



Social Worker: Jacqueline Mona Jackman

Registration Number: SW55541

Fitness to Practise: Removal Order

Meeting Venue: Remote hearing

Date of meeting: 01 June 2022

Final Order being reviewed:
Suspension Order– (expiring 14 July 2022)

Hearing Outcome:
Removal Order (to take effect upon expiry of current suspension order on 14 July 2022)

Introduction and attendees

1. This is the first review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 15 months by a panel of adjudicators on 18 March 2021.
2. Ms Jackman did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Capsticks LLP and their written submissions are set out within the notice of hearing letter.

Adjudicators	Role
Jacqueline Nicholson	Chair
Suzanna Jacoby	Social Work Adjudicator

Hearings Team/Legal Adviser	Role
Shane Jeetoo	Hearings Officer
Paul Harris	Hearings Support Officer
Helen Gower	Legal Adviser

Service of Notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter the panel) had careful regard to the documents contained in the substantive order review hearing service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of substantive order review hearing dated 23 May 2022 and addressed to Ms Jackman at her e-mail address as it appears on the Social Work England Register;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register detailing Ms Jackman's registered address;
 - A copy of a signed Statement of Service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 23 May 2022 the writer sent the Notice of Hearing and related documents to Ms Jackman by e-mail at the address referred to above.
5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.

6. Having had regard to all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Jackman in accordance with Rule 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2019 (“the Rules”).

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

7. The notice of final order review hearing informed the social worker that in line with the current government guidance concerning the COVID-19 virus (Coronavirus) pandemic, the review would take place electronically. The notice stated:

“If you wish to attend the electronic hearing, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on 30 May 2022. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you will not be attending the electronic hearing and the adjudicators may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If the adjudicators do hold a meeting, they will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England’s submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide.”

8. The panel received no information to suggest that the social worker had responded to the notice of final order review hearing.
9. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Rules which provides:

“Where the registered social worker does not state within the period specified by the regulator whether they intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may determine whether to make an order by means of a meeting.”

10. The panel also accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering this application. This included reference to the cases of *R v Jones [2003] UKPC*; *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162 etc*; and Rule 43 of the Rules.
11. The panel noted that Ms Jackman has not responded to correspondence from Social Work England since the imposition of the substantive suspension order and that there is a pattern of non-engagement. The panel decided that she has waived her right to attend the hearing and that it was very unlikely that she would attend a hearing if the panel were to decide to adjourn. The panel noted that the suspension order is due to expire on 14 July 2022 and considered that it was in the public interest that the review should be concluded expeditiously. The panel decided that the potential disadvantage to Ms Jackman in her non-attendance was outweighed by the public interest. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in Ms Jackman’s absence and in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c).

Review of the current order:

12. This final order review hearing falls under the Transitional and Savings Provisions (Social Workers) Regulations 2019 and as a result the review will be determined in accordance with Part 5 of the Regulations, Schedule 2 paragraph 15 of the Regulations and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 14 July 2022.

The allegations found proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

During your employment as a Social Worker at Coventry City Council ("CCC"), you:

- 1. Did not recognise that a safeguarding referral had been made in respect of SU:2;*
- 2. Did not take appropriate action under the Safeguarding Adult policy in relation to SU:2, in that you:*
 - a. Did not identify self-neglect and / or complete a needs assessment in around October 2016;*
 - b. Did not adequately assess SU:2's mental capacity in around October 2016;*
 - c. Not proved;*
 - d. Did not take and/or record any action in relation to SU:2's case between around 29 October 2016 and 2 March 2017. [L] [SEP]*
- 3. Did not adequately complete and / or make any record of assessments in relation to the following Service Users:*
 - a. SU:1 (no assessment between 17 November 2015 and May 2017;*
 - b. SU:3 (no assessment between 6 February 2017 and March 2017);*
 - c. Not proved;*
 - d. SU:10 (assessment started in June 2015 but not completed);*

- e. *SU:32 (no assessment in December 2016).*
- 4. *Did not adequately complete and / or record a carers assessment in relation to the following service users: [REDACTED]*
 - a. *SU:23;*
 - b. *SU:29.*
- 5. *Did not adequately complete support plans for the following service users:*
 - a. *Not proved;*
 - b. *SU:13 (in around February 2017).*
- 6. *Did not adequately complete and / or make a record of reviews for the following service users*
 - a. *SU:6 (in around March 2016);*
 - b. *SU:11 (in around October 2016);*
 - c. *SU:12 (in around January 2017;*
- 7. *Did not make any or any adequate record of the following visits to SU:2 on Care Director:*
 - a. *Visit conducted on 21 October 2016;*
 - b. *.....;*
 - c. *Visit conducted on 10 November 2016.*
- 8. *Recorded multiple instances of contact under one activity on Care Director (contrary to record keeping guidance), in relation to the following Service Users:*
 - a. *SU:5;*
 - b. *SU:8;*

- c.;
 - d. SU:24;
 - e. SU:30
9. *Did not take and/ or record appropriate action on the following Service User's cases:*
- a. SU:26 (between 7 June 2016 and March 2017);
 - b. SU:28 (between February 2015 and March 2017).
10. *Did not adequately complete safeguarding in relation to the following Service Users:*
- a.;
 - b. SU:25 (in around November 2016).
11. *In relation to SU:24, failed to act upon safeguarding concerns in that you did not alert or communicate with your line manager on receipt of the referral and / or make any or any adequate record of any action taken.*

The panel found that the following charges amounted to misconduct: 1; 2a,b, and d; 3a, b, d and e; 4b; 5b; 6a, b and c; 7a and c; 9a and b; 10b; and 11. The panel found that the following charges amounted to lack of competence 4a; 8a, b, d and e.

The final hearing panel on 18 March 2021 determined the following with regard to impairment:

The panel considered whether the failings were remediable and, if so, whether they had been remediated by Ms Jackman.

The panel found that the failings were remediable as Ms Jackman could have accessed various training, refreshed her understanding of requisite guidance and policy documentation or taken employment within non-registered roles in which she would have been able to develop her competence. However, the panel did not have any evidence that Ms Jackman had undertaken those activities or had otherwise remediated her wrongdoing.

She had been provided with refresher training by the Council but there was no evidence that she had implemented the lessons learnt and continued to dis-apply guidance and policy documentation that was available to her. Save for her self-referral, Ms Jackman had failed to engage with the regulatory proceedings. She had not acknowledged wrongdoing or expressed remorse, which indicated a concerning belligerence and therefore an ongoing attitudinal problem. She had not demonstrated any effort to proactively improve her practice by way of self-reflection or further training or learning.

The panel considered whether Ms Jackman had demonstrated insight.

The panel noted that Ms Jackman was being supervised, prior to the investigation by Mr SM, and that supervision notes had been adduced during the proceedings. The panel considered it significant that, within those supervision notes, Ms Jackman was not recorded as having acknowledged failings in her practice nor is it recorded that she demonstrated proactivity in improving her practice. Instead, the notes recorded that she sought to excuse her failings by reference to her workload. The panel would have expected that, as an autonomous professional with significant experience of social work, Ms Jackman would have been able to reflect upon her failings and take positive action to improve her practice in advance of being subjected to an audit and investigation.

Not only did Ms Jackman fail to demonstrate any insight into her failings during supervision meetings, but she denied the allegation of wrongdoing during the subsequent investigation by Mr SM. Instead of accepting wrongdoing, she pursued an unmeritorious grievance that he had not been impartial during the process. Through the investigation, Ms Jackman asserted that any failings in her practice were on account of her large caseload yet, as outlined at paragraphs 44 to 48, above, the panel accepted the evidence from Mr SM, Ms HR and Ms Brittain that Ms Jackman's workload was no greater than others within the team.

Ms Jackman also asserted that she did not have sufficient management support. As outlined at paragraph 49, above, the panel did not accept that this was a reasonable explanation for her failure to undertake basic social work duties. The panel also accepted and adopted Mr SM's conclusions:

"I cannot comment on [her] oversight overall as this would be difficult to do, however I believe there were other mitigating circumstances such as lack of challenges to her practice by management. Errors in her work had been obvious for years and should have been acted on before it got to the stage that it did. [Ms Jackman's] managers should have known about such concerns and should have placed [her] on an improvement plan. However, [Ms Jackman's] comment that she felt she had a lack of supervision I cannot agree with as although there may have been gaps in her supervision, as a grade seven social worker she should have been able to work with limited supervision. In regards to [her] complaint

about IT problems she had access to IT supervision as much as anyone and had 1:1 sessions with Sue Billings for this.” ^[L7]_[SEP]

Further, the panel found that Mr SM’s assertion below was the only proper conclusion in light of Ms Jackman’s explanations during the investigatory process:

“I am unsure if [Ms Jackman] recognized that her style of working was not keeping with standards expected from Council employees”

Whilst Ms Jackman self-referred to her professional regulator, she did not acknowledge or accept her failings within that referral and she failed to hitherto engage with the regulatory process.

The panel concluded that Ms Jackman had therefore consistently failed to demonstrate any insight into the failings in her social work practice, despite the significant passage of time.

Given the absence of insight and remediation, the panel concluded that there was a high risk of repetition of wrongdoing if Ms Jackman was permitted to practice without restriction.

The panel considered the overriding objective in light of the findings of fact and the findings that Ms Jackman had failed to demonstrate remediation or insight.

As outlined above, Ms Jackman’s failings spanned a prolonged period of time and were wide-ranging and concerned a large proportion of her caseload. The potential consequences of those failings were potentially devastating. She had failed to demonstrate remediation or insight. The panel found that there was a significant risk of repetition if Ms Jackman was permitted to practice in social work without restrictions. As such, the panel concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practice arising from her misconduct and lack of competence was necessary and appropriate in order to protect the health, safety and well-being of service users.

The panel found that Ms Jackman’s actions brought the social work profession in disrepute. As outlined at paragraph 54, above, service users allocated to Ms Jackman would be reasonable in feeling that they were not being supported by the profession. Further, Ms Jackman’s failings in relation to SU2 resulted in intervention from ‘St Basil’s’ and a Local Councillor and her failings in relation to SU11 resulted in SU11’s mother requesting an alternative social worker.

The panel was satisfied that well-informed and reasonable members of the public and the social work profession would consider Ms Jackman’s failings to be deplorable and would be appalled if her fitness to practice was not found to be impaired, particularly in light of absence of evidence of remediation and insight. The panel therefore concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practice arising from her misconduct and lack of competence was

necessary and appropriate to maintain public confidence in the social work profession and proper professional standards.

The panel therefore concluded that Ms Jackman's fitness to practice was currently impaired.

The final hearing panel on 18 March 2021 determined the following with regard to sanction:

The panel reminded itself that it had concluded that Ms Jackman posed a current risk of harm to the public, and that her fitness to practise was impaired to satisfy the wider public interest, namely to promote and maintain public confidence and proper professional standards.

In relation to mitigating factors, the panel noted that Ms Jackman had dedicated her professional life to the social work profession and that there had been no indication of previous regulatory breaches. Whilst there had been changes in her management and supervision during the material period, which would have been foreseeably unsettling for Ms Jackman, the panel did not consider that this provided any explanation for her failings as a social worker. She had self-referred to her professional regulator, although that was undermined by her failure to acknowledge her wrongdoing or accept any responsibility with relation to the referral.

The panel was unable to identify further mitigating features in light of Ms Jackman's lack of admissions, lack of meaningful engagement with the regulatory proceedings and lack of demonstrated insight and remediation.

The panel found that Ms Jackman's wrongdoing was aggravated by the fact that it involved wide-ranging failures in relation to core social work responsibilities which concerned a large number of service users during an extended period of time. Ms Jackman had demonstrated no remediation, insight or remorse. Her actions placed service users at risk and brought the social work profession into disrepute, as outlined within the determination on impairment.

Whilst no harm to service users had been evidenced as a result of Ms Jackman's failings, the panel considered paragraph 27 of the Sanctions Guidance to be particularly pertinent:

"Risk of harm can be as important as actual harm caused. This is because continuing to act in a way that risks public safety could cause actual harm in the future, whether or not it has in the past...."

The panel found that taking no action, issuing advice or issuing a warning would not adequately reflect the serious nature of Ms Jackman's wide-ranging and significant

failings. Such an outcome would undermine public confidence in social workers in England and

would not maintain proper professional standards, particularly in light of Ms Jackman's lack of demonstrated insight, remediation and remorse. Ms Jackman had failed to take personal responsibility for her failings and the panel assessed the risk of repetition as high.

When considering whether to impose an order of conditions of practice, the panel had particular regard to paragraph 85 of the Sanctions Guidance, which provides:

"Conditions may be appropriate where public protection can be delivered by some restriction of practice, but it is not necessary for either public protection or wider public confidence grounds to suspend the social worker's registration. When considering public protection, decision makers must fully assess insight and any attitudinal behaviours to determine whether or not the social worker is capable of complying with conditions." ^[17]
_{ISEP}

The panel found that workable conditions of practice could not be formulated as they would require engagement and commitment from Ms Jackman. Her lack of insight and engagement in the proceedings indicated that she would not comply with conditions if they were imposed. That conclusion was supported by the fact that her practice did not improve despite regular supervision and advice whilst working for the Council and the fact that her serious misconduct involved wilfully failing to undertake various fundamental social work duties. As such, the panel concluded that conditions of practice would not adequately protect the public.

Further, the panel concluded that the imposition of conditions, which would allow Ms Jackman to return to social work, would not maintain public confidence in the profession or maintain proper professional standards in light of the significant failings in her practice, the potential consequences of those failings and the lack of engagement by Ms Jackman in the regulatory proceedings.

The panel then considered whether a suspension order would be proportionate and appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel had particular regard to paragraph 92 of the Sanctions Guidance, which states:

"Suspension orders can be imposed for a period of up to three years. Suspension is appropriate where no workable conditions can be formulated that can protect the public or the wider public interest, but where the case falls short of requiring removal from the register or where removal is not an option." ^[17]
_{ISEP}

During the operation of a suspension order Ms Jackman would not be permitted to engage as a social worker. As such, the panel was satisfied that such an order would protect the public.

The panel also determined that a suspension order would not undermine public confidence or professional standards. Whilst the public would be appalled at Ms Jackman's failings and lack of engagement in the regulatory proceedings, reasonable and well-informed members of the public would not demand removal of a social worker with over 25 years' post qualification experience, without giving her an opportunity to adequately address her failings. The panel found that suspension would give Ms Jackman a further, potentially final, opportunity to develop and demonstrate insight and remediation. The suspension order would be subject to a review and as such the public could be confident that Ms Jackman would not be returned to practice until and unless she was to demonstrate adequate insight and remediation and a reduced risk of repetition of her wrongdoing.

In considering the length of suspension, the panel was cognisant of the considerations outlined within the Sanctions Guidance, particularly at paragraphs 93:

"In deciding on the period of suspension, decision makers should consider the need to protect the public and the wider public interest. They should balance this against the risk that prolonged suspension may result in deskilling. Where possible, it is in the public interest to support the return to practise of a trained and skilled social worker if this can be achieved safely. This means the risk of deskilling is a public interest consideration."

The panel balanced, on the one hand, the need to ensure that Ms Jackman does not become deskilled and, on the other hand, that she had already had sufficient time to develop and demonstrate insight and remediation, but had failed to do so despite supervision, investigation and the regulatory proceedings. The panel also took into account that before being permitted to return to practice, Ms Jackman would be required to develop insight and remediation in relation to wide-ranging failings.

Having balanced the factors outlined above, and upon considering all of the circumstances of the case, the panel determined that 12 months would not be a sufficient period for Ms Jackman to develop and demonstrate adequate insight and remediation and that a period of 15 months was instead proportionate and appropriate. The panel was satisfied, for all of the reasons outlined above, that this was a sufficient period of time to protect the public and to maintain public confidence and proper professional standards.

The panel had regard to paragraph 97 of the Sanctions Guidance, which provides:

*“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. A decision to impose a removal order should explain why lesser sanctions are insufficient to meet these objectives.” [L]
[SEP]*

Given the panel’s conclusion that a suspension order would be sufficient to protect the public and wider public interest, the panel found that a removal order was neither necessary nor proportionate.

The suspension order will be subject to review before expiry, during which a separate panel of adjudicators will consider whether Ms Jackman’s fitness to practice remains impaired and, if so, what, if any, sanction should be imposed. If Ms Jackman fails to demonstrate adequate insight and remediation into her failings there is every possibility that she will be removed from the social work register. She will only be permitted to practice, under restrictions or otherwise, if she demonstrates adequate insight and remediation and if the review panel is satisfied that there no longer remains a real risk of repetition of her wrongdoing and failings.

Any future review panel is likely to be assisted by Ms Jackman providing the following documentation in advance of the review:

- i. A full and detailed reflective statement addressing the failings that have given rise to the finding of impairment and details of how she has sought to remedy her shortcomings;*
- ii. If Ms Jackman undertakes un-registered employment or other relevant activity during the period of suspension, references and testimonials from people with whom she has contact; and*
- iii. Evidence that she has kept her skills and knowledge up to date.*

Social Work England submissions:

13. The submissions on behalf of Social Work England were contained in the Notice of Hearing letter:

“Subject to any engagement by the Social Worker prior to or at the review hearing, Social Work England invite the Panel to find that the Social Worker’s fitness to practise remains impaired. The Social Worker did not engage with the regulatory process and the panel making

the suspension order recommended that the Social Worker would not be returned to practice until and unless she was able to demonstrate adequate insight and remediation and a reduced risk of repetition of her wrongdoing. They also recommended that the Social Worker submits:

- (i) A detailed reflective statement addressing the failings that have given rise to the finding of impairment and details of how she has sought to remedy her shortcomings;*
- (ii) If the Social Worker undertakes un-registered employment or other relevant activity during the period of suspension, references and testimonials from people with whom she has contact; and*
- (iii) Evidence that they have kept their skills and knowledge up to date.*

The Social Worker was sent correspondence on 19 April 2021, 15 November 2021 and 14 March 2022 reminding them of the suspension term and the panel's recommendations regarding evidence the Social Worker may wish to submit demonstrating insight and remediation. To date the Social Worker has not engaged with the regulatory proceedings and has not responded to Social Work England. The Social Worker has not submitted a reflective statement, references/testimonials nor any evidence that their skills and knowledge have been kept up to date as recommended by the panel. Therefore there continues to be a lack of engagement with the regulatory process and there is no new information and no evidence of insight or remediation for the panel to consider.

In the light of the current position Social Work England submit that there has been no change in circumstances since the order was first imposed. Absent any engagement from the Social Worker, Social Work England submit that the Social Worker's fitness to practise remains impaired and invite the Panel to consider a removal order.

Following the final substantive hearing the Adjudicators put the Social Worker on notice that a future Panel may consider removal if evidence of insight and remediation of the concerns was not forthcoming. There has been no engagement with the Case Review Team since the final order was imposed and no indication that the Social Worker will engage in the future. Social Work England submit that there is no benefit in a further period of suspension in this case as there has been total disengagement. The matters are sufficiently serious, absent any evidence of insight or remediation, that removal is now an appropriate and proportionate sanction.

Social Worker submissions:

14. There were no submissions by or on behalf of Ms Jackman.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

15. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision

of the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment.

16. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel. The only other documentation was correspondence from Social Work England to Ms Jackman informing her of the panel's decision and reminding her of her opportunities to provide information or documents for this review.
17. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession.
18. The panel first considered whether Ms Jackman's fitness to practise remains impaired.
19. The panel noted the original panel's conclusion that the misconduct and lack of competence is remediable. It was disappointed that Ms Jackman has not engaged at all with Social Work England or with this review, particularly in the light of Ms Jackman's twenty-five years post qualification experience. The panel noted that there was no evidence that Ms Jackman has taken remedial steps or that her level of insight has developed. The panel concluded that there had been no change in the circumstances since the decision of the final hearing panel.
20. The findings made by the final hearing panel are serious and wide-ranging, extended over a period of time, and involved nineteen different service users. The failures related to tasks which form part of core social worker responsibilities. A repetition of such conduct would involve a risk to members of the public, including vulnerable service users.
21. Ms Jackman has not demonstrated that the concerns raised in the finding of impairment made by the previous panel have been addressed and the panel concluded that her fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

22. Having found Ms Jackman's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to Social Work England's written submissions and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel also took into account the Sanctions Guidance published by Social Work England.
23. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Jackman, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Ms Jackman's interests with the public interest and by considering each available sanction in ascending order of severity.

No Action

24. The panel concluded that, in view of the nature and seriousness of Ms Jackman's impairment which has not been remedied, it would be inappropriate to take no action. Furthermore, it would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession.

Advice or Warning

25. The panel then considered whether to issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that neither of these sanctions would restrict Ms Jackman's ability to practise and is therefore not appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety. In any event, the deficiencies in Ms Jackman's practice had the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences and therefore some restriction on her practice is required. Therefore, the panel concluded that issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

Conditions of Practice Order

26. The panel went on to consider a conditions of practice Order. The panel decided that conditions of practice were inappropriate and would be insufficient to meet the public interest in circumstances where Ms Jackman is not engaging with Social Work England and the panel can have no confidence that she would comply with conditions. The panel also considered that the findings of the original panel were so serious and wide-ranging that conditions that would be sufficient to protect the public would amount to a suspension order. The panel concluded that a Conditions of Practice Order would be insufficient to protect the public and to uphold the reputation of the profession.

Suspension Order

27. The panel considered the option of extending the current suspension order. The panel decided that this would serve no purpose. There was no indication from Ms Jackman that she is willing or intends to engage with the process. The final hearing panel gave guidance to Ms Jackman on the evidence which she might provide to this panel, but she has not done so nor has she explained why she is not able to engage with her regulator.
28. The option of extending the current order is open to the panel and this would protect the public against the risk of repetition, but the panel considered that it would not be sufficient to uphold and maintain public confidence in the profession. It is not in the public interest or Ms Jackman's interests for the regulatory process to be further extended unless there is a realistic prospect that Ms Jackman will engage. Ms Jackman has had a lengthy period of nearly fifteen months in which the pattern of her non-engagement has continued, and the panel

decided that was no realistic prospect that Ms Jackman will engage with the process and demonstrate to a review panel that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

29. The panel therefore decided that a suspension order was inappropriate and insufficient to protect the public.

Removal Order

30. 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. The panel took the view that in the circumstances of this case a removal order was the appropriate and proportionate order. The less restrictive option of a suspension order has not been effective in returning Ms Jackman to safe practice and there was nothing to indicate that she wishes to engage in the regulatory process. A removal order upholds and maintains public confidence in the profession and the regulatory process.

Right of Appeal

31. Under paragraph 16 (1) (b) of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, the Social Worker may appeal to the High Court against:
- a. 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,
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
32. Under regulation 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.
33. 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.
34. This notice is served in accordance with rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practise Rules 2019.

Review of final orders

35. Under regulation 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.

36. 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.