



Social worker: Steven D Brooks

Registration number: SW103588

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Meeting

Date of Meeting: 28 August 2024

Meeting venue: Remote Meeting

Final order being reviewed:

Conditions of practice order – (expiring 07 October 2024)

Hearing Outcome:

Impose a new order namely a removal order with effect from the expiry of the current order

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a panel of adjudicators on 10 March 2023.
2. Mr Brooks did not attend and was not represented. He provided written submissions to the panel.
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
Beverley Blythe	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Tom Stoker	Hearings officer
Jo Cooper	Hearings support officer
Charlotte Mitchell-Dunn	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) noted that the notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Brooks by email to an address provided by Mr Brooks, namely his registered address as it appears on the Social Work England Register.
5. The panel of adjudicators 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 29 July 2024 and addressed to Mr Brooks at his email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 29 July 2024 detailing Mr Brook’s registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 29 July 2024 the writer sent by email to Mr Brooks’, at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;

- A copy of email correspondences from Mr Brooks regarding the final order hearing dated between 8 August 2024 and 10 August 2024.
6. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
 7. Having had regard to the Social Work England Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (“the Rules”) 16, 44 and 45 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 Brooks in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

8. The notice of interim order review hearing informed Mr Brooks that the review would take place electronically. 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 13 August 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.”
9. Mr Brooks therefore understood that in his absence, the review could proceed as a meeting. Further the panel noted the email correspondences from Mr Brooks in which he expressly stated;

“ I confirm that I am not seeking a postponement, and am happy for the review to take place in my absence. I will not be able to provide my written submission by 4pm today as I am currently abroad, but would be able to submit it before 9am tomorrow”
10. 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 accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when deciding whether it was fair and appropriate to conduct the review in Mr Brooks’ absence. This included reference to the cases of *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162* and *Sansui v General Medical Council [2019] EWCA Civ 1172*. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s guidance ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’.

12. The panel considered all of the information before it. The panel noted that Mr Brooks had been sent notice of today's hearing and the panel was satisfied from the correspondence that he had chosen to voluntarily absent himself from today's hearing.
13. An adjournment has not been sought by Mr Brooks and the panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Mr Brooks' attendance at a later date. In the circumstances, the panel concluded that it was fair and appropriate to proceed in the absence of Mr Brooks.
14. In all the circumstances, 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:

15. 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).
16. The current order is due to expire at the end of 07 October 2024.

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

17. The allegations against Mr Brooks (the "Allegations") which found proved were as follows:

"That whilst registered as a social worker, you:

1. On or around 15 July 2019 with regard to Service User 1:

a) arranged a placement with a Care Home rated as "inadequate" by the Care Quality Commission;

b) did not escalate consideration of the Care Home placement to a senior manager;

c) did not consider and/or record consideration of whether alternative Care Homes were available.

2. In respect of Service User 2 recorded a mental capacity assessment:

a) but failed to conduct a mental capacity assessment with Service User 2 and/ or failed to accurately record the mental capacity assessment that you conducted;

(proved on the basis of failure to accurately record the assessment)

b) copied a previous assessment dated 18 September 2018.

3. Failed to complete tasks in a timely manner, or at all, in that you:

e) In respect of Service User 3, between 20 May 2019 and 29 August 2019 did not:

- i. complete and/ or record a mental capacity assessment;**
- ii. update the electronic case notes.**

f) In respect of Service User 4, following discharge from hospital, on or around 30 June 2019, failed to complete and/ or record:

- i. Care Act Assessment;**
- ii. support plan.**

g) In respect of Service User 5, between 5 April and 29 August 2019 failed to complete and/ or record:

- i. Mental capacity assessment;**
- ii. Best interest assessment;**
- iii. Support plan;**
- iv. Finance paperwork;**
- v. Any electronic case notes.**

h) In respect of Service User 6, between March and 29 August 2019, failed to complete and/ or record:

- i. Mental capacity assessment;**
- ii. Best interest assessment;**
- iii. Support plan;**
- iv. Finance paperwork;**
- v. Any electronic case notes.**

i) In respect of Service User 7, between 29 January and 29 August 2019, failed to complete and / or record a mental capacity assessment.

The matters at paragraphs 1-3 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct

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

The final hearing panel on 10 March 2023 determined the following with regard to impairment:

“111. The panel considered that, viewed objectively, the lack of record of paperwork could be remedied, as could a failure to adhere to policies to seek management approval. Where the panel had more concern was as to whether Mr Brooks was in a position to remediate his past misconduct.

112. The panel commended Mr Brooks for his insight and candour in admitting the difficulties that he faced. It appeared that part of the problem lay in his difficulties in keeping up with typing and bureaucracy. The pressures arising from this added to his [PRIVATE] and exacerbated the problem.

113. The remedy that Mr Brooks had applied was to remove himself from social work. However, he also recognised that a return to the particular role was likely to lead to a resurrection of past problems. As he acknowledged also, most social work roles were likely to involve similar pressures.

114. The panel concluded that, whilst development of insight is a key indicator to the potential for remediation, the panel was not satisfied that the misconduct had been remedied in this case, to a point where it was ‘highly unlikely’ to be repeated.

115. The panel welcomed the very positive reference provided about Mr Brooks current employment. It regarded his evidence as to a desire to contribute and to be of assistance to others, as heartfelt and genuine. However, judging the matter on the risk of repetition, if there was a return to social work the panel felt bound to find that Mr Brooks fitness to practise is currently impaired.

116. In addition to the risk of repetition, the panel could not ignore that there had been failures in respect of a number of service users, in respect of the recording of important assessments and other documents and over significant periods. There had also been the placement of SU1, without proper management oversight.

117. The panel concluded that the public would be alarmed that this had occurred in the practice of a social worker dealing with vulnerable service users in these circumstances. Therefore, the panel considered that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was also necessary in the wider public interests of maintaining public confidence in the profession and to maintain professional standards.

118. The panel determined that Mr Brooks’ fitness to practise is currently impaired.”

The final hearing panel on 10 March 2023 determined the following with regard to sanction:

“125. The panel considered its findings at previous stages of the hearing and whether there were aggravating or mitigating factors. The panel considered that there was a degree of aggravation in that there had been a number of service users involved in the findings, whose records of assessments and other documents had remained outstanding for some time. There had been a repetition of the failure to complete the necessary records. It considered that Mr Brooks could have expressed greater insight into the severity of the potential impact on service users from his failures.

126. In terms of mitigation, the panel had found that Mr Brooks had considerable insight into his failings. He had fully engaged in the proceedings and made frank admissions as to his failures. He had taken steps to remove himself from the circumstances in which there might be a repetition of these failures. He had provided a very positive reference from his current employer, as referred to above.

127. The panel considered that there had been certain environmental factors which had contributed to the situation. There was evidence of particular workplace pressures at the relevant time. There was also some conflicting evidence about the Council’s procedure for placements with regard to care homes which had been rated as ‘inadequate’, which led the panel to consider that the direction to staff could have been clearer. The panel noted that, although the Council had generally provided Mr Brooks with support, there had, according to Mr Brooks, been occasion when the support had been lacking, such as when he asked for support to improve his typing skills.

128. [PRIVATE]

129. The panel first considered taking no action in the case. It took into account that this would result in Mr Brooks being able to resume practice without restriction. However, it did not consider that there were any exceptional circumstances which would justify such a course. The misconduct was too serious, and the public would not be protected without further action.

130. Further, although giving advice or a warning to Mr Brooks would serve to mark the panel’s finding of impairment, neither would restrict his practice. There needed to be effective protection of the public in a case where the panel had found a risk of repetition of misconduct and therefore a risk of harm.

131. In addition, the panel had found impairment on the basis of a need to maintain public confidence and it did not think that it was sufficient to mark the impairment by issuing advice or a warning.

132. The panel noted paragraph 76 of the ISG, which states:

“In some cases, the decision makers may determine that the social worker’s impairment poses a current risk to public safety. If so, it may be reasonable to move beyond the lower sanctions (no action, advice or a warning) on this basis alone. This is

because these outcomes will not address the risk to the public as they do not restrict the social worker's practice."

The panel considered that this was relevant in this case.

133. The panel next considered imposing a conditions of practice order. It acknowledged that the primary purpose of such an order, as the ISG states, is to protect the public whilst the social worker undertakes remediation in practice.

134. The panel took into account that Mr Brooks has professed an intention not to return to practice. However, it considered that it should approach the matter on the basis of his 'fitness' to be in practice, in case he did make a return in future. The panel bore in mind the need to be proportionate in applying sanction, imposing the minimum to achieve public protection.

135. The panel had already determined that Mr Brooks' failures were, objectively judged, capable of remediation. It considered that there were steps that he could take to improve his record-keeping and organisational issues. The panel took into account that Mr Brooks had worked for the Council for a number of years before the period of the allegations. He had qualified as a social worker in 2016 whilst working for the Council, only relatively shortly before the problems had occurred. Although there were a number of failures found proved in the case, it had to be considered that these had to be put in the context of his other work in the role.

136. The panel had been impressed by Mr Brooks' attitude and engagement with the proceedings, his candour and the positive work reference. He appeared to be a genuinely caring and well-intentioned individual. There had been no indication of any shortcomings or impropriety in Mr Brooks' direct work with service users. The panel acknowledged that there is a public interest in returning an otherwise competent social worker back to practice, if the public can be protected at the same time.

137. Mr Brooks had given evidence of the steps he had taken to deal with his [PRIVATE]. Since the [PRIVATE] appeared to be exacerbated by Mr Brooks' work pressures, the panel considered that this ought to be less problematic as his work skills improved.

138. It appeared to the panel that the issues around Mr Brooks' failures were related to his inability at the time to cope with his workload, to manage his time and priorities. It considered that these ought to be amenable to improvement with oversight and assistance. It was confident that, if Mr Brooks decided to re-engage with social work, he would do so with an intention to comply with conditions.

139. The panel concluded that it could devise a set of conditions of practice which would be sufficient to protect the public, if Mr Brooks returned to practice. The conditions would apply to any return to a registered role.

140. The panel next considered whether it might be necessary to go further and suspend Mr Brooks' registration for a period. It acknowledged that this would protect the public by removing Mr Brooks from practice for a period. In that event, Mr Brooks

would not have the opportunity to remediate in practice under conditions. Since the panel had concluded that the lesser sanction of conditions of practice was the minimum necessary, it would not be proportionate to suspend Mr Brooks' registration."

Social Work England submissions:

18. The panel received written submissions from Social Work England as follows;

"Subject to any evidence of Social Worker engagement provided prior to the review, Social Work England will invite the Panel to consider imposing a Removal Order.

The Final Hearing Panel found that the Social Worker's impairment was remediable. He was also praised for his insight and frank admissions. However, the Social Worker has not engaged with Social Work England since the Order was imposed in March 2023. Before and during the Final Hearing, the Social Worker stated that he wished to be removed from the Register. He told the Final Hearing Panel he recognised that, because of his [PRIVATE] and the work pressures, there was no way he could carry on in the profession, and he acknowledged that similar pressures to those he experienced do exist in most registered social work roles.

The Social Worker has not taken any steps to remediate his practice. Accordingly, the Panel is invited to find that his fitness to practise remains impaired on both public protect and wider public interest grounds. Given the context of his wanting to be removed and making no contact with Social Work England for almost 18 months, the Panel is invited to find that there is no useful purpose in extending the current order or in making a suspension order.

Should the Social Worker choose to engage with the review process or indicate prior to the review that he wishes to remain registered with a view to completing remediation in the future, then Social Work England will reconsider their submissions, and the Order sought. Absent any further engagement, then the Panel are invited to consider directing removal from the register.

Social worker submissions:

19. Mr Brooks provided the following submissions to the panel;

"Since the decision of the tribunal, I have spent alot of time reflecting on what i could and should have done differently. I realise I spent too much time looking to blame others for the situation I was in. I now understand i should have accepted and took responsibility for my own actions. I realise how my actions let down my colleagues, the service users, my employer and the social work profession. I also let myself down.

I have not practiced as a social worker since I left my previous post and have no intention of working in the profession in the future.

It is my intention to voluntarily remove myself from the social work register after the the review has concluded.

I would like to thank the members of the panel for their professionalism in your vital role.”

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

20. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’.
21. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Social Work England and Mr Brooks.
22. The panel took into account the advice it received from the legal adviser as to the proper approach it should adopt. In particular, that:
 - i. The purpose of the review is to consider the current impairment based on the agreed disposal, the extent to which Mr Brooks has engaged with the regulatory process, the scope and level of his insight, and the risk of repetition.
 - ii. The persuasive burden is on Mr Brooks.
 - iii. In terms of whether the regulatory concerns have been sufficiently, and appropriately remediated, relevant factors include whether Mr Brooks is:
 - a. fully appreciative of the gravity of the previous panel’s finding of impairment;
 - b. up to date with his skills and knowledge;
 - c. likely to place service users at risk if he were to return to unrestricted practice.
 - iv. The panel should take into account any information that it has received relating to Mr Brooks’ ability to practise safely and effectively and the wider public interest, which includes promoting and maintaining proper professional standards of behaviour and promoting and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
 - v. It is only if the panel determines that Mr Brooks’ fitness to practise remains impaired, that it should go on to consider what, if any, sanction to impose by applying the guidance as set out in the Sanctions Guidance (SG), the Regulations

and the principles of proportionality which require Mr Brooks' interests to be balanced against the interests of the public.

23. The panel first considered whether Mr Brooks' fitness to practise remains impaired.
24. As a consequence of Mr Brooks' non-attendance and the limited written submissions provided by Mr Brooks demonstrating tangible insight and remediation, there was no evidence before the panel that Mr Brooks has acquired an in-depth understanding of the seriousness of the regulatory concerns or the impact these concerns had on the reputation of the social work profession as a whole.
25. The panel does not have before it any evidence to suggest that Mr Brooks has rectified the deficiencies in his practice. Further, the panel is aware from Mr Brooks' representations that he is not practicing as a social worker and has no intention of working in the profession in the future.
26. In the absence of any evidence of developed insight and remediation, the panel concluded that there has been no material change in circumstances, since the adjudicators decision in March 2023. This was despite the fact that Mr Brooks was provided with a clear opportunity to engage with his regulator and also provided with clear recommendations in respect of the evidence that a reviewing panel may benefit from in the future.
27. Mr Brooks has provided limited information pertaining to his engagement with any reflection and has not provided any evidence of further training or CPD. He has not provided any testimonials from paid or unpaid work, social work or otherwise.
28. Mr Brooks has not actively engaged with Social Work England for a significant period of time and has expressed a desire to apply for voluntary removal for a significant period of time, yet the panel has not been made aware of any such application.
29. The panel noted the previous panel's findings at Paragraph 140, namely

"The panel next considered whether it might be necessary to go further and suspend Mr Brooks' registration for a period. It acknowledged that this would protect the public by removing Mr Brooks from practice for a period. In that event, Mr Brooks would not have the opportunity to remediate in practice under conditions. Since the panel had concluded that the lesser sanction of conditions of practice was the minimum necessary, it would not be proportionate to suspend Mr Brooks' registration."
30. The panel considered that Mr Brooks had been given an opportunity to engage with the conditions of practice order imposed upon him, however he had chosen not to take that opportunity. The panel considered that there was no evidence of developed insight or remediation by Mr Brooks. The panel therefore concluded that there is no evidence before it to suggest that the risk of repetition of the misconduct has reduced, as such there remains a very real risk of repetition.

31. The panel noted that a significant aspect of the public component is promoting and maintaining public confidence and promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers. Members of the public would be extremely concerned if a social worker was permitted to resume unrestricted practise in circumstances where the regulatory concern which led to a conditions of practice order had not been remediated.
32. The panel concluded that, in these circumstances, a finding of no impairment would seriously undermine public trust and confidence in the profession and Social Work England as a professional regulator. Therefore, the panel concluded that Mr Brooks' fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanctions:

33. Having found Mr Brooks' 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, alongside all the information provided to them and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
34. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Brooks, 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 Mr Brooks' interests with the public interest.

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

35. The panel bore in mind Social Work England's overarching objective which is to protect the public which is achieved by:
- a. protecting, promoting and maintaining the health, safety and wellbeing of the public;
 - b. promoting and maintaining public confidence in social workers in England; and
 - c. promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers in England.

36. 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.”

37. The panel concluded that, in view of Mr Brooks’ impairment which has not been remedied, and in the absence of any evidence of developed insight or remediation 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.
38. The panel then considered whether to issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that neither of these sanctions would restrict Mr Brooks’ 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.
39. The panel went on to consider extending the current conditions of practice order. The panel took the view that, given the lack of engagement with the regulator in respect of the conditions of practice order, an extension of such an order would not be appropriate. The panel noted Mr Brooks’ lack of engagement following the imposition of the conditions of practice order and his representations that he no longer wished to work within the social work profession. The panel concluded that it could not formulate workable conditions of practice, that the panel could be confident that Mr Brooks would adhere to. As a result, the panel considered it was not appropriate to extend the current conditions of practice order.
40. The panel noted Mr Brooks’ email expressing his desire to voluntarily remove himself from the register.
41. The panel concluded that given the prolonged period of limited engagement from Mr Brooks, despite him being in receipt of communications from Social Work England, he is unlikely to sufficiently 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.
42. Mr Brooks has not taken the opportunity to demonstrate sufficient insight or remediation, despite the opportunity he was afforded to achieve this through the conditions of practice imposed at the final hearing. The panel noted the following paragraph of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance:

149. A removal order may be appropriate in cases involving (any of the following):

...

- *social workers who are unwilling and/or unable to remediate (for example, where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future)*

43. Given the panel's conclusion about Mr Brooks' limited engagement, and his expression of a desire to voluntarily remove himself from the profession, the panel considered it was unlikely that Mr Brooks would engage meaningfully 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 imposing a suspension order upon Mr Brooks, however it determined that the public interest was not served by keeping Mr Brooks on the register, with the associated requirement for future review hearings.
44. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Mr Brooks' fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of misconduct as set out in regulation 25(2)(a) of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended).
45. 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 Mr Brooks has engaged on a limited basis 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 Brooks on the register.
46. The Panel notes, with genuine regret, that Mr Brooks' decision not to engage with his conditions of practice has resulted in the end of his career in social work. However, the panel balanced this against the need to protect the public, and concluded it had no alternative but to remove Mr Brooks from the register.

Right of appeal:

47. 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.
48. 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.

49. 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.
50. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

51. 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).
52. 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

53. 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>