

Diversity data in our fitness to practise process

A technical report on our updated research and analysis

2026

Contents

Diversity data in our fitness to practise process: technical report.....	3
1. Scope.....	3
1.1 Purpose of the research.....	3
1.2 Our aims.....	4
2. Data used	4
2.1 Sample details.....	4
2.2 Variables	5
3. Data preparation.....	6
3.1 Data set creation	6
3.2 Data cleansing and variable transformation	6
3.3 Limitations of the data set	7
4. Multivariate analysis.....	7
4.1 Approach.....	8
4.2 Model design.....	8
4.3 Key results	8
5. Checking and quality assurance	9
6. Annexes	11
Annexe 1: Independent variable (IV) frequencies	11
Annexe 2: Pre-triage stage logistic regression results	18
Annexe 3: Triage stage logistic regression results	21
Annexe 4: Case examiner stage logistic regression stage results	24

Diversity data in our fitness to practise process: technical report

This technical report describes the approach we took to analyse the impact of social worker, referrer, and case characteristics on progression through our fitness to practise process. This report is designed to be read in conjunction with our [summary report](#) which provides context and interpretation of our findings.

This report will provide the information about the data we used and the analysis we conducted, and is split into the following sections:

1. Scope – The purpose of the research and the research questions we were seeking to address.
2. Data – The data we used for the analysis, including the source, the size, and the time period.
3. Data preparation – The steps we took to clean and transform our data, and limitations of the prepared data set.
4. Analysis – Details about the multivariate analysis we conducted, including the approach and key results.
5. Quality assurance – The processes we followed to check and quality assure our methods and results.

1. Scope

1.1 Purpose of the research

The research was intended to build on our [previously published analysis](#) which found that particular groups of participants were:

- overrepresented in the referrals we received
- had higher rates of progression through our fitness to practise process – between triage and investigation and between case examination and hearings

To build on this previous analysis, we set out to use more sophisticated statistical analysis (logistic regression) to examine a range of factors at the same time and identify which factors are most strongly associated with progression through the fitness to practise

process. In particular, this approach would help us explore if the social worker characteristics that appear to be overrepresented in the process continue to be significant when other factors, like referrer and case characteristics, are taken into account.

This research contributes to our wider research on equalities, diversity, and inclusion (EDI). While this analysis cannot evidence causation or provide explanations for patterns in the data, identifying factors associated with case progression can help towards understanding whether there may be discrimination in the fitness to practise process, and inform the next phase of our research.

1.2 Our aims

Our aims were:

- To examine a wider range of factors that could reasonably be associated with case progression through the fitness to practise process. This included the social worker characteristics previously seen to be overrepresented in our previous analysis (age, gender identity, and ethnicity), as well as employer, referrer, and case characteristics.
- , To specifically look at factors associated with case progression at 3 points in the fitness to practise process. This was so we could see, if and how, factors associated with case progression vary between the pre-triage, triage, and case examiner stages.
- To use a statistical method (logistic regression) that can take account of multiple factors at once to identify which remain associated with case progression once other relevant factors are taken into account.

2. Data

2.1 Sample details

The data set used for this analysis was case data for all the referrals that we received between 2 December 2019 and 31 March 2024. We used the same time period as our previously published data and analysis. The data was extracted from Social Work England's case management system and included 6,789 referrals.

This fitness to practise data set reduced in size across the stages of the analysis as cases dropped out of the process because they did not meet the threshold for progression. Additionally, there were cases at each stage that remained under investigation, without a decision at the time of analysis, and these are excluded too. Taking this into account, below are the number of fitness to practise cases included at the 3 stages of this analysis:

1. Pre-triage ($n = 6,585$ cases)
2. Triage ($n = 5,797$ cases)

3. Case examination ($n = 1,423$ cases)

In this analysis, we did not look at factors associated with case progression at the hearing stage due to there being too few cases left in the data set to conduct our regression analysis – subsample sizes for the different variables would be too small for statistically significant results.

2.2 Variables

For our multivariate analysis, using logistic regression, the dependent variable (DV) for models was case progression. The DV was a binary variable – cases either passed or did not pass at each of the fitness to practise stages.

We theoretically selected a range of variables from the fitness to practise data set to test as the independent variables (IV). These IVs represented a range of social worker characteristics, as well as employer, referrer, employer, and characteristics. A full breakdown of the IVs, including frequencies, can be seen in Section 4.2 below.

Social worker characteristics

The variables selected to represent the personal characteristics of social workers are as follows:

- Age
- Gender identity¹
- Sex registered at birth where different to current gender identity
- Disability
- Sexual orientation
- Ethnic group
- Religion or belief
- Nationality

Employer characteristics

The social worker's employer characteristics include the following:

- Employer type – This is the most recently recorded employer on their social worker record.
- Sector type – The sector type of the social worker, based on their current or most recent recorded role.
- Area of practice – An alternative grouping used to classify the sector type of the social worker's current or most recent recorded role.
- Region - The region in which the social worker is employed, based on the social worker's current or most recent role.

Referrer characteristics

¹ Historical diversity monitoring data collected by Social Work England asked registrants about their gender identity. This report analyses those data as collected and therefore refers to gender identity throughout.

Variables represented in each of the models for referrer characteristics include:

- Source of referral – This is a grouped category of the person or organisation that made a referral to us.
-

Case characteristics

The only relevant case characteristics represented in each of our models as an IV was concern type. We first checked for multicollinearity with the DV and confirmed there was sufficient variation for this to be an IV.

- Concern type – This is a categorical variable using high level descriptive categories for the concern type associated with a fitness to practise case. The concern type is determined by Social Work England case workers upon referral.

The concern type is not the same as seriousness and there was no objective measure for case seriousness in the fitness to practise data. While cases are allocated a risk score, this was not considered an IV in our models because the risk score determines whether case progress or not and is, unsurprisingly, multicollinear with the DV. The risk score can change across the fitness to practise process based on the available evidence and this how cases can progress or be closed between the three stages examined in our models.

3. Data preparation

3.1 Data set creation

We compiled our data set from 2 MySQL databases and linked them according to unique identifiers using Power Automate scripting in the Power BI business analytics platform. This provided a single data set containing all fitness to practise cases referred within our specified time period. This data set contained all the variables we needed for our analysis, including the range of social worker, referrer, and case characteristics list above.

From this linked data set, we extracted data needed for the 3 fitness to practise stages that we planned to examine using logistic regression. These 3 data sets were extracted as .csv files for loading into the statistical software packages – we used both SPSS and R.

3.2 Data cleansing and variable transformation

We removed duplicate entries for individual social workers, which is necessary to meet the assumption of independence of observations within the data set. Where social workers had multiple fitness to practise referrals, we retained the chronologically earliest referral, an approach used in other organisational data presentation.

We cleansed the master data set of all the fitness to practise cases, removing records created in error, and other invalid elements of the data set.

We assessed the extent of missing data for each of the IVs and re-categorised this missing data as “Unknown” across variables. This approach maintained as many cases as possible within the data set.

We transformed IVs so that all would be categorical variables and collapsed categories for some existing categorical variables for use in the models:

- Age was transformed from a continuous into a categorical variable, “binning” ages into 10-year groupings, with the lower range being “29 and under”. This matched the approach to reporting age ranges taken in other organisational data reporting.
- Ethnicity was grouped into 4 categories – White, Black, Other, and Unknown. This helped us test whether the previous finding about Black social workers being overrepresented in fitness to practise process can be explained by ethnicity alone or may be due to other relevant factors.
- For variables with data categories comprising small numbers of cases, we aggregated these categories into a single category named “Other” for some variables, such as nationality. For concern type, we used the category name “Small numbers category” to differentiate it from “Other” which was an existing category name for this variable.
- It is possible for case workers to select up to 3 concern types. For our final regression models, we included only the primary concern type. Before making this decision, we first checked that retaining multiple concern types in the model did not significantly change the results.

3.3 Limitations of the data set

There were some limitations with the data set used for our analysis:

- The completeness of diversity data decreases at later stages of the fitness to practise process. Diversity data is available for around 92% of referred cases, but only around a third of cases at the hearing stage. This is largely because hearings often involve older cases, and the quality and completeness of diversity data have improved over time. As a result, the analysis may give greater weight to the characteristics and outcomes of more recent cases than older cases.
- Some variables contained substantial levels of missing information. While these cases were retained within the analysis using an “unknown” category (as described above), a large proportion of missing data can make it more difficult to identify true differences between groups and may influence the results if the missing information is not random.

4. Analysis

4.1 Approach

We used binary logistic regression to examine which factors were most strongly associated with case progression at each stage of our fitness to practise process.

We chose logistic regression because it was the best fit for our largely categorical data set with binary outcomes for the dependent variable. Either cases passed a decision-making stage or they did not.

We chose variables based on our prior analyses in which we found some overrepresentations in our data. Using regression allowed us to examine the relationship between social worker's characteristics, case information, and what drives progression through our processes.

We can use these findings to develop actions that focus on the factors that are most important in the cases that are referred to us, and the experience of those in our fitness to practise process.

As stated in our aims section, it is essential to interpret these results carefully. The relationships we observe may be influenced by other factors not measured or accounted for in our analyses, or by wider systemic factors.

4.2 Model design

We treated each stage of the fitness to practise process under examination as a separate model, with one model for each of the following 3 stages:

1. Pre-triage – The first decision point when cases are referred to Social Work England. Progression requires a decision-maker to confirm only that the case is about a social worker and relates to at least one statutory ground of impairment.
2. Triage – Progressing through triage initiates a full investigation if a senior decision-maker determines there are 'reasonable grounds' to investigate whether a social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.
3. Case examiner – At this stage, case examiners review the evidence gathered during the investigation and decide whether there is a realistic prospect that a social worker's fitness to practise is impaired. They may refer the case to a hearing, propose an outcome without a hearing, or close the case.

IV categories and frequencies for each stage model can be seen in [Annexe 1](#) below.

4.3 Key results

The key findings from the logistic regressions conducted at each stage are below.

Pre triage stage

Progression at the pre-triage stage was most strongly associated with the referral source and the nature of the concerns raised, and then by geographical region. Social worker characteristics were not associated with progression at this stage.

Triage stage

At the triage stage, progression was still most strongly associated with referral source and nature of concerns. Social worker ethnicity, gender identity, and religion also became associated with likelihood of progression at this stage.

Case examiner stage

At the case examiner stage, referral source continued to be the strongest predictor of progression, followed by region and concern type. Social worker ethnicity also continued to be associated with progression at this stage, but not religion. Age became associated with progression but only for some age groups.

Full regression outputs for each stage see [Annexe 2 to 4](#) below.

5. Quality assurance

We conducted quality assurance across the research, including when extracting and creating the data set, and when conducting the logistic regression analysis:

- When compiling our data set from two MySQL databases for diversity and fitness to practise case data, we checked the validity of each half of the data set independently, and then again when the extracts were combined into the master data set of all cases at all stages of fitness to practise.
- When we extracted the data for each separate stage of fitness to practise for the 3 models, creating 3 separate data sets, we checked the validity of each against the master data set.
- We conducted the regression analyses in both SPSS and R, completed by 2 analysts working together. Results were cross validated between each software package, ensuring findings were consistent.
- We also obtained independent quality assurance and advice from a data oversight group: a cross-regulator support and discussion group formed after the publication of our earlier analysis of fitness to practise referrals and case progression. Members of this group included representatives of the General Medical Council, the Nursing and Midwifery Council and support from an independent academic

advisor. The group provided support in quarterly meetings, and direct feedback on our methodological design choices, and interpretation of the regression outputs.

6. Annexes

Annexe 1: Independent variables

Table 1: Frequencies and percentages for independent variables in the analysis at the pre triage stage analysis

Variable type	Variable category	Number	% of the variable type in the sample*
Referrer type	Member of the public (reference category)	3,767	57%
	Employer	1,151	17%
	Other agency	164	2%
	Other social worker	149	2%
	Self-referral	505	8%
	Unknown referrer	849	13%
Concern type	Poor or inappropriate communication (ref)	1,178	18%
	Conviction	88	1%
	Court proceedings	295	4%
	Criminal proceedings/involvement	161	2%
	Dishonesty	1,107	17%
	GDPR/data protection	92	1%
	Health	176	3%
	Issue with social worker's place of work or service as a whole	79	1%
	Performance issues	295	4%
	Bias and/or prejudicial treatment	103	2%
	Professional boundaries	339	5%
	Record keeping	218	3%
	Safeguarding concerns	803	12%
	Sexual misconduct	63	1%
	Violent or abusive conduct	161	2%
	Unknown	788	12%
	Other	550	8%
	Small numbers category**	89	1%
Employer	Local authority (ref)	4,354	66%
	CAFCASS	136	2%

	Agency	384	6%
	NHS	176	3%
	Other	398	6%
	Unknown	1,137	17%
Age group when referred	29 and under	1,682	26%
	30-39	649	10%
	40-49 (ref)	1,856	28%
	50-59	1,826	28%
	60 or over	572	9%
Gender identity	Female (ref)	5,138	78%
	Male	1,438	22%
	Unknown	9	0%
Ethnicity	White ethnicities (ref)	4,095	62%
	Black ethnicities	1,119	17%
	Other ethnicities (not White or Black)	763	12%
	Unknown	608	9%
Disability	No disability	4,960	75%
	Disability	712	11%
	Prefer not to say	354	5%
	Unknown	559	8%
Sex same as at birth	Yes	5,299	80%
	Prefer not to say	288	4%
	Unknown	573	9%
	No	425	6%
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	5,051	77%
	Gay man	109	2%
	Gay woman	129	2%
	Bisexual	147	2%
	Prefer not to say	536	8%
	Unknown and Other	613	9%
Religion	Christianity (ref)	2,694	41%
	Other religion (not Christianity)	1,015	15%
	No religion	2,298	35%
	Unknown	578	9%
Nationality	British (ref)	6,015	91%
	Other (not British) or Unknown	570	9%

Region	East Midlands (ref)	424	6%
	East of England	505	8%
	London	1,001	15%
	North East	313	5%
	North West	904	14%
	South East	840	13%
	South West	508	8%
	West Midlands	694	11%
	Yorkshire and The Humber	607	9%
	Other or Unknown	789	12%
Sector type	Child (ref)	4,308	65%
	Adult	1,475	22%
	Other	339	5%
	Unknown	463	7%
Area of practice	Specialist - children and families (ref)	3,866	59%
	Specialist - adults	896	14%
	Disabilities	236	4%
	Hospital	110	2%
	Mental health	503	8%
	Crime and courts	228	3%
	Other	283	4%

* Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Table 2: Frequencies and percentages for the independent variables included in the analysis at the triage stage

Variable type	Variable category	Number	% of the variable type in the sample*
Referrer type	Member of the public (reference category)	3,153	61%
	Employer	996	19%
	Other agency	148	3%
	Other social worker	131	3%
	Self-referral	379	7%
	Unknown	373	7%
Concern type	Poor or inappropriate communication (ref)	1,033	20%
	Conviction	85	2%

	Court proceedings	259	5%
	Criminal proceedings/involvement	99	2%
	Dishonesty	936	18%
	GDPR/data protection	45	1%
	Health	127	2%
	Issue with social worker's place of work or social work service as a whole	47	1%
	Performance issues	198	4%
	Bias and/or prejudicial treatment	79	2%
	Professional boundaries	288	6%
	Record keeping	214	4%
	Safeguarding concerns	689	13%
	Sexual misconduct	46	1%
	Violent or abusive conduct	152	3%
	Unknown and Other	883	17%
Employer type	Local authority (ref)	3,663	71%
	CAFCASS	106	2%
	Agency	322	6%
	NHS	145	3%
	Other	318	6%
	Unknown	626	12%
Age group	29 and under	516	10%
	30-39	1,296	25%
	40-49 (ref)	1,449	28%
	50-59	1,469	28%
	60 or over	450	9%
Gender identity	Female (ref)	4,020	78%
	Male	1,151	22%
	Unknown	9	0%
Ethnicity	White ethnicities (ref)	3,155	61%
	Black ethnicities	889	17%
	Other ethnicities (not White or Black)	610	12%
	Unknown	526	10%
Disability	No disability (ref)	3,883	75%
	Disability	531	10%
	Prefer not to say	282	5%

	Unknown	484	9%
Sex same as at birth	Yes (ref)	4,129	80%
	No	321	6%
	Prefer not to say	234	5%
	Unknown	496	10%
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	3,937	76%
	Gay man	83	2%
	Gay woman	102	2%
	Bisexual	114	2%
	Prefer not to say	416	8%
	Prefer to self-describe	28	1%
	Unknown	500	10%
Religion	Christianity (ref)	2,124	41%
	Other religion (not Christianity)	804	16%
	No religion	1,753	34%
	Unknown	499	10%
Nationality	British (ref)	4,731	91%
	Other (not British) or Unknown	449	9%
Region	East Midlands (ref)	313	6%
	East of England	407	8%
	London	799	15%
	North East	248	5%
	North West	695	13%
	South East	663	13%
	South West	375	7%
	West Midlands	547	11%
	Yorkshire and The Humber	491	9%
	Unknown or Other	642	12%
Sector type	Child (ref)	3,389	65%
	Adult	1,120	22%
	Other	274	5%
	Unknown	397	8%
Area of practice	Specialist - children and families (ref)	3,064	59%
	Specialist - adults	677	13%
	Disabilities	183	4%
	Hospital	85	2%

	Mental health	378	7%
	Crime and courts	164	0%
	Other	232	0%

* Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Table 3: Frequencies and percentages for independent variables included in the analysis at the case examiner stage

Variable type	Variable category	Number	% of the variable type in the sample*
Referrer type	Member of the Public (reference category)	530	37%
	Employer	535	38%
	Other agency	86	6%
	Other social worker	32	2%
	Self-referral	164	12%
	Unknown	76	5%
Concern type	Poor or inappropriate communication (ref)	198	14%
	Court proceedings	50	4%
	Dishonesty	239	17%
	Health	49	3%
	Conviction	66	5%
	Professional boundaries	111	8%
	Record keeping	93	7%
	Safeguarding concerns	265	19%
	Violent or abusive conduct	63	4%
	Unknown and Other	289	20%
Employer	Local authority (ref)	967	68%
	CAFCASS	16	1%
	Agency	102	7%
	NHS	40	3%
	Other	98	7%
	Unknown	200	14%
Age group	29 and under	111	8%
	30-39	314	22%
	40-49 (ref)	425	30%
	50-59	421	30%

	60 or over	152	11%
Gender identity	Female (ref)	1,018	72%
	Male	401	28%
	Unknown	4	0%
Ethnicity	White ethnicities (ref)	730	51%
	Black ethnicities	281	20%
	Other ethnicities (not White or Black)	162	11%
	Unknown	250	18%
Disability	No disability (ref)	964	68%
	Disability	142	10%
	Prefer not to say	84	6%
	Unknown	233	16%
Sex same as at birth	Yes (ref)	1,019	72%
	No	89	6%
	Prefer not to say	76	5%
	Unknown	239	17%
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual (ref)	973	68%
	Gay man	26	2%
	Gay woman	23	2%
	Bisexual	26	2%
	Prefer not to say	129	9%
	Prefer to self-describe	5	0%
	Unknown	241	17%
Religion	Christianity (ref)	554	39%
	Other religion (not Christianity)	254	18%
	No religion	374	26%
	Unknown	241	17%
Nationality	British (ref)	1,267	89%
	Other (not British) or Unknown	156	11%
Region	East Midlands (ref)	74	5%
	East of England	115	8%
	London	199	14%
	North East	61	4%
	North West	176	12%
	South East	165	12%
	South West	106	7%

	West Midlands	152	11%
	Yorkshire and The Humber	112	8%
	Unknown or Other	263	18%
Sector type	Child (ref)	793	56%
	Adult	334	23%
	Other	90	6%
	Unknown	206	14%
Area of practice	Specialist - children and families (ref)	733	52%
	Specialist - adults	199	14%
	Disabilities	43	3%
	Mental health	120	8%
	Unknown or Other	328	23%

* Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Annexe 2: Pre-triage stage logistic regression results

Table 4: Logistic regression results - factors associated with fitness to practise cases progressing at the pre-triage stage*

Note: Statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$) results are highlighted in bold.

Variable type	Variable category	Odds Ratio	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value
Referrer type	Member of the public (reference category)	1.00	-	-	-
	Employer	3.54	2.28	5.47	0.00
	Other agency	1.73	0.78	3.83	0.18
	Other social worker	0.94	0.51	1.73	0.84
	Self-referral	0.62	0.42	0.91	0.01
	Unknown referrer	0.56	0.36	0.85	0.01
Concern type	Poor or inappropriate communication (ref)	1.00			
	Conviction	5.38	1.24	23.37	0.02
	Court proceedings	0.64	0.42	0.97	0.04
	Criminal proceedings/involvement	1.25	0.62	2.52	0.53
	Dishonesty	1.39	0.99	1.96	0.06
	GDPR/data protection	2.35	0.72	7.64	0.16
	Health	0.27	0.16	0.44	0.00

	Issue with social worker's place of work or service as a whole	0.44	0.23	0.85	0.01
	Performance issues	0.79	0.49	1.27	0.33
	Bias and/or prejudicial treatment	1.51	0.64	3.56	0.35
	Professional boundaries	1.59	0.87	2.93	0.13
	Record keeping	4.02	1.45	11.12	0.01
	Safeguarding concerns	1.77	1.16	2.70	0.01
	Sexual misconduct	1.25	0.37	4.23	0.72
	Unknown	0.15	0.10	0.24	0.00
	Violent or abusive conduct	1.38	0.67	2.85	0.38
	Other	1.24	0.83	1.87	0.30
	Small numbers category**	0.34	0.19	0.61	0.00
Employer	Local authority (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	CAFCASS	0.89	0.44	1.78	0.74
	Agency	1.03	0.65	1.65	0.89
	NHS	1.31	0.65	2.65	0.45
	Other	0.88	0.59	1.32	0.54
	Unknown	1.02	0.72	1.45	0.91
Age group	29 and under	1.06	0.78	1.45	0.70
	30-39	1.03	0.82	1.30	0.78
	40-49 (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	50-59	1.08	0.86	1.36	0.51
	60 or over	1.17	0.84	1.63	0.36
Gender identity	Female (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Male	1.08	0.86	1.36	0.49
	Unknown	2254228 40.62	0.00	-	1.00
Ethnicity	White ethnicities (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Black ethnicities	1.11	0.84	1.46	0.45
	Other ethnicities (not White or Black)	1.24	0.91	1.69	0.18
	Unknown	1.02	0.39	2.66	0.97
Disability	No disability	1.00	-	-	-
	Disability	0.82	0.63	1.07	0.15
	Prefer not to say	1.00	0.64	1.55	0.99

	Unknown	0.34	0.04	3.32	0.35
Sex same as at birth	Yes	1.00	-	-	-
	Prefer not to say	1.19	0.67	2.10	0.55
	Unknown	3.00	0.37	24.64	0.31
	No	1.05	0.75	1.47	0.79
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	1.00	-	-	-
	Gay man	0.76	0.40	1.42	0.39
	Gay woman	1.12	0.61	2.06	0.72
	Bisexual	0.76	0.45	1.28	0.30
	Prefer not to say	0.82	0.55	1.22	0.34
	Unknown and Other	1.41	0.43	4.61	0.57
Religion	Christianity (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Other religion (not Christianity)	1.01	0.75	1.34	0.97
	No religion	0.95	0.77	1.18	0.65
	Unknown	0.67	0.10	4.40	0.68
Nationality	British (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Other (not British) or Unknown	0.77	0.57	1.06	0.11
Region	East Midlands (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	East of England	1.92	1.22	3.02	0.00
	London	1.34	0.92	1.96	0.12
	North East	1.34	0.81	2.20	0.26
	North West	1.29	0.89	1.88	0.18
	South East	1.47	1.01	2.15	0.05
	South West	1.22	0.81	1.84	0.34
	West Midlands	1.19	0.80	1.76	0.39
	Yorkshire and The Humber	1.62	1.07	2.47	0.02
	Other or Unknown	1.50	0.98	2.29	0.06
Sector type	Child (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Adult	1.57	0.78	3.18	0.21
	Other	0.68	0.28	1.64	0.39
	Unknown	0.84	0.53	1.34	0.46
Area of practice	Specialist - children and families (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Specialist - adults	0.47	0.22	0.99	0.05

	Disabilities	0.85	0.52	1.36	0.49
	Hospital	0.89	0.33	2.39	0.82
	Mental health	0.79	0.40	1.56	0.49
	Crime and courts	0.74	0.45	1.21	0.23
	Other	1.59	0.60	4.23	0.36

***Contains categories with fewer than 35 observations, aggregated for calculation in regression.*

Annexe 3: Triage stage logistic regression results

Table 5: Logistic regression results - factors associated with fitness to practise cases progressing at the triage stage*

Note: Statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$) results are highlighted in bold.

Variable type	Variable category	Odds Ratio	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value
Referrer type	Member of the public (reference category)	1.00	-	-	-
	Employer	19.42	15.68	24.05	0.00
	Other agency	9.21	6.11	13.90	0.00
	Other social worker	1.34	0.88	2.03	0.17
	Self-referral	4.41	3.33	5.83	0.00
	Unknown	1.56	1.14	2.12	0.00
Concern type	Poor or inappropriate communication (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Conviction	3.83	2.01	7.30	0.00
	Court proceedings	1.50	1.06	2.12	0.02
	Criminal proceedings/involvement	1.40	0.84	2.34	0.19
	Dishonesty	1.25	0.99	1.57	0.06
	GDPR/data protection	0.64	0.29	1.43	0.28
	Health	1.10	0.69	1.76	0.68
	Issue with social worker's place of work or service as a whole	0.57	0.22	1.44	0.23
	Performance issues	1.12	0.75	1.68	0.59
	Bias and/or prejudicial treatment	0.44	0.19	1.03	0.06
	Professional Boundaries	1.69	1.20	2.37	0.00
	Record keeping	2.24	1.55	3.23	0.00
	Safeguarding concerns	1.96	1.52	2.51	0.00

	Sexual misconduct	2.28	1.01	5.12	0.05
	Violent or abusive conduct	1.53	1.00	2.34	0.05
	Unknown and Other	1.25	0.97	1.60	0.08
Employer type	Local authority (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	CAFCASS	0.73	0.40	1.36	0.33
	Agency	1.34	0.99	1.81	0.06
	NHS	0.98	0.63	1.53	0.93
	Other	1.03	0.77	1.38	0.84
	Unknown	1.48	1.15	1.89	0.00
Age group	29 and under	0.84	0.64	1.10	0.20
	30-39	0.95	0.78	1.15	0.57
	40-49 (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	50-59	0.98	0.81	1.17	0.80
	60 or over	1.09	0.84	1.43	0.51
Gender identity	Female (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Male	1.32	1.10	1.57	0.00
	Unknown	2.57	0.48	13.88	0.27
Ethnicity	White ethnicities (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Black ethnicities	1.44	1.16	1.78	0.00
	Other ethnicities (not White or Black)	0.90	0.70	1.15	0.39
	Unknown	1.61	0.76	3.41	0.22
Disability	No disability (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Disability	0.99	0.78	1.25	0.91
	Prefer not to say	1.17	0.84	1.63	0.37
	Unknown	0.13	0.02	0.71	0.02
Sex same as at birth	Yes (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	No	1.03	0.77	1.37	0.84
	Prefer not to say	0.87	0.56	1.35	0.53
	Unknown	2.19	0.54	8.93	0.28
	Heterosexual	1.00			
Sexual orientation	Gay man	0.96	0.55	1.68	0.90
	Gay woman	0.94	0.56	1.58	0.82
	Bisexual	1.52	0.97	2.38	0.07
	Prefer not to say	1.35	0.97	1.87	0.07
	Prefer to self-describe	0.71	0.26	1.90	0.49
	Unknown	3.35	0.70	16.14	0.13

Religion	Christianity (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Other religion (not Christianity)	1.28	1.01	1.61	0.04
	No religion	0.85	0.71	1.02	0.09
	Unknown	0.80	0.15	4.24	0.79
Nationality	British (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Other (not British) or Unknown	0.97	0.75	1.25	0.81
Region	East Midlands (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	East of England	0.95	0.65	1.37	0.77
	London	0.80	0.57	1.12	0.19
	North East	1.12	0.73	1.71	0.61
	North West	1.03	0.73	1.43	0.88
	South East	0.93	0.66	1.30	0.67
	South West	1.07	0.73	1.56	0.74
	West Midlands	0.93	0.66	1.32	0.69
	Yorkshire and The Humber	0.91	0.63	1.30	0.59
	Unknown or Other	1.14	0.80	1.64	0.47
Sector type	Child (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Adult	1.48	0.83	2.64	0.19
	Other	3.15	1.51	6.58	0.00
	Unknown	1.27	0.89	1.81	0.18
Area of practice	Specialist - children and families (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Specialist - adults	0.64	0.35	1.19	0.16
	Disabilities	1.05	0.72	1.55	0.79
	Hospital	0.79	0.36	1.73	0.56
	Mental health	0.80	0.45	1.44	0.46
	Crime and courts	0.96	0.59	1.56	0.88
	Other	0.42	0.19	0.94	0.03

Annexe 4: Case examiner stage logistic regression stage results

Table 6: Logistic regression results - factors associated with fitness to practise cases progressing past the case examiner stage*

Note: Statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$) results are highlighted in bold.

Variable type	Variable category	Odds Ratio	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value
Referrer type	Member of the Public (reference category)	1.00	-	-	-
	Employer	13.51	8.88	20.56	0.00
	Other agency	6.89	3.70	12.82	0.00
	Other social worker	4.85	1.86	12.61	0.00
	Self-referral	5.23	2.97	9.24	0.00
	Unknown	4.00	1.99	8.03	0.00
Concern type	Poor or inappropriate communication (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Court proceedings	1.04	0.36	2.98	0.94
	Dishonesty	2.08	1.23	3.50	0.01
	Health	0.63	0.28	1.43	0.27
	Conviction	0.58	0.26	1.29	0.18
	Professional boundaries	1.58	0.84	2.95	0.15
	Record keeping	0.78	0.39	1.57	0.49
	Safeguarding concerns	0.49	0.29	0.84	0.01
	Violent or abusive conduct	1.00	0.47	2.13	0.99
	Unknown or Other	0.85	0.50	1.44	0.54
Employer	Local authority (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	CAFCASS	0.00	0.00		1.00
	Agency	0.76	0.46	1.28	0.31
	NHS	0.65	0.26	1.62	0.35
	Other	1.50	0.87	2.56	0.14
	Unknown	1.59	1.00	2.54	0.05
Age group	29 and under	0.76	0.42	1.38	0.36
	30-39	0.59	0.38	0.89	0.01
	40-49 (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	50-59	0.94	0.66	1.35	0.75
	60 or over	0.80	0.49	1.29	0.36
Gender identity	Female (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Male	1.04	0.76	1.43	0.82
	Unknown	5.61	0.33	96.92	0.24
Ethnicity	White ethnicities (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Black ethnicities	2.08	1.35	3.20	0.00
	Other ethnicities (not White or Black)	1.53	0.93	2.53	0.10
	Unknown	1.44	0.36	5.81	0.61
Disability	No disability (ref)	1.00	-	-	-

	Disability	0.70	0.43	1.15	0.16
	Prefer not to say	1.48	0.77	2.85	0.24
	Unknown	0.59	0.05	6.52	0.67
Sex same as at birth	Yes (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	No	0.82	0.44	1.52	0.53
	Prefer not to say	0.42	0.18	0.99	0.05
	Unknown	2.00	0.20	19.70	0.55
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Gay man	1.51	0.47	4.85	0.48
	Gay woman	0.19	0.02	1.64	0.13
	Bisexual	1.25	0.39	4.02	0.71
	Prefer not to say	1.70	0.88	3.28	0.11
	Prefer to self-describe	5.29	0.53	52.66	0.16
	Unknown	7.08	0.60	83.72	0.12
Religion	Christianity (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Other religion (not Christianity)	0.95	0.60	1.50	0.82
	No religion	0.86	0.56	1.34	0.51
	Unknown	0.23	0.02	2.48	0.22
Nationality	British (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Other (not British) or Unknown	1.26	0.82	1.93	0.29
Region	East Midlands (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	East of England	1.25	0.50	3.13	0.63
	London	2.36	1.01	5.50	0.05
	North East	1.80	0.61	5.31	0.28
	North West	2.90	1.25	6.74	0.01
	South East	2.50	1.06	5.87	0.04
	South West	1.97	0.79	4.91	0.15
	West Midlands	2.09	0.89	4.94	0.09
	Yorkshire and The Humber	2.03	0.82	5.06	0.13
	Unknown or Other	2.93	1.27	6.73	0.01
Sector type	Child (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Adult	0.72	0.27	1.93	0.52
	Other	2.12	0.85	5.26	0.11
	Unknown	4.39	1.58	12.22	0.00
Area of practice	Specialist - children and families (ref)	1.00	-	-	-
	Specialist - adults	1.40	0.49	4.05	0.53
	Disabilities	0.47	0.18	1.25	0.13
	Mental health	0.93	0.34	2.51	0.88
	Unknown or Other	0.39	0.15	0.99	0.05