



Social worker: Hope Wilson

Registration number: SW86240

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review meeting

Date of hearing: 09 November 2023

Hearing venue: Remote meeting

Final order being reviewed:

Suspension order – (expiring 23 December 2023)

Hearing Outcome: Impose a new order namely removal order with effect from the expiry of the current order.

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a panel of adjudicators (appointed by Social Work England) on 27 May 2022.
2. Ms Wilson 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 dated 10 October 2023.
4. The adjudicators (hereinafter referred to as “the panel”) and other people present at the meeting are set out in the table below.

Adjudicators	Role
Frank Appleyard	Chair
Sarah (Sally) Scott	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Titlee Pandey	Hearings officer
Mollie Roe	Hearings support officer
Nedah Nourouzi	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 10 October 2023 addressed to Ms Wilson at their electronic mail address which she provided to Social Work England
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 10 October 2023 detailing Ms Wilson`s registered electronic mail address.
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 10 October 2023 the writer sent by electronic mail to Ms Wilson at the address referred to above; notice of hearing and related documents.
6. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.

7. Having had regard to Rule 16 and 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 Wilson in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules (as amended) ("the rules").

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting and in the absence of Ms Wilson:

8. The notice of final order review informed Ms Wilson that the review would take place as a meeting. The notice stated:

"If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on Tuesday, 24 October 2023. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators 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."

9. The panel received no information to suggest that Ms Wilson had responded to the notice of final order review. The panel was satisfied Ms Wilson understood that in their absence, the review could proceed as a meeting.
10. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering whether it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the review in the absence of Ms Wilson. This included reference to the case of *R v Jones [2003] UKPC; General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. The panel also took into account Social Work England's guidance 'Service of notice and proceeding in the absence of the social worker'. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) 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."

11. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c) and in the absence of Ms Wilson, on the basis that:

- Ms Wilson has had an opportunity to make submissions within the time periods specified under rule 16(b) of the rules.
- Ms Wilson has not requested a postponement or an adjournment. The panel did not consider that a postponement or adjournment would result in Ms Wilson's future attendance.
- Ms Wilson has not made any contact with Social Work England since the final hearing.

- It would not be in the public interest or in Ms Wilson's interests to adjourn the mandatory review of the final order.

Preliminary matters:

12. The panel noted at the outset of the final hearing, Ms Wilson had applied for any matters regarding her health to be heard in private. The substantive panel having taken legal advice and considered paragraph 38 of the Fitness to Practise Rules, decided that if such matters arose it would be fair and appropriate to hear those parts of the hearing relating to Ms Wilson's health in private.

Review of the current order:

13. 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 Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
14. The current order is due to expire at the end of 23 December 2023.

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

1. The allegations against Ms Wilson (the "Allegations") were as follows:

Whilst employed as Senior Social Worker in the Court Team at West Sussex County Council between 4 June 2018 to 20 May 2019, you failed to demonstrate the necessary level of knowledge, skill or judgment in the following areas:

1.1 Carrying out visits

1.2 Quality of written work

1.3 Recording work in a timely manner

1.4 Organisation and time management

1.5 Carrying out the agreed actions

2. *Your actions at regulatory concern 1 placed vulnerable children at risk of harm.*

The matters set out at paragraph 1 and 2 above amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.

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

The final hearing panel on 27 May 2022 determined the following with regard to impairment:

15. The final hearing panel on 27 May 2022 determined the following with regard to impairment:

120. The panel has found that Ms Wilson's deficiencies were serious and carried a risk of harm to service users. Her conduct resulted in a delay in a S47 Child Protection Conference; she failed to progress the plan of permanence to match service users to a long term, foster placement; she failed to progress a child permanence report which was not lodged in court in time which led to a court adjournment. Ms Wilson produced no reports in LAC reviews and she did not update care plans. Ms Wilson was asked to read the background of LT's case on 27 Feb 2019 in supervision but had not done so on 3 May 2019. Ms Wilson did not evidence that she completed statutory visits to children as required by their care plans. Given the low level of cases she had and the support provided, the panel found these were especially serious failings.

121. The panel has found that despite a low case load, a high level of support and supervision, a PIP and a Performance Review plan Ms Wilson still seriously failed in her role. Despite all of the support and direction given, Ms Wilson failed to respond, failed to improve her practice and could not give an explanation for her behaviour. She left the Council whilst on a PIP rather than complete it and try to improve her practice. The panel found that in doing Ms Wilson showed a lack of insight and recognition of the seriousness of her deficiencies and the importance of steps to remedy them.

122. Although the panel found that Ms Wilson's conduct is remediable, it found no evidence of any remediation by Ms Wilson. Some of the training she referred to in her submissions was learning on IT systems with other employers and was not directed at remedying her failings. The information from her subsequent employment with Wandsworth Council indicates a mixed picture with concerns about Ms Wilson's practice which included a support plan to manage her workload and meet deadlines, similar concerns to what has been found proved in this case. She has not worked in a social work role since December 2020.

123. Ms Wilson apologised, and she expressed regret. She submitted that she understood and took seriously her professional responsibilities and that this would not happen again. However, the panel found that she demonstrated very limited insight into the extent and seriousness of her failings. She did not meaningfully acknowledge or show developed insight into the impact of her misconduct on service users, colleagues or on the wider profession. Ms Wilson was not able to explain and did not appear to have any clear understanding of her conduct.

Significantly, she was unable to explain why these failures had occurred. She has since repeated some of her failings at her subsequent employer, Wandsworth Council.

124. Ms Wilson tended in her submissions to focus on IT issues and on record keeping and failed to acknowledge or address the other serious deficiencies found proved. The panel found that she demonstrated a lack of recognition of her inability to work to a satisfactory standard, even when well supported, and that she tended to deflect responsibility away from herself by criticising her supervision and management which the panel has found to have been of a high and consistent standard. Ms Wilson was unable to explain to the panel why she had worked in such a seriously disorganised and deficient way.

125. The panel was mindful of the guidance in Grant and the need to assess the risk of repetition, and with that in mind the panel considered the test in Grant expressed as follows:-

“Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor’s misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that s/he:

a. has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or

b. has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or

c. has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession”

126. Having considered all the circumstances, including remediation and insight, the panel concluded that all three limbs are engaged. The panel found that Ms Wilson has in the past and is likely in the future to act so as to put service users at unwarranted risk of harm; has in the past and is likely in the future to bring the profession into disrepute as a result of her misconduct; and that she has in the past and is likely in the future to breach fundamental tenets of the profession, namely fulfilling core social work duties and responsibilities.

127. The panel concluded, given the serious lack of insight and lack of evidence of remediation, that there was a high risk of repetition of the misconduct and that Ms Wilson’s fitness to practise is currently impaired.

128. The panel was also mindful of the wider public interest and of the guidance in Grant which states:- “...it is essential, when deciding whether fitness to practise is impaired, not to lose sight of the fundamental considerations emphasised at the outset ... namely the need to protect the public and the need to declare and uphold

proper standards of conduct and behaviour so as to maintain public confidence in the profession.”

129. Given the nature and gravity of the misconduct and the risk of harm to service users, the panel was satisfied that a reasonable member of the public would be most concerned were the misconduct found proved not to attract a finding of impairment of fitness to practise. Not to make a finding of impairment of fitness to practise in the circumstances of this case would fail to protect the public, would undermine public confidence in the profession and would fail to uphold proper professional standards.

130. The panel concluded that on the personal and public interest elements that Ms Wilson’s fitness to practise is currently impaired.”

The final hearing panel on 27 May 2022 determined the following with regard to sanction:

16. The final hearing panel on 27 May 2022 determined the following with regard to sanction:

"134. The legal adviser referred the panel to Social Work England’s Sanctions Guidance and reminded it that the purpose of sanction is not to punish. It must act proportionately and apply the least restrictive sanction that protects the public and the wider public interest. It should approach sanction starting from the lowest level and move upward applying the least restrictive sanction that is appropriate and proportionate. He reminded the panel to take account of any mitigating and aggravating factors and to balance the interests of Ms Wilson with the need to protect the public.

135. The panel found that the mitigating factors were:-

- Some health and personal issues*
- Full engagement throughout the process*

136. The panel found that the aggravating factors were:-

- Breaches of fundamental tenets of the profession*
- The risk of harm to service users*
- Repeated breaches of professional standards*
- The duration of the failures despite management support*
- The failure to access the help and support offered*
- Lack of insight and any remediation*

- *Ms Wilson was an experienced practitioner*

137. The panel first considered taking no further action. The findings are serious and placed service users at risk of harm. The conduct has not been remedied and the panel found there was a high risk of repetition. Taking proper account of the nature and gravity of these findings, the panel concluded that to take no further action would not protect the public and would undermine public confidence in the profession.

138. Next the panel considered issuing Advice or a Warning. Where there is a finding of a lack of insight and remediation and a high risk a repetition these would fail to deal proportionately with the seriousness of the panel's findings. The panel concluded that to issue Advice or a Warning would not sufficiently protect the public, would undermine public confidence and would fail to uphold proper professional standards.

139. The panel was mindful of its findings in respect of the impact of the high level of support and supervision provided to Ms Wilson by FO and the Council. Despite that good, consistent support, Ms Wilson did not respond and her practice failed to improve over a prolonged period. Despite a PIP and a Performance Review Plan, Ms Wilson failed to respond and to improve her practice at the Council.

140. Given the nature and gravity of the findings, and the circumstances in which the deficiencies occurred and were repeated, the panel found that it was not able to devise workable, realistic, proportionate and achievable conditions of practice that would be sufficient to protect the public. Any conditions that would be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest would require to be so restrictive that they would amount to a suspension.

141. The panel has found a serious lack of insight and no remediation. It has found that Ms Wilson has not demonstrated developed insight into the reasons for her sustained misconduct, nor properly acknowledged and recognised the seriousness and the impact of her conduct. The panel found she had placed vulnerable service users at risk of harm, and that she continued to do so despite a high level of support.

142. The panel considered the Sanctions Guidance and was mindful of paragraphs 92-94 and 96. It considered that in all the circumstances of this case that it was appropriate to impose a Suspension Order. This will serve to protect the public and will also mark the seriousness of the case. The panel took account of the guidance that, 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. In the circumstances of this case, the panel concluded that the lack of evidence of any remediation, the lack of insight and the identified risk of harm were such that a period of suspension of

more than one year was appropriate. It decided to impose a Suspension Order for a period of 18 months.

143. The panel decided that this period of Suspension was appropriate and proportionate given the seriousness its findings, and in order to uphold and declare proper professional standards and maintain public confidence in the profession.

144. The panel decided that a Removal Order would not be proportionate in this case as the lesser sanction of Suspension serves sufficiently to protect the public and the public interest. This was not a case where nothing less than Removal Order was appropriate.

145. The panel considered that a future reviewing panel may be assisted by Ms Wilson providing the following:-

- A written reflective piece on the cause of her failures, and the impact of her misconduct on service users, colleagues and the profession*
- Any relevant references and testimonials from employers, whether paid or unpaid*
- Evidence of any relevant training and reflection on what she has learned from it.*

Social Work England submissions:

17. The panel received written submission from Social Work England set out in the notice of hearing letter dated 10 October 2023. The letter set out the following submissions:

‘Social Work England invites the Panel to seek a Removal Order with immediate effect.

Despite several reminders, the Social Worker has not engaged with Social Work England’s Case Review Team for the duration of the Order. She has taken none of the steps recommended by the Panel at the final hearing – i.e., has provided no written reflective piece, no relevant references, and no evidence of any relevant training.

Without any such engagement, the Social Worker has not demonstrated any insight since the Order was imposed, and it would be impossible for the Panel to make any assessment of remediation or reflection – as she has provided no evidence of either.

Social Work England submit that a Removal Order would now be proportionate in this case to sufficiently serve to protect the public, including the public interest. Since the final hearing, the Social Worker has not engaged at all and there is no benefit to holding a social worker on

the register who cannot or will not make any attempt to remediate. As this is the current position of the Social Worker (and has been since the Order began), a Removal Order is now deemed appropriate.'

Social worker submissions:

18. Ms Wilson did not attend the meeting, nor did she provide written submissions prior to the meeting for the panel's consideration.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

19. 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.
20. The panel also took into account Social Work England's '*Impairment and sanctions guidance*' dated 19 December 2022.
21. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser as to the proper approach it should adopt.
22. The panel reminded itself of the importance of a review hearing, and it followed the sequence of decision making set out by Blake J in *Abrahaem v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 183:
- i. Address whether the fitness to practise is impaired before considering conditions.
 - ii. Whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction.
 - iii. In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner to a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision, or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments.
23. The panel had regard to the over-arching objectives of protecting the public which involves the pursuit of the following objectives:
- To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public.
 - To promote and maintain public confidence in the profession.
 - To promote and maintain proper professional standards of conduct for members of the profession.
24. The panel also bore in mind that in deciding whether Ms Wilson's fitness to practise is still impaired it should follow the approach of Dame Janet Smith endorsed by the High Court in *CHRE v NMC and P Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin). Do our findings of fact in respect of the (registrant's) misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction,

caution, or determination show that his/her fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that s/he;

- Has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or
- has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the ... profession into disrepute; and/or
- has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or
- has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.

25. The panel first considered whether Ms Wilson's fitness to practise remains impaired. The panel kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment and asked itself whether Ms Wilson had demonstrated that she had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the previous panel.

26. The panel noted that the original panel found that Ms Wilson had limited insight and had demonstrated a lack of recognition of her inability to work to a satisfactory standard, even when well supported, and that she tended to deflect responsibility away from herself by criticising her supervision and management which the panel had found to have been of a high and consistent standard. Ms Wilson was unable to explain to the panel why she had worked in such a seriously disorganised and deficient way.

27. The panel considered the fact that Ms Wilson has not engaged with Social Work England since the substantive hearing and has taken no steps towards compliance with the recommendations of that panel. Whilst it is not mandatory for Ms Wilson to have demonstrated she had complied with the recommendations made, the panel considered that even with a suspension order in place, the recommendations if they had been complied with would have enabled and assisted Ms Wilson to provide relevant information for the review.

28. The panel has not been provided with any information from Ms Wilson in relation to her reflections on the findings of the original panel, no evidence of insight from her to say how she could have acted differently, and no evidence of remediation including how she has updated her skills and knowledge.

29. In the circumstances, the panel concluded that there is a significant ongoing risk of repetition of misconduct. The panel noted that the misconduct set out in the substantive hearing decision was serious in that Ms Wilson repeatedly failed in a wide range of core, fundamental social work responsibilities over a sustained period of time placing multiple, vulnerable service users at unnecessary risk of harm. The panel at the substantive hearing had found, Ms Wilson was a senior social worker whose conduct fell well below what would have been proper in the circumstances, despite the high level of support and supervision she was given, she failed to improve and continued to practise in an unsafe and highly inadequate manner.

30. The panel concluded that there has been no evidence of change that would reduce the risk of repletion since the substantive hearing, and that there is an ongoing risk of harm to members of the public.
31. Further, considering Ms Wilson's lack of evidence of insight and remediation, together with her lack of constructive engagement in this review hearing, the panel concluded that a failure to find Ms Wilson impaired would undermine public confidence in the profession and the regulator.

Decision and reasons:

32. Having found Ms Wilson's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case.
33. The panel considered the written submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a Removal order.
34. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
35. The panel bore in mind that sanction is a matter for its own independent judgement, and that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish Ms Wilson but to protect the public and the wider public interest.
36. The panel reminded itself that the protection of the public includes not only maintaining the health, safety, and well-being of the public but also maintaining public confidence in the profession and promoting and maintaining proper professional standards of conduct for member of the profession.
37. Furthermore, a sanction must be proportionate, so that any order that it makes should be the least restrictive order that would suffice to protect the public and the public interest.

Decision on whether to revoke order/make no further order

38. The panel noted the following paragraphs of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance:

"215. If a social worker remains not fit to practise, the adjudicators will make a decision on what order should be imposed.

216. A social worker must not be allowed to resume unrestricted practice unless the decision makers are satisfied their fitness to practise is no longer impaired."

39. The panel concluded that the serious misconduct demonstrated by Ms Wilson within her practice continues to have the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences for service users and therefore some restriction on her practise is required. The panel considered that, in view of Ms Wilson's impairment which has not been remedied, and in the absence of any evidence of insight or remediation (and apparent unwillingness to do so) it would not be appropriate to take no further action. Furthermore, such an outcome would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession, given the risk of repetition.

Decision on whether to issue advice or warning on expiry of suspension order

40. The panel then considered whether to issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that neither of these sanctions would restrict Ms Wilson's ability to practise and therefore such sanctions would not be appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety and public confidence in the profession. Therefore, the panel concluded that issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and would provide insufficient protection of the public.

Decision on whether to impose a conditions of practice order on expiry of suspension order

41. The panel went on to consider whether a conditions of practice order could be imposed. The panel concluded that given Ms Wilson's lack of engagement following the imposition of the suspension order a conditions of practice order would be insufficient to protect the public. For this reason, the panel concluded that it could not formulate workable conditions of practice in this case.

Decision on whether to extend the period of the suspension order

42. The panel acknowledged that the substantive hearing had found Ms Wilson's failings to be in five, basic and fundamental areas of social work practice. The panel had found as a senior social worker with substantial experience, Ms Wilson knew what was required of her. Her failures, the panel found, amounted to misconduct rather than lack of competence.
43. The substantive panel had also found that Ms Wilson had demonstrated very limited insight into the extent and seriousness of her failings. She had apologised and expressed regret. She had also submitted that she understood and took seriously her professional responsibility and that this would not happen again. The substantive panel provided clear and reasonable recommendations as to how Ms Wilson could seek to demonstrate to this panel her developing insight and remediation. Despite this, Ms Wilson appears to have disengaged with the process of seeking to address her failings. The panel had no evidence to suggest Ms Wilson is willing and able to resolve or remediate her failings.
44. The panel considered that Ms Wilson has been given a full opportunity to demonstrate that she is willing to remediate the deficiencies in her practice but has failed to acknowledge or address the serious deficiencies found.
45. In the circumstances, the panel decided that there was little prospect that if the panel were to impose a suspension order, Ms Wilson would engage with Social Work England or provide evidence for a further review hearing. In the panel's judgement the imposition of a further suspension order would serve no purpose. It is not in the public interest for the panel to impose a suspension order in circumstances where there is no realistic prospect that Ms Wilson will constructively engage with her regulator. The panel concluded that a suspension order would not be appropriate or sufficient to meet the public interest.

Decision on whether to impose a removal order.

46. The panel was satisfied that it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Ms Wilson's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of

misconduct as set out in regulations 25(2) of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended).

47. 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 a removal order would be appropriate because Ms Wilson's fitness to practise remains impaired, she had not engaged with her regulator since the final hearing and is unlikely to engage with Social Work England in the foreseeable future or take the necessary steps in order to satisfy any reviewing panel that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The panel considered that the public interest is not served by keeping Ms Wilson on the register. Further to keep Ms Wilson on the register derails the confidence that the public is able to place in the regulator.
48. The Panel notes with genuine regret that Ms Wilson's decision not to engage or to seek to address the remediable findings of the final hearing has resulted in the decision for a removal order. The panel regrets the loss of an experienced social worker to the profession. However, the panel balanced this against the need to protect the public and uphold public confidence in the profession and its regulator. The panel concluded it had no alternative and a removal order is the appropriate and proportionate order.

Right of appeal:

Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), 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.

49. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.

50. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.

51. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

52. Under regulation 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended):

- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
- 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).

53. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a 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.

The Professional Standards Authority

54. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a review decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners>