risk of harm when social workers do not follow the correct procedures following serious incidents such as car accidents. Allegations that the social worker may have started to manage person A's medication and stored their belongings in their home suggests that the social worker had lost perspective on the

role of a registered social worker, and the possibility that they may have been leaving themselves vulnerable to allegations by other professionals and service users.

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 there are some mitigating circumstances in that the social worker was not [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The social worker has shown some limited insight, but they have completed no remediation at this stage and their ability to practise [REDACTED] place is as yet untested, 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 has breached professional boundaries, has not adhered to recording policy and procedure, and has potentially failed to adequately report a car accident involving a service user.

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

Accepted disposal

Case outcome

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

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 are concerns about professional boundaries, 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 begin the process of remediation 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 24 months duration. The case examiners consider that this timeframe will allow sufficient time for the social worker to demonstrate strengthened practice, to complete remediation, and develop further insight. The case examiners are of the view that any timeframe above 24 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.

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 workplace supervisor, 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.

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 the importance of case recording and maintaining professional boundaries.

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 professional boundaries in social work practice.

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 9 September 2025, the social worker confirmed that they had read the case examiners decision and the accepted disposal guide. The social worker confirmed that they accepted the terms of the accepted disposal in full and agreed to their fitness to practise case concluding by way of a conditions of practice order of 24 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. Case examiners are satisfied that an accepted disposal conditions of practice (two years duration) 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.