

Social Worker: Ketty  
Chirangwanda  
Registration Number: SW130481  
Fitness to Practise:  
Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 4 April 2022 to 6 April 2022

Hearing Venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome: Removal Order

Interim order: 18 month Interim suspension order

## Introduction and attendees

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018.
2. Ms Chirangwanda initially engaged but was not able to attend the hearing and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Sadaf Etemadi, as instructed by Capsticks LLP.

| Adjudicators    | Role                      |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Timothy Skelton | Chair                     |
| Pervez Akhtar   | Social Worker Adjudicator |
| Karen McArthur  | Lay Adjudicator           |

|               |                         |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| Simone Ferris | Hearings Officer        |
| Paige Higgins | Hearing Support Officer |
| Margaret Obi  | Legal Adviser           |

## Service of Notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators ('the panel') took into account the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle which included:
  - An extract from Social Work England's Register ('the Register') confirming Ms Chirangwanda's registered postal and email addresses;
  - A copy of the Notice of Hearing, dated 25 February 2022, addressed to Ms Chirangwanda's email address as it appeared on the Social Work England Register;
  - A copy of a signed Statement of Service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 25 February 2022, a paralegal from Capsticks LLP sent the Notice of Hearing and related documents to the Ms Chirangwanda's registered postal and email addresses.
5. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to service of notice.

6. The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Hearing had been properly served on Ms Chirangwanda in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules (the Rules)

### Proceeding in the absence of the Social Worker:

7. Ms Etemadi, on behalf of Social Work England, made an application under Rule 43 for the hearing to proceed in the absence of Ms Chirangwanda. She submitted that numerous attempts had been made by Ms Chirangwanda and Social Work England to connect her to MS Teams, but this had not proved to be successful due to connectivity issues in Zimbabwe. Ms Etemadi submitted that there was no indication from Ms Chirangwanda that an adjournment would resolve the connection issues. She reminded the panel that Ms Chirangwanda has stated in her email dated 4 April 2022 (timed at 09.58 hours) and in her further email dated 5 April 2022 (timed at 06.42 hours) that she is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence. Ms Etemadi submitted that any disadvantage to Ms Chirangwanda has been minimised as she has confirmed in writing that she admits the allegations and accepts that the witness statements of the witnesses are true. Ms Etemadi reminded the panel that the two witnesses remain scheduled to give evidence and invited the panel to conclude that it is in the public interest for the hearing to proceed without further delay.
8. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering the application to proceed in the Ms Chirangwanda's absence. This included reference to the relevant factors to be taken into account as set out in the case of *R v Jones [2003] UKPC*.
9. The panel determined that it was fair, reasonable and in the public interest to proceed in Ms Chirangwanda's absence for the following reasons:
  - a. Ms Chirangwanda and Social Work England have made efforts to establish an electronic link to the hearing via MS Teams without success. These efforts took all day on 4 April 2022. This includes Ms Chirangwanda attending another location within her local area but unfortunately there appears to be a power cut throughout the region where she is located. Ms Chirangwanda in her email dated 4 April 2022 (timed at 09.58) stated "*...I suggest you proceed with the hearing even in my absence and you can email me the outcomes of the hearing.*" On 4 April 2022, an email (timed at 16:58) was sent to Ms Chirangwanda to let her know that a decision on proceeding in absence had been delayed until 09.00 hours the following morning to allow more time for the connectivity issue to be resolved. In that email, Ms Chirangwanda was invited to: (i) provide any further information about the connection problem and when she anticipates that it may be resolved; (ii) confirm whether she would be seeking an adjournment if

the problem persisted; and (iii) if she remained content for the hearing to proceed in her absence provide written submissions on impairment. The next morning (5 April 2022) Ms Chirangwanda sent a further email timed at 06.42 hours in which she stated, “...I won’t be able to attend. I am in the remote parts of Zimbabwe and the network is a challenge. I am happy that the panel understands that I admit the allegations. The panel can continue with the hearing in my absence.” That same morning, Social Work England was able to obtain a one off licence to dial Ms Chirangwanda on her mobile phone but unfortunately despite numerous attempts it was not possible to reach Ms Chirangwanda via her mobile phone. A further email was sent to Ms Chirangwanda (timed at 09.03 hours) to let her know that the panel would decide whether to proceed in her absence if there was no response from her by 09.30 hours. There has been no further communication from Ms Chirangwanda. In these circumstances, the panel was satisfied that Ms Chirangwanda waived her right to attend.

- b. Ms Chirangwanda has not made an application for the hearing to be adjourned and there was no indication that she would be willing or able to attend via video conference or telephone on an alternative date. Therefore, re-listing this substantive hearing would serve no useful purpose.
- c. The panel recognised that there may be a disadvantage to Ms Chirangwanda in not being able to make oral submissions or give oral evidence. However, as Ms Chirangwanda admits the allegations and intended to attend the hearing, she was given the opportunity to provide written submissions on impairment. She has chosen not to do so. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that any disadvantage to Ms Chirangwanda was significantly outweighed by the public interest in ensuring that the substantive hearing is commenced and concluded as expeditiously as possible.

## Allegation(s)

*‘Whilst registered as a Social Worker:*

1. *On or around 8 December 2020, you plagiarised an assessment task during an employment interview with Hampshire County Council.*
2. *Your actions at paragraph 1 were dishonest.*

*Your actions at paragraphs 1 and 2 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.*

*Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.'*

## Summary of Evidence

10. Ms Chirangwanda registered with Social Work England on 5 February 2020.
11. On 18 December 2020, Social Work England received a complaint from Hampshire County Council ('the Council') that Ms Chirangwanda when applying for a social worker role with the Council, plagiarised an assessment task during the recruitment process.
12. The Council's Children's website had a live advert which advertised social worker positions on a rolling basis. Ms Chirangwanda applied for a qualified social work position through the continuous advertisement on 12 November 2020. Ms Chirangwanda applied from Zimbabwe as an overseas candidate. Following the submission of her application she was invited for an interview. On 27 November 2020, Ms Chirangwanda was notified that she was required to undertake a written assessment in addition to the remote interview scheduled on 08 December 2020. At 08.17 am on 08 December 2020, Ms Chirangwanda was sent the written task and instructions on how to undertake the task. Ms Chirangwanda completed the assessment which consisted of a case study and four questions and sent it back at 09.00 am. Ms Chirangwanda was then interviewed.
13. Upon reading the written assessment Ms VJ, the chair of the interviewing panel, became suspicious that the assessment had been plagiarised as she felt the Ms Chirangwanda's assessment was similar to a previous submission due to the grammatical errors in the way it was written. The only other candidate that had undertaken that assessment was Ms A.
14. A meeting was set up with Ms Chirangwanda on 11 December 2020 to discuss the concerns. Ms Chirangwanda was asked how she had found the written task. In response she stated that she thought the written assessment was "*fine*." She was also asked if she knew anyone that worked at the Council. Ms Chirangwanda stated that she did not know anyone working in Hampshire and that she had seen the position advertised. It was at this point that Ms Chirangwanda was informed that there was a concern that she had not submitted her own work during the written assessment. She was asked if she had been supported by anyone prior to the interview. Ms Chirangwanda initially stated that she had not been supported by anyone during the interview. However, when Ms VJ informed Ms Chirangwanda that her written

assessment appeared to be a direct copy of someone else's work she admitted that she had not been honest. Ms Chirangwanda admitted to having a coach and support sessions during the recruitment process. In particular she said she had received the assessment from a Whatsapp group chat as a member of the group had posted the assessment on the platform. When she saw that the assessment case study was the same as the one on Whatsapp she submitted that as her own work.

15. On 17 December 2020, Ms VJ spoke to Ms A regarding the incident. Ms A explained she was in a WhatsApp group for Social Workers in Zimbabwe applying for roles in the UK. She initially stated that she did not think that she had sent the written assessment and answers to anyone but when asked if she had sent it to Ms Chirangwanda, Ms A admitted that she had been approached by Ms Chirangwanda and had sent her the written task over WhatsApp. Ms A stated that she thought she had only sent the task and not the answers and if she had sent the answers this would have been by mistake. Ms A subsequently sent Ms VJ the WhatsApp messages which confirmed that she had sent Ms Chirangwanda the task and the answers in separate messages.
16. Ms VJ discussed the matter with her managers which led to the referral to Social Work England.
17. During Social Work England's investigation witness statements were obtained from Ms VJ and Ms A. Ms VJ's witness statement is dated 11 November 2021 and Ms A witness statement is dated 1 November 2021.
18. Ms A is a social worker currently working for the Council. She moved to the UK from Zimbabwe and has been employed by the Council since May 2021. She stated that prior to securing the role with the Council she was in a WhatsApp group for social workers seeking roles in the UK. Ms A messaged the group when she was offered an interview with Lambeth Council. Although she did not receive a reply from the group, she did receive a private message from Ms Chirangwanda who also had an interview with Lambeth Council. They exchanged information and documents in preparation for the interview. During their private messages Ms A shared that she also had an interview with the Council. Ms Chirangwanda disclosed that she did too. They mainly discussed preparation for the interview.
19. Ms A's interview with the Council was in September 2021. She stated that Ms Chirangwanda subsequently asked her via a private message for the answers to the written assessment that Ms A had provided. Ms A stated that she sent Ms Chirangwanda the question but was asked to send the answers. Ms A then forwarded the answers. Ms A stated that she thought Ms Chirangwanda wanted to read the questions and answers to get an idea of what was required. Ms A did not think that

Ms Chirangwanda would copy her answers and did not know that they would be given the same assessment.

20. Ms A stated that she has never met Ms Chirangwanda in person and has never had any formal relationship with her.

## Oral Evidence

21. The panel was provided with witness statements from Ms VJ and Ms A. Ms Chirangwanda confirmed in an email dated 1 April 2022, that the witness statements from these witnesses are “*are true*”.
22. The panel chose not to hear from Ms A but did hear oral evidence from Ms VJ.
23. Ms VJ confirmed that the contents of her witness statement are true to the best of her knowledge and belief. In response to a question from the Chair Ms VJ stated that there were no explicit instructions sent to Ms Chirangwanda advising her that the written assessment had to be her own work. However, Ms VJ informed the panel that she believed this to be implicit, as the purpose of the written assessment was to assess whether Ms Chirangwanda met the criteria for the role. She stated that there is a difference between preparation and assistance (which she acknowledged is entirely appropriate) and copying the work of someone else.
24. In response to further questions from the Chair, Ms VJ informed the panel that during the follow up interview she gently probed Ms Chirangwanda to ascertain whether she would volunteer that she had plagiarised the work of someone else but initially Ms Chirangwanda indicated that the assessment was “fine.” Ms VJ stated that it was only when she brought to Ms Chirangwanda’s attention that there were concerns about her written assessment that Ms Chirangwanda disclosed that she had received the assessment through the WhatsApp group. Ms VJ stated that she noted that there were discrepancies between Ms Chirangwanda’s account of how she came to be in possession of the written assessment and the account provided by Ms A.
25. Ms VJ informed the panel that Ms Chirangwanda apologised and expressed remorse for her actions.

## Finding and reasons on facts

26. The panel noted that Ms Chirangwanda admitted the regulatory concern in a document dated 9 February 2021. In relation to regulatory concern 1 (plagiarism) Ms Chirangwanda stated:

*“I do accept the regulatory concern. I did not know that it would affect my fitness to practice, and I was just too irrational to not come up with an*

*assessment from my experiences. ...it is because of the poor regulation of social work in Zimbabwe that I had not known of the importance of such practices.”*

In relation to regulatory concern 2 (dishonesty) Ms Chirangwanda stated:

*“Yes my actions are dishonest and I admit.”*

27. The panel also noted that in Ms Chirangwanda’s email dated 1 April 2022, she accepted that the contents of the witness statements of Ms VJ and Ms A “*are true*” which the panel understood to mean that she did not challenge the accounts that they have provided.
28. The panel was satisfied that the Ms Chirangwanda’s admissions were unequivocal and accepted her admissions as conclusive evidence that she had plagiarised the written assessment and in so doing had acted dishonestly.
29. The Chair formally announced that the allegations had been found proved by reason of the Ms Chirangwanda’s admissions.

## Finding and Reasons on Grounds

### The Panel’s Approach

30. Having found the allegations proved in their entirety the panel went on to consider whether the facts amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.
31. The panel took into account the submissions made by Ms Etemadi and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
32. In considering the issue of misconduct, the Panel bore in mind the explanation of that term provided by the Privy Council in the case of Roylance v GMC (No.2) [2000] 1 AC 311 where it was stated that:

*“Misconduct is a word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a ... practitioner in the particular circumstances. The misconduct is qualified in two respects. First, it is qualified by the word ‘professional’ which links the misconduct to the profession of medicine. Secondly, the misconduct is qualified by the word ‘serious.’ It is not any professional misconduct which will qualify. The professional misconduct must be serious.”*

### Decision on Misconduct

33. The panel noted that it is essential that local authorities and employers can rely on the professionalism and integrity of registered social workers at all times. The willingness and ability to adhere to high standards of behaviour is fundamental to the role of a social worker. This includes being open and honest at all times including when applying for social work roles.
34. The panel was satisfied that Ms Chirangwanda knew that doing well in the written assessment would improve her chances of being offered the role. She also knew that the assessment was intended to test her skills and suitability for the role and therefore had to be her own work. In deliberately attempting to mislead her prospective employer Ms Chirangwanda acted dishonestly. Ms Chirangwanda's behaviour demonstrates a willingness to put her own interests before the interests of her profession and service users. It also demonstrates a complete disregard of her professional obligations to act with honesty and integrity.
35. Ms Chirangwanda's actions had the potential to cause harm to service users as the purpose of a recruitment exercise is to assess a social worker's suitability for the role. Ms Chirangwanda, in submitting the written work of Ms A, attempted to circumvent the process by which the Council was to assess her experience, skills and knowledge. Had Ms Chirangwanda's dishonesty not been discovered she may have been appointed to a role to which she was not suited, and this had the potential to expose children to an unwarranted risk of harm. The dishonesty, in itself, also indicates an unsuitability for social work as social workers are trusted professionals who are required to exercise good judgment and produce written assessments and reports which are relied on by various stakeholders. For this reason, the honesty and integrity of registered social workers is required to be beyond reproach.
36. The panel considered the Professional Standards ("the Standards") for social workers. The panel was satisfied that Ms Chirangwanda's conduct breached the following Standards:
- 2.1** As a social worker I will be open, honest, reliable and fair
- 5.2** As a social worker 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
37. The panel was aware that breach of the standards alone does not necessarily constitute misconduct. However, the panel was satisfied that Ms Chirangwanda's conduct fell far below the standards expected of a registered social worker.
38. The panel had no hesitation in concluding that the Ms Chirangwanda's dishonesty was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.

## Finding and Reasons on Impairment

### The panel's approach

39. In considering whether Ms Chirangwanda's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel took into account its findings in relation to misconduct, the oral submissions of Ms Etemadi and the written submissions of Ms Chirangwanda.

40. Ms Etemadi invited the panel to conclude that Ms Chirangwanda's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of public protection and public interest.

41. Ms Chirangwanda stated in her formal response to the regulatory concern dated 9 February 2021:

*"I do accept that I did something wrong and as someone who is still learning how things work in England, this will be a huge lesson for me. The other problem is that the social work profession is poorly regulated in Zimbabwe. Had it [not] been poorly regulated I would have known what is right and what is wrong in this regard. It was not my intention to taint the profession and I admit that this is a mistake that I made and I will take it as a lesson going forward.*

*I exited and deleted the WhatsApp Group after receiving this concern and ever since then have started writing assessments (the ones I have applied for since I received this concern) out of my own knowledge and experience and not from what I was taught in coaching sessions. ... I also take this as a learning curve for me and this will help me in preserving the integrity of the social work profession and also acknowledging the centrality of the social work ethics, values and principles in England and the rest of the UK. "*

42. Ms Chirangwanda stated in her written observations dated 26 April 2021 that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired as she has accepted her wrongdoing *"which is a key ingredient for creating room for change and for correction. I would like to believe that I have since changed and I will, in any endeavour that I partake, make strenuous efforts to be of sound character and to exude professionalism within and outside any workplace and anywhere."*

43. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

44. In determining current impairment, the panel had regard to the following aspects of the public interest:

- The extent to which Ms Chirangwanda has the skills, knowledge, and character to practise their profession safely and effectively without restriction; and

- The wider public interest which includes the need to promote and maintain public confidence in social workers in England and the need promote and maintain proper professional standards for these social workers.

#### Decision on Impairment

45. The panel considered Ms Chirangwanda's current fitness to practise firstly from the perspective of her ability to work safely and effectively as a social worker and then from the perspective of the wider public interest.
46. Ms Chirangwanda undermined her professional standing and the social work profession as a whole by dishonestly presenting a written assessment as her own work during the Council's recruitment procedure. Ms Chirangwanda's course of conduct significantly breached the high standards expected of registered social workers.
47. The panel recognised that demonstrating remediation, following a finding of dishonesty, can be difficult as it is an attitudinal failing which can only be inferred from conduct. It is particularly difficult when a social worker does not attend the hearing in person or submit written submissions. The panel noted that Ms Chirangwanda in her formal response to the regulatory concern expressed remorse and regret. She also acknowledged her wrongdoing and stated that she now submits her work when completing written assessments. However, the panel concluded that Ms Chirangwanda has demonstrated only limited insight and no real understanding of the purpose of an assessment process. The panel was not satisfied that Ms Chirangwanda's written responses in 2021 provide sufficient evidence that she fully appreciates the nature and gravity of her admitted dishonesty. Nor is there any evidence before the panel that she fully appreciates the risk to service users, the impact of her behaviour on her prospective employer, the impact on her professional standing as a registered social worker and the effect on the wider profession as a whole. There has been no explanation as to how Ms Chirangwanda would behave in the future beyond the assertion that she now completes her own assessments and no assurance that she has taken appropriate steps to reduce the risk of repetition. In the absence of complete and meaningful insight and the steps taken towards remediation, the panel concluded that there is a real risk of repetition.
48. The panel took the view that the factual findings and the finding of misconduct raise serious public safety concerns. Ms Chirangwanda put her own personal interests above the interests of vulnerable service users, her prospective employer, and her professional obligations. Although there was no actual harm, her actions had the potential to cause serious harm to service users as she attempted to deprive the Council of the ability to properly assess her suitability for the role for which she had

applied. Ms Chirangwanda has demonstrated only limited insight and in the absence of any evidence of remediation the panel took the view that there is a current and ongoing risk of harm to service users. The panel assessed the risk as high given Ms Chirangwanda's dismissive attitude towards her professional obligations.

49. The panel did not accept that Ms Chirangwanda's assertion that her dishonest actions can be explained by reference to the poor regulation of social work in Zimbabwe. Ms Chirangwanda is registered with Social Work England. In applying for registration and being admitted to the register Ms Chirangwanda agreed to be bound by the high expectations of conduct and behaviour as set out in the Standards. Ms Chirangwanda failed to adhere to these Standards in order to further her own interests. Furthermore, the panel took the view that honesty and integrity are fundamental qualities; Ms Chirangwanda did not need to be advised or trained by a regulatory body to know that submitting the written assessment of someone else and attempting to pass it off as her own work is wrong.
50. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that Ms Chirangwanda's ability to practise safely and effectively is currently impaired.
51. In considering the wider public interest the panel had regard to the need to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession and to promote and maintain proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
52. The panel was mindful of the duty to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and maintain public trust and confidence in the profession. Ms Chirangwanda's conduct and behaviour had the potential to put service users at risk of harm, breached fundamental tenets of the profession which include honesty and trustworthiness and, in so doing, brought the profession into disrepute. The panel concluded that a finding of impairment is required to publicly declare that it is wholly unacceptable for a registered social worker to plagiarise the work of someone else in an attempt to secure employment.
53. The panel also concluded that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would be extremely concerned by Ms Chirangwanda's misconduct. The panel took the view that public trust and confidence in the profession and in Social Work England would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment of fitness to practise was not made, given the nature and seriousness of Ms Chirangwanda's conduct and behaviour.
54. Therefore, the panel concluded that Ms Chirangwanda's current fitness to practise is also impaired based on the wider public interest.

## Decision and reasons on sanction:

### The Panel's Approach

55. The panel considered the submissions made by Ms Etemadi, on behalf of Social Work England. She outlined the relevant paragraphs of the Sanctions Guidance and invited the panel to impose a Removal Order. She submitted that none of the other available sanctions would be appropriate either because they would not restrict Ms Chirangwanda's practice or because they would not adequately protect the public and the wider public interest.
56. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser and took into account the Sanctions Guidance (SG) published by Social Work England.
57. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Chirangwanda, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and promoting and maintaining proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
58. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Ms Chirangwanda's interests with the public interest and by considering each available sanction in ascending order of severity.

### Decision on Sanction

59. The panel, at the outset of its deliberations, considered the aggravating and mitigating factors.
60. The panel identified the following aggravating factors:
- Ms Chirangwanda intended to establish a career as a social worker in England and from the very outset was willing to achieve this through a dishonest means; this indicates a significant attitudinal failing.
  - Ms Chirangwanda, in her responses to the regulatory concern, sought to minimise the nature and gravity of her dishonesty. The panel noted that Ms Chirangwanda accepted that the witness statement of Ms A "*was true*" but this statement conflicts with her own account of how she came into possession of the written assessment. Ms Chirangwanda has not provided any explanation for the discrepancy. The panel concluded that the original explanation provided by Ms Chirangwanda is an attempt to limit her culpability.

61. The panel was unable to identify any mitigating factors. The panel noted that during the interview with Ms VJ, Ms Chirangwanda admitted that she had plagiarised Ms A's written assessment. Ms Chirangwanda also made full admissions in her formal response to the regulatory concern. However, the panel noted that the evidence against Ms Chirangwanda was overwhelming and therefore she could be given no credit for having to accept the inevitable consequences of her actions.

#### No Further Action

62. The panel first considered taking no further action. The panel concluded that, in view of the nature and seriousness of Ms Chirangwanda's misconduct which has not been remedied, and in the absence of exceptional circumstances, it would be inappropriate to take no action on her registration. Furthermore, it would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession.

#### Advice or Warning

63. The panel then considered whether to issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that neither of these sanctions would restrict Ms Chirangwanda's ability to practise and is therefore not appropriate where, as in this case, there is a current risk to public safety. The social worker's conduct had the potential to cause significant harm to vulnerable children, their families, and her prospective employer. The risk is ongoing as there is no evidence that it has been reduced during the intervening period. As a consequence, some form of restriction on Ms Chirangwanda's practise is required. Therefore, the panel concluded that issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and insufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest.

#### Conditions of Practice Order

64. The panel went on to consider a Conditions of Practice Order. The panel noted that it would be unusual to address a finding of dishonesty by imposing a Conditions of Practice Order as such conduct is based on an attitudinal failing.

65. Ms Chirangwanda made a conscious decision to plagiarise the work of Ms A to further her own interests. The panel took the view that it would not be possible to formulate measurable and workable conditions to address this type of attitudinal failing. Furthermore, although in theory Ms Chirangwanda's dishonesty is capable of being remedied, such remediation requires not only an acknowledgment of fault, but also deep and meaningful reflection which demonstrates a commitment to ensuring that the dishonesty and underlying conduct will not be repeated. There was insufficient evidence before the panel that Ms Chirangwanda is willing or able to take active steps

to remediate her misconduct. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that conditions would not be appropriate, proportionate, or workable.

### Suspension Order

66. The panel, having determined that a Conditions of Practice Order would not be appropriate went on to consider whether to impose a Suspension Order.

67. The panel noted that a Suspension Order would reaffirm to Ms Chirangwanda, the profession, and the public the standards expected of a registered social worker. It would also prevent the social worker from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore provide temporary protection to the public and address the wider public interest. As stated in paragraph 47 above, dishonesty is inherently difficult to remediate, particularly where, as in this case, the social worker has not adequately demonstrated any willingness or ability to remediate their conduct. Ms Chirangwanda's misconduct involved a breach of her prospective employer's trust and a reckless disregard for the interests of vulnerable service users. Furthermore, the panel took the view that the public would consider Ms Chirangwanda's dishonesty as a betrayal of the trust and confidence afforded to registered social workers which would need to be marked by the most severe sanction.

68. The panel concluded that Ms Chirangwanda's persistent lack of insight and her disregard of the high standards of honesty and integrity expected of her at all times are fundamentally incompatible with continued registration. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that any sanction short of a Removal Order would fail to promote and maintain proper standards of conduct and would fail to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as the regulator. Ms Chirangwanda has not provided the panel with any basis for imposing a more lenient sanction.

### Removal Order

69. The panel noted that a Removal Order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest.

70. The panel determined that a Removal Order should be imposed. In reaching this conclusion the panel took into account paragraphs 97 of the SG which states:

*"A removal order must be made where the adjudicators conclude that no other outcome would be enough to protect the public, maintain confidence in the*

*profession or maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.”*

71. Ms Chirangwanda has not practised as a social worker in the UK and now has a finding of dishonesty recorded against her. The panel noted that Ms Chirangwanda confirmed on 26 April 2021, in her formal response to the regulatory concern, that she admitted the allegation in its entirety. However, during the intervening period, Ms Chirangwanda has made insufficient efforts to address her dishonesty and no testimonial evidence has been provided to indicate that her behaviour was an isolated incident. In these circumstances, the panel took the view that there was no realistic prospect that Ms Chirangwanda would be able demonstrate that she can work safely and effectively as a social worker in England. Therefore, the panel concluded that no sanction lower than a Removal Order would be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest.
72. Accordingly, the panel determined that a Removal Order is the appropriate, necessary, and proportionate sanction in this case.

### Interim Order

73. Ms Etemadi made an application for an 18 month interim Suspension Order to cover the 28 day appeal period and, if necessary, any appeal.
74. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that the bar for imposing an interim Suspension Order is set high. It must be necessary for the protection of members of the public, be otherwise in the public interest or the interests of the social worker.
75. The panel determined that an interim order is necessary for the protection of the public because of the nature and seriousness of the findings that have been made against Ms Chirangwanda. Members of the public would be extremely concerned if she was able to continue to practise during the appeal period, in circumstances where her actions had the potential to expose service users to the risk of harm. Furthermore, it would be perverse and inconsistent with the panel’s determination that there is an ongoing risk of repetition which justifies removal from the Register. The panel concluded that Conditions of Practice would be inappropriate and unworkable for the same reasons that conditions were not imposed as a substantive order. Therefore, the Panel determined that an Interim Suspension Order should be imposed on Ms Chirangwanda’s registration.

### Right of Appeal

76. Under paragraph 16 (1) (a) of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, the Social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:

- (i) to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
  - (ii) not to revoke or vary such an order,
  - (iii) to make a final order.
77. Under paragraph 16 (2) schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018 an appeal must be made within 28 days of the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
78. Under regulation 9(4), part 3 (Registration of social workers) of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, this order can only be recorded on the register 28 days after the Social Worker was informed of the decision or, if the social worker appeals within 28 days, when that appeal is exhausted.
79. This notice is served in accordance with rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019.

## Review of final orders

80. Under paragraph 15 (2) and 15 (3) of schedule 2, part 4 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018:
- 15 (2) – The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
  - 15 (3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under regulation 25(5), and a final order does not have effect until after the expiry of that period.
81. Under rule 16 (aa) of Social Work England’s fitness to practise rules, a registered social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.