

Social worker: Devon Jones
Registration number: SW26650
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review meeting

Date of meeting: 24 November 2023

meeting venue: Remote meeting

Final order being reviewed: Suspension order – (expiring 11 January 2024)

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 12 months by a panel of adjudicators (appointed by Social Work England) on 15 December 2022 and due to expire on 11 January 2024.
2. Mr Jones 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 25 October 2023.

The adjudicators (hereinafter referred to as “the panel”) and other people present at the meeting are set out in the table below.

Adjudicators	Role
Paul Grant	Chair
Sabraj Akhtar	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Jenna Keats	Hearings officer
Gabriella Berettoni	Hearings support officer
Nedah Nourouzi	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. 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 25 October 2023 and addressed to Mr Jones at their electronic mail address which they provided to Social Work England
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 25 October 2023 detailing Mr Jones’s registered electronic mail address.
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 26 October 2023 the writer sent by electronic mail to Mr Jones at the address referred to above; notice of hearing and related documents.

5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
6. 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 Mr Jones 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 Mr Jones:

7. The notice of final order review informed Mr Jones 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 09 November 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."

8. The panel received no information to suggest that Mr Jones had responded to the notice of final order review. The panel were satisfied Mr Jones understood that in his absence, the review could proceed as a meeting.
9. 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 Mr Jones. 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."

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) and in the absence of Mr Jones, on the basis that:
 - Mr Jones has had an opportunity to make submissions within the time periods specified under rule 16(b) of the rules.
 - Mr Jones has not requested a postponement or an adjournment, but in any event, the panel did not consider that a postponement or adjournment would result in Mr Jones's future attendance.
 - It would not be in the public interest or in Mr Jones's interests to adjourn the mandatory review of the final order.

Review of the current order:

11. 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).
12. The current order is due to expire at the end of 11 January 2024.

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

13. The allegations against Mr Jones were as follows;

Whilst registered as a Social Worker:

1. *Between 1 January 2019 and 8 May 2019, you allowed Child B to have overnight contacts with one or more family members as set out in Schedule 1:*
 - a. *Without following the appropriate regulations and/or completing a Placement with Parent Assessment;*
 - b. *Not in accordance with a safety plan;*
 - c. *Against the instruction of your line manager.*
2. *Between 1 January 2019 and 8 May 2019, you failed to maintain accurate records of Child B's contact arrangements, in that you:*
 - a. *Failed to record a Placement with Parents assessment/report;*
 - b. *Failed to update a care plan, placement plan and/or safety plan;*
 - c. *Failed to record case notes on Child B's file containing details of one or more overnight stay as set out in Schedule 1*
3. *Between 26 April 2019 and 2 May 2019, you failed to appropriately respond to a safeguarding disclosure regarding Child A, in that you:*
 - a. *Failed to inform your team manager of the referral;*
 - b. *By virtue of 3.a above, prevented your team manager from taking appropriate action/s.*

The matters in allegations 1 and/ or 2 and /or 3 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

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

The final hearing panel on 15 December 2022 determined the following with regard to impairment:

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

“113. The panel had found that each of the proved facts did amount to misconduct which was serious professional misconduct and therefore satisfied the statutory ground of misconduct relevant to fitness to practise. The panel next went on to consider whether the misconduct found also indicated that Mr Jones’ fitness to practise is currently impaired.

114. The legal adviser had advised the panel that impairment of fitness to practise was a matter for its judgement, based on its findings at earlier stages. He advised the panel that it should consider the risk of repetition and whether the misconduct was remediable, had been remedied and was ‘highly unlikely’ to be repeated. It should also consider whether public confidence in the profession and promoting professional standards required a finding of impaired fitness to practise.

115. The panel bore in mind the submissions of the parties and the legal advice. It also bore in mind that not every finding of misconduct automatically results in a finding of impairment. It had to consider and determine Mr Jones’ fitness to practise, as judged by the panel, at the current time.

116. The panel considered that Mr Jones had good intentions towards the children under his care and had meant to do the best for them. However, it also considered that his decision-making had been flawed and he lacked insight into that decision-making.

117. The panel noted that some degree of insight had been displayed by Mr Jones by his admissions to the allegations. The evidence as to the particular events in the allegations had indicated a low level of transparency and accountability on his part. He had appeared to be more transparent now about the issues to the panel in the hearing, but he did not fully engage with all the concerns around his decision-making at the time of the events.

118. The panel considered that Mr Jones had demonstrated limited insight into the wider effects of his errors on service users, his colleagues, the wider profession and public confidence in the profession from his failures. It appeared to the panel that Mr Jones’ responses rested very much on his having good intentions, on his detailed knowledge of the children concerned and that no known harm had resulted.

119. The panel considered that Mr Jones’ misconduct was remediable. If he could alter his attitudes by reflection, learning or otherwise, he could potentially be a good social worker. His colleagues who gave evidence did appear to have some positive views about him. However, the panel considered that Mr Jones had not progressed

very far on any journey of remediation which he might undertake, to return to unrestricted practice.

120. Mr Jones had not provided any detailed reflections on the issues in the case, nor produced evidence to the panel of any detailed continuing professional development or learning in the relevant areas. On the evidence before the panel, it was not satisfied that he has remedied his past misconduct. On that basis, the panel could not say it was highly unlikely he would repeat his past misconduct and it concluded that there was therefore a risk of repetition.

121. The panel took into account that Mr Jones' indication that he did not intend to return to practise as a social worker may well have an impact on his desire to undertake remediation. However, it was also mindful that it had to judge his fitness to practise as a social worker of itself, in recognition that he might decide to return to practice in the future.

122. The panel considered that he had in the past placed service users at risk of harm. It could not be confident that he would not do so in the future. He had by his actions undermined the reputation of the profession and might again. He had breached a fundamental tenet by undermining the safeguarding of children.

123. The panel also decided that, in the circumstances of the misconduct and the current risk of repetition, a finding of impaired fitness to practise was also necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession and to promote and maintain professional standards. The public would expect a finding of impairment where there is a risk of repetition in the particular circumstances of this case.

124. The panel found that Mr Jones' fitness to practise is impaired."

The final hearing panel on 15 December 2022 determined the following with regard to sanction:

15. The final hearing panel on 15 December 2022 determined the following with regard to sanction:

125. "Having found Mr Jones' fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel next considered pursuant to paragraph 12(3) of Schedule 2 of the Regulations and Rule 32(c)(i)(c) what, if any, sanction to impose.

*131. The panel considered the particular factors which mitigated or aggravated the case. The panel had not been informed of any previous regulatory matters known against Mr Jones. The panel was satisfied that, while not an excuse for his failings, **PRIVATE**. It was also uncontested in the evidence that Mr Jones had been dealing with a considerably higher caseload than was the normal level at the council.*

132. The panel also considered that certain factors aggravated the case. It was concerned that the case involved Mr Jones' decision to go against the direct instruction of his

line manager. The case also involved a series of repeated instances of failure to make case notes, to complete the PWP assessment and to appropriately involve Mr Jones' seniors in decision-making. The panel was concerned at the level of risk involved, due to Mr Jones' lack of insight. Mr Jones had not sought further support nor raised further concerns for the apparent lack of support he was receiving regarding the execution of his documentary responsibilities.

133. *The panel first considered taking no action. However, it did not consider that there were any exceptional reasons in the case which would warrant this course. The panel identified a lack of insight and remediation and a lower level of remorse commensurate with the severity of the misconduct. It also considered giving advice or a warning to Mr Jones about his misconduct. However, the panel recognised that each of these steps would result in Mr Jones being able to resume unrestricted practice. In the panel's view to do so would fail to meet the serious findings in the case and would not sufficiently protect the public.*
134. *The panel next considered imposing conditions or restrictions on Mr Jones' registration. It bore in mind that Mr Jones was not currently in a social work role. This created some difficulty with devising workable conditions. However, more importantly, the panel noted the guidance in the SG that the purpose of conditions is to protect the public whilst the social worker remediates. The panel had found that Mr Jones lacked full insight into the misconduct and his impaired fitness to practise. It considered that, due to the lack of insight, the public would not be protected by a resumption of practice, even under conditions.*
135. *The panel next considered a suspension order. It noted the power to suspend Mr Jones' registration for up to three years. The panel took into account paragraphs 92 and 96 of the SG, which state as follows:*

"92. 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."

And

"96. As a general principle, longer periods of suspension may be appropriate where this is necessary to protect public safety. If the suspension is aimed primarily at maintaining confidence in the profession or setting the professional standards to be observed, then a sanction of suspension up to one year may be appropriate. "

136. *The panel took into account the seriousness of the misconduct, including the matter of repeated failings, direct contravention of instructions and the risks resulting from that misconduct. It considered that Mr Jones needed to engage in a considerable*

amount of remediation, before it would be appropriate to allow him to return to practice. In its view, he needed to engage in some further detailed reflection and be in a position to demonstrate alteration in his attitudes towards adherence to policies and instructions.

- 137. Nevertheless, the panel was of the view that Mr Jones had the potential to develop insight and to remediate his misconduct, if he was minded to do so. He had made significant admissions and partial insight into the misconduct during the course of the hearing. He needed time to demonstrate the further development of insight. The panel was mindful that there is a public interest in being able to return a professional to practice, provided the public was safe.*
- 138. The panel therefore decided that it was appropriate and proportionate to impose a period of suspension on Mr Jones' registration. For the period of the suspension, the public would be better protected while Mr Jones develops greater understanding into the identified deficiencies of his practice and undertakes any remediation.*
- 139. The panel was aware that for the period of the suspension, Mr Jones will be prevented from working as a registered social worker. This is likely to have an effect on his earning capacity and also on his professional reputation. However, the panel considered that the public interest outweighed his interests in this regard.*
- 140. The panel considered the duration of the order. It was aware that it could suspend for up to three years. Social Work England had suggested 18 months. However, the panel also bore in mind that the period of suspension had to be proportionate. It considered that, within a period of 12 months, Mr Jones will have sufficient time to decide whether he is committed to a return to social work, to undertake the necessary reflection and remediation and to prepare sufficient evidence for a future panel. It considered that a longer period was not necessary and increased the risk of de-skilling Mr Jones.*
- 141. Having decided that a 12-month suspension order would be appropriate, the panel considered whether it was necessary to go further and make a removal order. However, it decided that his misconduct, whilst serious did not amount to being fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register. The SG states that a removal order should be made only where no lesser sanction is sufficient to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession or maintain professional standards.*
- 142. The panel decided to impose a suspension order on Mr Jones' registration for 12 months.*
- 143. The panel had concluded a suspension order would be sufficient to achieve the overarching objective of protection of the public. Therefore, it was not necessary, nor proportionate, to go further and make a removal order.*
- 144. Shortly before the conclusion of the suspension order now imposed, another panel of adjudicators will be convened to review this order and Mr Jones' impaired fitness to practise. That review will be assisted by Mr Jones' attendance at the review. In*

addition, Mr Jones may wish to provide further information, to assist the panel in its decisions. The panel suggests that the relevant information may include:

- a. Mr Jones' written reflections on the **PRIVATE** issues, the effect on service users, professional colleagues and the wider public interest*
- b. Details of any Continuing Professional Development undertaken and how Mr Jones has kept his social work knowledge and skills up to date*
- c. Any personal and/or professional references or testimonials from persons who can speak to Mr Jones' character and/or work performance. "*

Social Work England submissions:

16. The panel received written submission from Social Work England set out in the notice of hearing letter date 25 October 2023. The letter set out the following submissions:

` Social Work England submit that:

Subject to any evidence of engagement or desire to remediate received prior to the review hearing, Social Work England invite the Panel to find that the Social Worker's fitness to practise remains impaired and to consider directing removal from the register.

Since the final hearing concluded the Social Worker has not engaged at any point with the Case Review Team.

The Adjudicators made a number of recommendations that would assist a future panel, namely:

- i) Written reflections by the Social Worker on the impairment issues, the effect on service users, professional colleagues and the wider public*
- ii) Details of any Continuing Professional Development undertaken and how the Social Worker has kept his social work knowledge and skills up to date*
- iii) Any personal and/or professional references or testimonials from persons who can speak to the Social Worker's character and/or work performance.*

To date none of the recommendations have been followed. The Social Worker has previously indicated they do not wish to return to Social Work. The absence of any engagement with the review process indicates that this remains the case, and that further remediation is unlikely.

If the Social Worker no longer wishes to engage with the fitness to practise process and is unwilling, or unable, to remediate then it is submitted that it is now appropriate to consider a removal order.`

Social worker submissions:

17. Mr Jones did not attend the meeting, nor did he provide written submissions prior to the meeting for the panel's consideration.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

18. 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.
19. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel.
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*:
 - Address whether the fitness to practise is impaired before considering conditions.
 - Whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction.
 - In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at 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 objective 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 Mr Jones'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 Mr Jones's fitness to practise remains impaired. The panel kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment and asked itself whether Mr Jones had demonstrated that he had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the previous panel.
26. The panel noted that the original panel found that Mr Jones had had good intentions towards the children under his care and had meant to do the best for them, however, the panel had found his decision-making had been flawed and he lacked insight into that decision-making.
27. The original panel had noted some degree of insight which had been displayed by Mr Jones by his admissions to the allegations, but he did not fully engage with all the concerns around his decision-making at the time of the events. Mr Jones had demonstrated limited insight into the wider effects of his errors on service users, his colleagues, the wider profession and public confidence in the profession from his failures.
28. The panel concluded that Mr Jones's fitness to practise remains impaired, having regard to both the personal and the public interests for the same reasons as the substantive panel. Mr Jones 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 Mr Jones to have demonstrated he 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 Mr Jones to provide relevant information for the review.
29. The panel has not been provided with any information from Mr Jones in relation to his reflections on the findings of the original panel, no evidence of insight from him to say how he could have acted differently, and no evidence of remediation or details of any Continuing Professional Development undertaken and how Mr Jones has kept his social work knowledge and skills up to date nor any personal or professional testimonials.

30. 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 Mr Jones, despite his good intentions, failed to follow appropriate regulations or update the care plan, placement plan and safety plan. He had failed to maintain accurate records, failed to record cases notes, had not considered all the issues nor the impact or the risk to others, and had gone against management instructions. The original panel had considered Mr Jones' **PRIVATE** however found that this had not had a real impact on the misconduct found given that Mr Jones was able to complete case records on his other cases.
31. The panel concluded that there has been no evidence of change that would reduce the risk of repetition since the substantive hearing, and that there is an ongoing risk of harm to members of the public.
32. Further, considering Mr Jones's lack of evidence of insight and remediation, together with his lack of constructive engagement in this review hearing, the panel concluded that a failure to find Mr Jones's impaired would undermine public confidence in the profession and the regulator.

Decision and reasons:

33. Having found Mr Jones'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 the 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 Mr Jones 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 of members 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 Mr Jones within his practice continue to have the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences for service users and therefore some restriction on his practise is required. The panel considered that, in view of Mr Jones’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 Mr Jones’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 a whether a conditions of practice order could be imposed. The panel concluded that given Mr Jones’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 Mr Jones had demonstrated very limited insight into the extent and seriousness of his failings. The panel had considered Mr Jones had good intentions towards the children under his care and had meant to do the best for them. The panel had found Mr Jones's misconduct was remediable. However, Mr Jones appears to have disengaged with the process of seeking to address his failings. The panel had no evidence to suggest Mr Jones is willing and able to resolve or remediate his failings.
43. The panel considered that Mr Jones has been given a full opportunity to demonstrate that he is willing to remediate the deficiencies in his practice but has failed to acknowledge or address the serious deficiencies found proved.
44. In the circumstances, the panel decided that there was little prospect that if the panel were to impose a suspension order, Mr Jones 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 Mr Jones will constructively engage with his 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

45. The panel was satisfied that it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Mr Jones'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).
46. 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 was the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case in view of the facts Mr Jones's fitness to practise remains impaired, he had not engaged with his regulator, 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 his fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The panel considered that the public interest is not served by keeping Mr Jones's on the register.
47. The Panel notes with regret, Mr Jones's decision not to engage has resulted in the end of his career in social work, however the panel balanced this against the need to protect the public. The panel concluded it had no alternative and a removal order is the appropriate and proportionate order.

Right of appeal:

48. 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).

The Professional Standards Authority

52. 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>