



Case Examiner Decision
Laila Vincent
FTPS-17521

Contents

The role of the case examiners	3
Administrative details	4
Decision summary	5
Summary of the initial concerns	6
Preliminary issues	8
The realistic prospect test - facts	9
The realistic prospect test - grounds	11
The realistic prospect test – current impairment	14
Referral to a hearing	18
Accepted disposal	20
Final decision	24

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 statutory grounds for impairment is engaged
- adjudicators could find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired

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.

Administrative details

Case examiners

Lay case examiner	Oliver Carr
Professional case examiner	Elaine Weinbren

Social worker that is the subject of the concern(s)

Name	Laila Vincent
Registration number	SW128644
Date of registration	11 October 2019

Case details

Case reference number	FTPS-17521
Date the concern was raised	31 May 2020

Decision summary

Decision summary

Final decision

Accepted disposal -published warning 5 years

Executive summary

This case was presented to the case examiners by the case investigators with a written recommendation for case closure in relation to Regulatory Concern 2, as permitted by Paragraph 4 (1) (d) of the Social Work England appointment rules 2020.

However, the case examiners did not agree with this recommendation. They paused their consideration of the case in order that the social worker was informed of this preliminary decision and was given additional opportunity to provide submissions on this regulatory concern.

The case examiners then proceeded with the consideration of the substantive decision.

The case examiners are satisfied that there is:

- a realistic prospect of the regulatory concern being found proven by adjudicators
- a realistic prospect that that these concerns would amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct, competence, and adverse health
- a realistic prospect that adjudicators would find that the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

However, the case examiners consider that it is not in the public interest to refer this to a hearing and they wrote to the social worker to ask if they would agree to dispose of this matter without the need of a hearing.

The case examiners full reasoning is set out in detail below.

Summary of the initial concerns

Complainant's details

Complainant's name	Two of the complainants wished to remain anonymous and two were named as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
Relationship to the social worker	The two named contacts were described as former midwife colleagues

Details of the complaint

Date complaint was received	31 May 2020
Complaint summary	Four referrals were received in respect of this social worker in May and June 2020 in relating to posts that were made on social media. The complainants spoke of the social worker encouraging hate and violence against the police and posting comments which they viewed as unprofessional and they described as racist. Two of the complainants upon commenting on some of the posts described feeling personally bullied and threatened by the comments that the social worker posted. A further concern was raised during the investigation in relation to the social worker's health. This regulatory concern has been placed before the case examiners with a recommendation for closure.

Regulatory concerns

Regulatory Concern 1:

On or around 29th May 2020, you posted images and comments on Facebook which may be harmful to the public confidence in social workers, and not in accordance with the professional standards and conduct expected of a social worker.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Regulatory Concern 2:

You suffer from an adverse health condition as set out in Schedule 1 which impacts on your ability to practise as a social worker.

Schedule 1



Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of health.

Key evidence considered by the case examiners

The case examiners considered all the evidence presented in the bundle and determined the following as key to their decision making:

- Four referrals received by Social Work England
- Letter dated 14 August 2020 and email dated 17 August 2020 from the social worker's manager
- Screenshots of the social worker's posts on Facebook
- Letters and records from health professionals regarding the social worker's health
- Submissions and emails from the social worker in July, September and November 2020

Preliminary issues

Conflicts of interest

Declaration: *I am not aware of any material conflicts of interest that could impact upon my consideration of this case.*

Lay case examiner

Oliver Carr

Professional case examiner

Elaine Weinbren

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

The case examiners initially paused this case as they did not agree with the investigators' recommendation for closure of Regulatory Concern 2. In the interests of fairness, they asked the investigators to alert the social worker to this and invite further submissions in light of this preliminary decision.

The social worker returned some further comments, and the case examiners were able to proceed with their deliberation of the substantive case.

The case examiners are satisfied that the social worker in this case has been notified of the grounds for investigating whether their fitness to practise is impaired and has been provided with a reasonable opportunity to provide comments.

The case examiners have noted a misspelling of 'practise' within the regulatory concern where the grounds are set out and they have therefore amended this within their decision. As this is an administrative change, this was not communicated to the social worker.

The realistic prospect test - facts

Is there a realistic prospect of the facts as stated being found?

Regulatory Concern 1: *On or around 29th May 2020, you posted images and comments on Facebook which may be harmful to the public confidence in social workers, and not in accordance with the professional standards and conduct expected of a social worker.*

The case examiners have seen copies of posts, which the social worker has made on her Facebook page from screen shots provided by the complainants. The complainants have stated that the comments were posted on 29 May 2020 and the case examiners note that much of the content related to events surrounding George Floyd's death in America which occurred on 25 May 2020. The case examiners have noted some of the content:

- *"Dear non-black friends....I'm paying attention to your silence..."*
- *"You stay there in your white privilege bubble and better pray it keeps you safe when communities of colour rise up as a collective and [REDACTED] up" which accompanies two photographs entitled "Not enough Malcolm's" with a black male holding a gun and a "Too many Martin's" with a black male holding the Bible.*
- *"No justice, no peace, [REDACTED] the police" which is posted within a picture of a pig wearing a police helmet. This image also represents her profile picture.*
- *Alongside photographs and commentary stating it was protesters laying siege to the Minneapolis police officer's home who killed George Floyd; photos of protesters with placards stating "is my son next?" and "#Black Lives Matter"; photographs of a number of black people with the headed "all unarmed..murdered" and commentary that the police killed another black man who begged for his life telling them he couldn't breathe and a photograph of George Floyd and his words at the point of his arrest, the social worker commented, "This is the least of what he deserves. So, so, so sick of seeing yet another black man MURDERED by the police. How many more black lives will be taken by so called 'officers of the law' before something will be done? Peaceful protests have been tried and failed, the police are one big, corrupt and institutionally racist system and it will take more than peaceful protests to bring about any meaningful change. People wonder why there's such division between the police and communities of colour. This is why. In the police's eyes, black lives don't matter."*

- Alongside a post by someone else stating *“Here’s my question. If this was your child what would you do? Our babies are under attack. This fact is not new.”* And a video that is blacked out as it states it may show violent or graphic content. The social worker has written *“It never ends.....police are scum”*.

The case examiners are satisfied that these posts were made by the social worker as her name accompanies all the posts. They will go on to consider how this affects the public confidence and whether this is in accordance with professional standards expected of social workers within subsequent sections of their decision.

In her submissions, the social worker has admitted to posting these comments on her Facebook page.

The case examiners are therefore satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of this fact being found proven by adjudicators.

Regulatory Concern 2: *You suffer from an adverse health condition as set out in Schedule 1 which impacts on your ability to practise as a social worker.*

Schedule 1



The case examiners have seen reports and correspondence from health professionals, her GP records and occupational health services attached to the social worker’s employers, that indicate the social worker struggles with the health conditions as set out in Schedule 1. Further, the evidence suggests that the conditions were impacting upon her ability to complete her work effectively and recommendations and temporary adjustments were suggested to the employer in order to support the social worker during this period.

Whilst the social worker in her submissions to Social Work England has ticked to indicate that she does not accept this regulatory concern, her reasoning is due to the fact that she feels that this is currently being managed. She does not therefore dispute that she has the adverse health condition as set out in Schedule 1.

The case examiners are therefore satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of this fact being found proven by adjudicators.

Is there a realistic prospect of facts being found if the regulatory concerns were amended?

The case examiners, as explained above, made an administrative change to the spelling on the concerns.

The realistic prospect test - grounds

For the facts that have passed the realistic prospect test, is there a realistic prospect that they could amount to an allegation of impaired fitness to practise by reason of the statutory grounds?

The case examiners must now consider whether the facts, if proven, would amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct and health. The case examiners will consider each in turn.

Misconduct

In line with the Case Examiner Guidance (2020), case examiners are aware that misconduct denotes serious acts or omissions which represent a significant departure from what would be proper in the circumstances. Therefore, the case examiners have considered what adjudicators may reasonably expect from the social worker and how they may view this incident in relation to Social Work England standards (2019). The case examiners consider that the following standard may have been breached. Social worker must not:

5.6 Use technology, social media or other forms of electronic communication unlawfully, unethically, or in a way that brings the profession into disrepute.

The case examiners are aware that falling short of the standards may not always amount to misconduct. However, adjudicators in this instance may determine that the threshold for misconduct was reached. Where there is a realistic prospect of finding that a social worker has made remarks which have been viewed by others on social media and considered to be racist, encouraging hate and violence, adjudicators may view this as very serious.

The case examiners have also considered the legal framework in respect of freedom of speech as this right is protected by the law (common law and Human Rights Act 1998).

However, Article 10 of the Human Rights Act 1998 makes clear that everyone has a right to freedom of expression, however although you have this right you also have a duty to behave responsibly and to respect other people's rights.

At least two of the complainants perceived the comments to be inciting hate and violence towards the police, as well as being threatening in tone towards themselves or members of their family. The case examiners are of the view that some of these posts could be perceived as threatening.

Whilst the social worker has fully accepted the concerns raised about her conduct, she has sought to provide some context and mitigation for her behaviour. The case examiners have noted the following:



- The conduct took place immediately following George Floyd's death in America which was widely reported in the media to have increased tensions within communities and in a variety of relationships in respect of differing views about racism in Britain as well as around the world
- The social worker is not identifiable as a social worker on her Facebook profile and her profile was not open to the public, it was friends only. She states, *"it was brought to my attention that some posts that are shareable on Facebook automatically display as public which I had not realised"*. The comments from the complainants indicate that they knew the social worker in a personal capacity prior to these events and were not members of the general public
- The social worker reports that she posts the comments following an exchange with one of the complainants which became heated and, in her words, *"not productive as there was a clear difference of opinion"*. She states that she was extremely upset following this exchange as they had previously been close friends and having also watched a number of very traumatic videos, she proceeded to post comments in a *"heightened state of trauma"*
- This conduct also took place around the time of a national lockdown as a result of the global pandemic. The social worker advised that as a result of this, she did not have access to her normal support systems such as being able to see friends and family, rely upon them for childcare and was therefore juggling work and childcare

and as a result of her isolation was also spending increased amounts of time on social media



The case examiners are mindful that people have the right of express themselves, but they consider that adjudicators would view these comments as having gone too far in terms of content and are potentially inciting violence. No matter how passionately social workers feel about issues that personally impact upon them, they must be mindful of anything which is posted on social media has the potential to impact on public confidence in them and their profession. Further, the case examiners are of the view that whilst there are some mitigating factors, the adjudicators would remain satisfied that this is a significant departure from what would be expected from a social worker. Whilst the case examiners accept that this conduct occurred in her private life and she could not be identified as a social worker from her Facebook page, she is posting these comments to people who are aware that she is a social worker and as such her conduct has the potential to bring the profession into disrepute. Further, the people viewing these comments stated that they found them to be threatening in content.

Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the alleged facts amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.

Health

The case examiners are mindful that when considering the statutory ground of adverse health that they must have regard not only to when someone has a health condition, but whether this has the potential to impact upon their fitness to practise. Ill health, in itself, will not automatically meet the threshold of the statutory ground of adverse health.

As indicated above in the facts section, the case examiners have had sight of medical information from health professionals which indicate that the social worker's health was impacting upon her practice and as such her employer was advised to make temporary adjustments in order to support her within the workplace.

The social worker within her submissions had indicated that her health has, at times, impacted upon her ability to practise. The case examiners are of the view that since this has impacted upon the social worker in the past and the condition is still present, that it has the potential to impact upon her practice in the future.

Adjudicators may therefore consider that the social worker has a health condition which has the potential to impact upon her fitness to practise.

The case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the alleged facts amount to the statutory ground of adverse health.

The realistic prospect test – current impairment

Fitness to practise history

The case examiners have not been made aware of any previous fitness to practise concerns in relation to this social worker.

Is there a realistic prospect that, if the case were to proceed to a hearing, the adjudicators might find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired?

In assessing whether there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators may find the social worker's fitness to practise to be impaired, the case examiners have considered both the personal and public interest elements.

Personal

In considering the personal impairment, the case examiners have considered the test as set out in the Case Examiner guidance (2020), namely whether the conduct is remediable; whether the social worker has undergone remediation and demonstrated insight; and whether there is a likelihood the matters alleged will be repeated.

The case examiners noted that adjudicators may be satisfied that the social worker's conduct is, in principle, remediable. There is no suggestion that the conduct alleged arose from a deep-seated attitudinal or character flaw that would be difficult to remediate. Rather, the conduct appears to be a result of a specific combination of contributory factors impacting upon the social worker at that time. These can be remediated in several ways, for example through demonstrable development of insight, gaining support and guidance from health and wellbeing professionals.

In considering impairment, the case examiners have considered the context in which the alleged conduct took place and note the mitigation put forward by the social worker in respect of this. They are of the view that whilst this does not minimise the actions of the social worker, it does explain the specific set of circumstances which led up to the alleged behaviour. Moreover, they consider that the social worker's understanding of what led up to her alleged conduct will assist her in taking steps to ensure that the conduct is not repeated.

There is evidence of the social worker expressing regret and remorse at the earliest opportunity and consistently thereafter. In her submissions, she states that shortly after the postings being made, she reflected and considered that the wording was not in keeping with social work professional conduct and she therefore removed the postings from her account and further secured her privacy settings on her account. Further she states, *"I feel saddened by my actions and how this singular day may cause me to be seen in a light that is not truly reflective of who I am as a person and a professional: and not in keeping with the morals and values I set out for myself"*.

The social worker in her submissions has shown insight into how her comments could be perceived and interpreted by a member of the public viewing these. She states, *"speaking from a place of fear, hurt and anger as I was at that time, I didn't take stock of how that comment would be received which was a mistake and unacceptable"* and *"As social workers we will always have unconscious biases and parts of our own experiences that we are being to the role. What I have learned from this is that I must always quietly reflect on my experiences that may have a bearing on my role as a social worker"*.

In terms of remediation, the social worker advised that she has discussed her thoughts as a member of the local authority's BAME forum and how *"as people of colour, we have been deeply affected by witnessing these videos"* and *"we have discussed how we can improve race relations within the Local Authority and the community in which we work, as well as how we can work with the police to achieve this"*.

The social worker's manager has also confirmed that they held a reflective session with the social worker on 14 July 2020 where they discussed the impact of her comments. They identified how the situation had arisen and how by taking a break from social media, this could be avoided in the future. Her manager states *"I have attended a lot of meetings with her involving other professionals including the Police and I have not observed anything within her practice that would cause me to question her fitness to practice or about her interactions with service users, the police or any other professionals"*. In respect of her practice, her manager advised, *"I have not observed anything that will make me question her fitness to practise or concern about her practice. She approaches her work*

with professionalism and will seek advice and support when the need arises. She is diligent and conscientious about her work”.

As part of their reflective session, the social worker was directed to undertake reading on racial trauma and race-related stress in order to learn alternative strategies in dealing with the negative emotions that this can evoke. The social worker in her most recent submissions states that she has *“continued to undertake reading and journaling in order to continue to learn about my adverse reaction to the events of that time and develop ways of managing the feelings it evokes”*. Further, she is undertaking and submitting a dissertation around race, racism and social work which has *“given her significant opportunity to unpick and understand how race and racism affects individuals and the reactions to this”*. Whilst it has not been independently verified that the social worker has undertaken this reading, it appears from the comments from the social worker’s manager that they were satisfied from their discussions that she had demonstrated insight into her conduct and how this may impact upon her practice and the wider public confidence in the profession.

The case examiners acknowledge the social worker has undertaken reflection on how this conduct would be viewed by members of the public, however they recommend that as part of her ongoing reflection on this incident, she not only considers the impact on how these comments would be perceived by the public, but also upon the people who viewed these comments at the time.

The case examiners therefore consider that adjudicators may be satisfied that the risk of repetition is low.

With regards to the social worker’s alleged adverse health condition, the case examiners consider that there is evidence that the social worker has insight into her health condition; she is managing her health and this is not impacting upon her fitness to practise.

There is evidence within the bundle of the social worker seeking support from her GP, alerting her employer to her condition and taking herself out of practice for short periods when she considered that her health was impacting upon her ability to carry out her role effectively.

All of the above is verified independently through medical records and from her employer’s confirmation that they are fully aware of her condition and have put support in place to assist the social worker with her condition.

Given the social worker’s insight into her condition and the supportive employment environment in which she is operating which provides her with the necessary adjustments

and support in order to manage her condition, the case examiners consider that the risk of repetition is low.

Taking all of the above into consideration, in relation to regulatory concerns 1 and 2 the case examiners are satisfied that there is no realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired on the personal element.

Public

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

Adjudicators may determine that a member of the public reading these comments would be concerned about the social worker showing respect and empathy in the future both towards the potential people she would be working with both and colleagues within the police force. They may consider there is potential harm to the wider public in terms of their ability to trust and have confidence in the social worker who had acted in this manner. Furthermore, the social worker's actions may undermine public confidence in the social work profession. The case examiners have reminded themselves that the public interest includes responding proportionately to regulatory concerns. It is therefore necessary for the regulator to take proportionate action to uphold the expected standards of social workers.

Accordingly, in relation to regulatory concern 1, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators making a finding of impairment on public interest grounds.

In relation to regulatory concern 2, as there is no realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the social worker's fitness to practise impaired on the personal element, there can be no finding of impairment on public interest grounds.

Referral to a hearing

Is there a public interest in referring the concerns to a hearing?

The case examiners must now take into account whether it is in the public interest for this matter to be referred to a final hearing to be considered by adjudicators.

The case examiners have noted that the social worker has indicated that she is not currently impaired, however she has accepted all the regulatory concerns and has undertaken significant amounts of remediation work in acknowledgement of her wrongdoing. It is clear in discussing this with her employer and in all correspondence with Social Work England, the social worker accepts that her conduct fell short of the standards expected of social workers. The case examiners, therefore, consider that it would be appropriate, fair and proportionate to propose accepted disposal in this instance, as they consider that she is no longer personally impaired.

Whilst the case examiners have determined that there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would find that there is a public interest in this case, resolving a case without a hearing and publishing the decision and reasoning will serve the wider public interest of maintaining confidence in, and the professional standards of, social workers.

The case examiners have considered whether there is a realistic prospect of removal if the case was considered at a hearing. The case examiners have noted that conduct which involves posting comments with the potential to incite violence on social media could be viewed as extremely serious and therefore potentially lead to a realistic prospect of removal. However, the case examiners have carefully considered the unique and exceptional context in which the alleged behaviour took place and consider the adjudicators would be sympathetic to this as well as the social worker's acceptance of her behaviour and the remediation completed. As a result, the case examiners consider there would not be a realistic prospect of removal in this instance.

They consider the public interest in this matter can be satisfied by the full decision being recorded on the public register. The publication of this matter will also highlight behaviour that falls short of acceptable standards in social work and will act as a warning to other members of the profession. There is a public interest in proportionate regulation and in this instance, swift and appropriate action in response to the alleged wrongdoing will enhance the public's confidence in the social work profession whilst also ensuring the public remains adequately protected. There is nothing to be gained from delaying taking action by referring this to a public hearing.

The case examiners have noted a positive testimonial from the social worker's current employer as well as the supportive environment where the employer is aware of her health condition and is providing support. They have also taken account of the social worker's submissions about learning from her mistakes and moving forward how she may deal with anything of a similar nature.

In conclusion, the case examiners are satisfied that there is no public interest in referring this matter to a hearing.

Accepted disposal

Case outcome

Proposed outcome

Final order – warning -5 years (published)

Reasoning

In considering which sanction is appropriate in this instance, the case examiners have had regard to Social Work England's Sanctions Guidance. They are also mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish the social worker but to protect the public and the wider public interest. They have therefore considered the aggravating and mitigating factors which are set out below:

Aggravating

- Posted comments on social media which were seen as intimidating, as well as encouraging hate and violence by the recipients

Mitigating

- Evidence submitted that social worker was experiencing a specific set of circumstances at a unique moment in time that led to a lack of clear judgement
- Remediation completed
- No concerns raised relating to her professional relationships or practise prior to, at the time or subsequent to the incident

To determine 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 that taking no further action or issuing advice would not be appropriate in a case where the social worker was accused of posting inappropriate comments on social media. Case examiners note that whilst this was an isolated incident within her personal life, there are wider implications in terms of public confidence in the profession. Taking no further action or issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which the case examiners viewed the social worker's alleged conduct and fails to safeguard the wider public interest.

The case examiners next considered issuing a warning and determined that a warning that remained on the social worker's entry on the Register for a period of 5 years was the appropriate and proportionate response in this case and was the minimum sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest. The case examiners reminded themselves that this was not a case which requires that the social worker's practice be restricted. While a warning will not restrict her practice, it will serve as a clear expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct. Further, a warning will be a signal that any repetition will be highly likely to result in a more severe sanction.

In considering the appropriate length of time for a warning, the case examiners have had regard to the Sanctions Guidance (2020, paragraph 82) which states,

"Five years may be appropriate for serious cases that have fallen only marginally short of requiring restriction of registration, to maintain confidence in the profession and where it is necessary to send a clear signal about the standards expected. The timeframe presents an extended period over which the social worker must demonstrate that there is no risk of repetition".

As mentioned in previous sections of this decision, the case examiners view this conduct as very serious and it is only due to the exceptional and unique circumstances and time at which the alleged conduct took place that the case examiners consider that a 5 years warning is the minimum required to protect the public and maintain public confidence.

The case examiners did go on to consider whether the next sanction, conditions of practice, was a more appropriate outcome. They concluded that conditions were more relevant in cases requiring some restriction in practice and were not suitable in this instance.

The case examiners are aware that if the social worker does not agree to this sanction, the matter will progress to a final hearing.

In line with the Social Work England's Case Examiner Guidance, the case examiners would like the social worker to respond to this proposal in writing within 21 days.

Content of the warning

The case examiners formally warn the social worker as follows:

The case examiners warn that all social workers must display behaviour while at work, and also in their private lives, which does not fall short of the professional standards. This includes any communication online.

The posting of any inappropriate or hostile information on social media not only brings into question an individual's fitness to practise, but also has the potential to harm the reputation of the wider profession.

Specially, the following Social Work England Standards apply. Social workers must not:

5.6 Use technology, social media or other forms of electronic communication unlawfully, unethically, or in a way that brings the profession into disrepute.

Any other matters of this nature involving the social worker, which are brought to the attention of the regulator, will likely result in a more serious sanction.

This warning will remain published for five years which reflects how serious the case examiners consider the matter to be.

Response from the social worker

The social worker returned the signed agreement to the case examiners on 7 December 2020. The social worker accepted in full the proposals put forward by the case examiners.

Case examiner response

Before making their final decision, the case examiners have again considered whether it is in the public interest to refer this matter to a hearing. In this instance, the social worker has admitted her fitness to practise is currently impaired and has accepted the regulatory concerns as set out. The case examiners have not been provided with any additional information which would make them change their previous assessment of this issue.

The case examiners are of the view that their decision is fair and proportionate for the social worker and is the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

Accordingly, and in light of the social worker's acceptance, the case examiners have decided to resolve this matter by way of a warning order, that will appear on the social worker's entry on the register for five years.

Final decision

Case examiners' final decision

Accepted disposal – Warning 5 years (published)

Is there an interim order to be revoked?

No. There is no current interim order in place.