

Social worker: Barbara Collings

Registration number: SW46887

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Meeting

Date of Meeting: 08 August 2024

Meeting venue: Remote Meeting

Final order being reviewed: Suspension Order (expiring 20 September 2024)

Hearing Outcome: Removal Order to come into effect upon expiry of the current Suspension Order.

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final order. A conditions of practice order was originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a panel of adjudicators on 24 May 2022. This order was reviewed on 6 November 2023 and the conditions of practice order was replaced by an suspension order for a period of 9 months.
2. Ms Collings 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
Linda Owen	Chair
Sarah (Sally) Scott	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Wallis Crump	Hearings officer
Jo Cooper	Hearings support officer
Emma Boothroyd	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators (the panel) had careful regard to the documents contained in the substantive order review hearing service bundle as follows:
 - a. A copy of the notice of substantive order review hearing dated 3 July 2024 and addressed to Ms Collings at her email address as it appears on the Social Work England Register;
 - b. An extract from the Social Work England Register detailing Ms Collings' registered email address;
 - c. A copy of the email sent on 3 July 2024 to Ms Collings at her email address as it appears on the Social Work England Register, sending:
 - i. FOR bundle
 - ii. Notice of hearing
 - iii. Written submission form

- iv. Hearing participation form
- v. Notice of representation form
- d. A copy of a signed statement of service, dated 6 August 2024 on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that the writer on 3 July 2024 sent to Ms Collings at the email address referred to above: Notice of Final Order Review with enclosures.
- 5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to Rules 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules (the Rules) and service of the notice.
- 6. Having had regard to all of the information before it in relation to the service of the notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been properly served on Ms Collings in accordance with Rules 16, 44 and 45.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

- 7. The notice of final order review informed Ms Collings that the review could 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 12 July 2024. 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.”
- 8. The panel received no information to suggest that Ms Collings had responded to the notice of final order review and had not been in contact with Social Work England since the last review.
- 9. 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.”
- 10. 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).

Review of the current order:

- 11. This final order review hearing is taking place under 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).
- 12. The current order is due to expire at the end of 20 September 2024.

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

1.2 (ii) Signed off on work which was not fit for purpose.

1.2(iii) Allowed delays to take place for child visits

1.3 As a Senior Social Worker from April 2018 – December 2018 you failed to demonstrate the required improvements in performance as outlined by way of a capability action plan.

1.4 As a Senior Social Worker from April 2018 – December 2018 you consistently failed to work in accordance with the Council's expectations as outlined within the role profile in that you:

1.4(i) produced an inadequate child in need assessment, in relation to Service User child A.

1.4(ii) completed the Social Work Assessment with errors, in relation to Service User Child B.

1.4(iii) did not visit Service User Child C in a timely manner and were unable to identify that Service User C's father was due to be evicted from his home.

1.4(vi) failed to arrange a Speech and Language Report for Service User Child D when one was required.

1.4(vii) did not communicate well with Service User E's family and produced an inaccurate assessment in relation to Service User E.

1.4(viii) Failed to comply with the Council's Practice Quality Standards by not keeping the front screen of cases up to date.

1.4(ix) Failed to comply with the DFE National Guidance under Working to Safeguard Children 2018 by not visiting children within timescales.

1.4(x) Failed to comply with the Council's Practice Quality Standards by not updating the Service User's case summaries every three months.

2. On 15 September 2017 whilst working as a Team Manager for Cornwall Council you threatened a member of your team with suspension. This was carried out in a public area and in sight of a newly qualified social worker.

The final hearing panel on 24 May 2022 determined the following with regard to impairment:

13. The final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings' actions as found proved in Allegation 1 had breached the following HCPC Standards of Proficiency 2017:
 - 1: Be able to practise safely and effectively within their scope of practice*
 - 3: Be able to maintain fitness to practise*
 - 8.3: understand how communication skills affect the assessment of and engagement of service users and carers*
 - 9: Be able to work appropriately with others*
 - 12: Be able to assure the quality of their practice.*
14. The final hearing panel concluded that Allegation 2 amounted to misconduct. Ms Collings had admitted that this was the case and the final hearing panel agreed that her actions had fallen seriously below the standards expected of a social worker in the circumstances. Ms Collings had not been in a position to threaten suspension, and her decision to do so in a public place, within sight and earshot of a trainee social worker, would be regarded as deplorable by fellow social workers.
15. The final hearing panel concluded that Allegation 1 amounted to lack of capability on Ms Collings' part. Ms Collings had agreed that this was the case and the final hearing panel agreed that her failure to allocate, her poor decision making, her failure to demonstrate the improvements required of her by her capability plan, and her repeated failure to work in accordance with her employer's expectations, amounted to a lack of capability on her part.
16. The final hearing panel then considered whether Ms Collings' fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of her misconduct and/or lack of capability.
17. The final hearing panel concluded that Allegation 2 amounted to an isolated incident in the context of a lengthy and unblemished career. The final hearing panel had heard Ms Collings give evidence and had read references which attested to her kind and caring personality. It was clear that she had acted out of character at the time. Ms Collings had apologised for her actions. The final hearing panel concluded that it was highly unlikely that she would repeat her misconduct in the future. In those circumstances the final hearing panel was satisfied that a finding of impairment was not required to protect the public. The final hearing panel was also satisfied that the public interest would be met by the finding of misconduct.
18. Accordingly, the final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings' fitness to practise was not currently impaired by reason of her misconduct.
19. The final hearing panel concluded that Allegation 1 related to incidents which had had the potential to place vulnerable service users at risk of harm. The final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings had not demonstrated adequate remediation or full insight

into her behaviour. Her response to questioning regarding how she would deal with the same situations in future centred on removing herself from the workplace, taking time off and seeking the assistance of her line manager. She had produced testimonials, but these had not provided detail on relevant matters such as how Ms Collings is able to demonstrate the necessary level of knowledge, skill, practice and judgement required of a social worker. The references she had provided contained no mention of her ability to allocate work appropriately and fairly, make good decisions, produce assessments, communicate well or keep cases up to date.

20. The final hearing panel noted that Ms Collings had not worked as a social worker since the time of the Allegation; she had worked in social care. Whilst the final hearing panel accepted that some skills are transferrable from a social care setting to the work of a social worker, the skills required of Ms Collings in her current job as a team leader leading the care for one service user did not equate to the level of skill required of a social worker. The final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings' testimonials provided positive information about Ms Collings' character but not her work. The final hearing panel also concluded that whilst the training she had undertaken, as demonstrated by the certificates that she had produced, overlapped with the role of a social worker, nevertheless they did not target the concerns found proved. Further, in the course of her evidence, Ms Collings had spoken of actions taken by her which appeared to amount to a continued lack of capability and yet she did not appear to recognise the significance of this. Her decision to allow a worker to enter the workplace without having had the requisite Covid test had clearly been a poor decision, and yet Ms Collings did not appear to have recognised that. The same issue applied to her decision to allow a worker into the workplace without first conducting a DBS check, which, she told the panel, had then proved positive in that the worker had interviewed as part of a theft investigation. Here again when giving evidence Ms Collings did not appear to fully understand the importance of this poor decision making. The final hearing panel concluded from this that Ms Collings has still not developed the necessary level of judgement to make good decisions and has not remediated her past behaviour.
21. In light of Ms Collings' lack of adequate insight and remediation to date, the final hearing panel concluded that there is a clear risk that Ms Collings will repeat the behaviour that was found proved in Allegation 1. The final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings would pose a risk to the public if permitted to practise without restriction. The final hearing panel concluded that a finding of impairment is required on public protection grounds.
22. The final hearing panel also concluded that a finding of current impairment is required on public interest grounds. The final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings had failed to allocate appropriately, made poor decisions which had the potential to put vulnerable children and their families at risk, failed to demonstrate the required improvement in performance as outlined in her capability action plan and consistently failed to work in accordance with her employer's expectations in a number of regards. The final hearing panel concluded that she had breached fundamental tenets of her

profession, and, through her behaviour, she had brought her profession into disrepute. The final hearing panel therefore concluded that a finding of impairment was required to promote and maintain public confidence in social workers and to promote and maintain proper professional standards for social workers.

23. Accordingly, the final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings' fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of lack of capability, both on public protection and public interest grounds.

The final hearing panel on 24 May 2022 determined the following with regard to sanction:

24. The final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings' lack of capability was mitigated by:

- a. her previous good character,
- b. her remorse and partial insight, and
- c. her personal circumstances at the time

25. The final hearing panel concluded that Ms Collings' lack of capability was aggravated by:

- a. The wide range of issues and lengthy period of time over which her performance had been found to be unacceptably low.

26. The final hearing panel concluded that there were no exceptional reasons to merit taking no action. It concluded that issuing an advice or a warning would not restrict Ms Collings' ability to practise and therefore would not be adequate to protect the public or the public interest in light of the panel's findings on impairment.

27. The final hearing panel concluded that relevant, workable conditions could be formulated which would protect both the public and the wider public interest. The final hearing panel concluded that a conditions of practice order was the appropriate and proportionate sanction in the circumstances, taking into account the mitigating and aggravating factors.

28. The final hearing panel considered the imposition of a suspension order but concluded that this would be disproportionate in light of the many years that Ms Collings had worked as a social worker without previous complaint, together with the fact that it was possible to formulate a workable conditions of practice order which would adequately protect the public and wider public interest.

29. The final hearing panel decided that a conditions of practice order for 18 months in duration was the appropriate and proportionate period of time in all the circumstances of the case.

30. Accordingly, the final hearing panel decided to impose a conditions of practice order for a period of 18 months in the following terms:

Condition 1

You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.

Condition 2

You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.

Condition 3

a. At any time you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England's register.

b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.

Condition 4

You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 6 months and at least 28 days prior to any review and Social Work England will make these reports available to any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions on request.

Condition 5

You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.

Condition 6

You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.

Condition 7

You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.

Condition 8

You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect.

Condition 9

You must work with your workplace supervisor/reporter, to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:

- Assessment writing
- Timeliness, including visiting service users within time scales and recording
- Communication with service users

Condition 10

You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 6 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.

Condition 11

a. At any time you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England; you must place yourself and remain under the supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by you, and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register.

b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.

Condition 12

You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 6 months and at least 28 days prior to any review, and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.

Condition 13

You must not supervise the work of any other social worker or student social worker.

Condition 14

You must not be responsible for the work of any other social worker or student social worker.

Condition 15

You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019), and provide a written reflection 4 months after these conditions take effect, focusing on how your conduct, for matters relating to this case, as set out in Condition 9, was below the accepted standard of a social worker, outlining what you should have done differently.

Condition 16

You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at 1 to 15, above:

- Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.
- Any locum, agency or out-of-hours service you are registered with or apply to be registered with in order to secure employment or contracts to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any organisation, agency or employer where you are using your social work qualification/knowledge/skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.

You must forward written evidence of your compliance with this condition to Social Work England within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect

Condition 17

You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions 1 to 16 to any person requesting information about your registration status.

The previous final order review panel on 20 December 2023 determined the following with regard to impairment:

31. The reviewing panel noted that Ms Collings has not been working as a social worker since the imposition of the conditions of practice order. Indeed, the panel noted that it is three years since she last practised as a social worker. She does not therefore appear to have been in a position to remediate the deficiencies in her practice and there is no evidence before the panel of any steps taken to remediate her performance, or to keep her skills and knowledge up to date. Ms Collings provided a reflective statement to Social Work England over a year ago, but since then there has been relatively little engagement from her. She has expressed clearly that she will not return to the profession and would like to remove herself from the register. There does not appear to be any current motivation or desire on her part to address the impairment of her fitness to practise. She has not sought to put any evidence or submissions before the panel to suggest that she is no longer impaired. She has chosen not to attend this review notwithstanding that at this stage the persuasive burden is on her to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.
32. The reviewing panel determined that Ms Collings' fitness to practise remains impaired on the same ground that it was found to be impaired at the substantive hearing. A finding of impairment is necessary in order to protect the public and the wider public interest."

The previous final order review panel on 20 December 2023 determined the following with regard to sanction:

33. The reviewing panel considered the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, that the Panel should replace the conditions of practice order with a 9-month suspension order, upon expiry of the current order. A 9-month suspension is proposed so that at the time of the next review Ms Collings will have been continuously subject to a conditions of practice or suspension order for two years, which will enable a removal order to be considered as an option, should Ms Collings not remediate the concerns.
34. The reviewing panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
35. The reviewing panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Collings 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 Collings' interests with the public interest.

36. Given the wide-ranging and serious findings against Ms Collings that have led to a finding of impairment of fitness to practise the reviewing panel considered that a restrictive order is necessary in this case. Advice or a warning order were not therefore considered to be appropriate as they would not restrict Ms Collings' practice.
37. The reviewing panel next considered a conditions of practice order. Ms Collings has indicated that she is not seeking employment under the current conditions of practice order. As she does not want to work under conditions of practice the panel concluded they are simply not workable. The panel was mindful that Ms Collings has previously asked, in response to Social Work England's communications about her conditions of practice order: *"I just want to clarify, can this stop now? I am never going to be a social worker again, despite 23 years of unblemished service. I just want to move on with my life."* It is disproportionate to impose further conditions which necessitate further detailed follow-up communications between Social Work England and Ms Collings when she clearly does not wish to engage with Social Work England any further.
38. The reviewing panel noted that a removal order was not yet available to the panel as Ms Collings has not yet been suspended from practice or subject to a conditions of practice final order (or a combination of both) for a continuous period of two years immediately preceding the day when the removal order would take effect.
39. The reviewing panel noted that suspension would not impact Ms Collings unduly as she is not working as a social worker and nor does she wish to if she has any restriction on her practice. A suspension order would prevent her from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest. The length proposed, namely nine months, facilitates a removal from the register in due course if Ms Collings' stated position remains that she does not intend to practise as a social worker in the future.
40. The reviewing panel determined that, at the expiry of Ms Collings conditions of practice order, a suspension order for a nine-month period will take effect.
41. The reviewing panel noted it could not bind a future panel. However it set out that a future reviewing panel will expect Ms Collings to attend the review hearing if she intends to oppose a submission from Social Work England that she should be removed from the register. If she were opposing such a submission, she would need to be able to provide evidence that she embarked upon remediation activity. This may include:
 - (i) A personal development plan with evidence that she has kept her social work skills and knowledge up to date,
 - (ii) Signed and dated references from any employment or voluntary work that may have relevance to social work,

- (iii) A further reflective statement demonstrating her understanding of the need to minimise the risk of similar events occurring in the future and the steps that she might need to take in order to achieve this.

Social Work England submissions:

42. Social Work England provided written submissions as detailed in the notice of review hearing as follows,

“Social Work England will invite the Panel to impose a Removal Order, on the grounds that such an Order is necessary for the protection of the public including the public interest.

The Social Worker has not made contact with Social Work England since the last review. The Case Review Officer sent correspondence to the Social Worker on 6 November 2023, 22 December 2023 and 17 May 2024 in relation to the Suspension Order, seeking evidence by 31 May 2024, including any evidence of engagement with the previous Panel’s recommendations. No response or evidence has been received.

Prior to the last review the Social Worker indicated that they did not wish to return to social work. On 22 December 2023, they were provided with links to information regarding Voluntary Removal, but no application has been received from the Social Worker.

At the date of this Notice, the Social Worker has not provided any further evidence to address the concerns. The risk of repetition has not changed. There is no further evidence of the Social Worker’s insight, reflection or remediation.

The Social Worker will already have a further period of time upon receipt of this Notice (which sets out the clear intention of Social Work England) to re-engage with this process prior to the date of the Review, by way of the provision of evidence in line with the Panel’s recommendations. If the Social Worker does provide such evidence prior to the Review, Social Work England will review its position.

As above, if the Social Worker does not provide such evidence prior to the Review, Social Work England invite the Panel to impose a Removal Order.”

Social worker submissions:

43. Ms Collings has provided no submissions or evidence for this reviewing Panel to consider. The Panel had regard to the information contained within the decision of the previous reviewing Panel which indicated that Ms Collings did not wish to return to social work but that no application for Voluntary Removal has been made to Social Work England.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

44. 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 decisions of the previous panels. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
45. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel and the previous review panel. The panel noted that a reflective statement dated 13 October 2022 was before the previous reviewing panel but this panel had not had sight of that document. The panel also took account of the written submissions made on behalf of Social Work England.
46. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on Ms Collings at this review to demonstrate that she has fully acknowledged and addressed the past impairment. Further, the panel must determine whether Ms Collings' fitness to practise is impaired today, taking into account her conduct at the time of the events and any relevant factors since then such as whether the matters are remediable, have been remedied and any likelihood of repetition.
47. 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 maintaining public confidence in the profession.
48. The panel first considered whether Ms Collings' fitness to practise remains impaired.
49. The panel noted that Ms Collings indicated to the previous reviewing panel that she has not been working as a social worker since the imposition of the conditions of practice order. Ms Collings was suspended in December 2023 and therefore has been unable to work as a social worker since then. There was no evidence before this panel of any steps taken by Ms Collings to remediate her performance, or to keep her skills and knowledge up to date. The panel noted that the previous panel had explicitly set out in its decision the evidence that may be of assistance to this panel.
50. The panel noted that Ms Collings provided a reflective statement to Social Work England in October 2022 but there has been no engagement with Social Work England since the previous review. The panel noted that despite efforts by Social Work England to request evidence from Ms Collings she has not engaged with this review. Ms Collings had expressed clearly to the previous reviewing panel that she will not return to the profession and would like to remove herself from the register but she has made no application for Voluntary Removal. The panel agreed with the previous panel that there does not appear to be any current motivation or desire on her part to address the impairment of her fitness to practise. The panel therefore concluded that there remained a risk of repetition. The panel considered that Ms Collings has provided no evidence to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

51. The panel determined that Ms Collings' fitness to practise remains impaired on the same grounds that it was found to be impaired at the substantive hearing and the previous review hearing. A finding of impairment is necessary in order to protect the public and the wider public interest.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

52. Having found Ms Collings' 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 the submissions made, along with all of the information it has before it, and accepted the advice of the legal adviser that under Schedule 2, paragraphs 13 and 15(1) of the Regulations the panel can:

- a. extend the period for which the order has effect, provided that the extended period does not exceed three years from the date on which it is extended;
- b. with effect from the expiry of the order, make any order which the original panel could have made provided that the period for which the new order has effect does not exceed three years in total;
- c. make a removal order as the social worker has been either suspended from practice or subject to a conditions of practice order for a continuous period of two years;
- d. revoke the order with effect from the date of the review for the remainder of the period for which it would have had effect

53. The panel considered the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, that the Panel should make a removal order as Ms Collings has been continuously subject to a conditions of practice or suspension order for two years and Ms Collings has not remediated the concerns.

54. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.

55. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Collings 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 Collings' interests with the public interest.

56. Given the wide-ranging and serious findings against Ms Collings that have led to a finding of impairment of fitness to practise the panel considered that a restrictive order is necessary in this case. Advice or a warning order were not therefore considered to be appropriate as they would not restrict Ms Collings' practice.

57. The panel next considered a conditions of practice order. Ms Collings has not engaged with this review hearing and had not previously worked under the conditions of practice. The panel therefore concluded they are not workable or appropriate. The panel noted that although conditions could potentially be formulated to manage the

risk there was no evidence that Ms Collings would comply with them. The panel agreed with the previous panel that it was disproportionate to impose further conditions which necessitate further detailed follow-up communications between Social Work England and Ms Collings when she clearly does not wish to engage with Social Work England any further. The panel also considered that her continued non-engagement with her regulator would not address the public interest considerations and conditions would not be sufficient to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

58. The panel next considered whether to extend the current suspension order. The panel noted that this would prevent Ms Collings from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore continue to protect the public and the wider public interest. However, the panel noted that a further period of suspension would serve no useful purpose given the continued non-engagement of Ms Collings. The previous reviewing panel indicated in its decision that removal from the register was likely to be a consideration for this panel should Ms Collings fail to engage with the review process to demonstrate commitment to remediate the concerns. The panel therefore considered that the only appropriate and proportionate order in these circumstances was a removal order.
59. 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 in these circumstances because Ms Collings had persistently failed to address the concerns and demonstrate remediation. The panel considered that the only order that would be sufficient to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour would be a removal order.
60. The Panel determined to impose a removal order upon expiry of the current suspension order.

Right of appeal:

61. 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.

62. 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.
63. 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.
64. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

The Professional Standards Authority

65. 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>