

Social worker: Rhyne Young

Registration number: SW108806

Fitness to Practise

Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 15 January 2024 to 31 January 2024 and 01 July 2024 to 03 July 2024.

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Hearing Outcome: Allegation 1 a, 1 b, 2 a) b, 2 a) e, 2 d) (part proven), 2 e, 3 a), 3 c), 4, 5 a), 6 a), 6 b), 7 a – e proved
Allegation 2 c), 2 d) (part proven), 3 b), 3 d), 5 b) not proved

Sanction: Removal Order

Interim order: Interim suspension order

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”).
2. Ms Young attended and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Mr Khan of counsel, instructed by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Frank Appleyard	Chair
Jacqueline Telfer	Social worker adjudicator
Sarah McNulty	Lay adjudicator

Simone Ferris / Paul Harris	Hearings officer
Sam Harvey / Andrew Brown	Hearings support officer
Gemma Gillet / Helen Gower	Legal adviser

Preliminary matters:

4. At a Case Management Meeting on 12 June 2023 a panel of adjudicators directed that;
 - Special Measures, with the “effect of screens” (the hearing being a virtual one) would be applied to the evidence given by Person 1 and Service User 1.
 - The joinder of FTPS-17792, FTPS-17121 and FTPS-19331. 13.
5. Before the hearing commenced, Ms Young made an application under Rule 29 of the Fitness to Practise Rules and asked that this panel reconsider the direction in relation to the special measures determination for Person A and the use of “screens”.
6. Ms Young stated that when she had attended the Case Management Meeting in June 2023 she had been misled about what was meant by the “effective use of screens” and had not appreciated that she would be required to have her camera off. Ms Young submitted that it was important for this panel to have sight of her, during Person A’s evidence, as her reactions would be important to their assessment of Person A’s credibility.
7. Ms Young submitted that there had been a material change in circumstances since June, in that Person A had escalated her campaign of abuse against her over the Christmas period. Given the serious nature of the allegations made by Person A, and the possible impact on Ms Young’s life, she submitted that Person A should not be entitled to hide away when giving her evidence. Ms Young believed that Person A was no longer suffering from anxiety and asked the panel to take into account the fact that Social Work England had not provided any evidence of Person A’s current health, 7 months after the original determination.
8. On behalf of Social Work England, Mr Khan opposed the application. He submitted that the relevant information had been before the panel of adjudicators in June 2023. There was no

evidence of a material change in circumstances and it was not in the interests of justice for the issue to be reopened. The current direction allowed for the panel and Ms Young to see Person A during their evidence. The only impact of the direction was to restrict Person A (and by extension, the Panel) from seeing Ms Young at that stage. Mr Khan submitted that for the reasons given at the previous hearing and in all the circumstances of this case it was not fair or proper for Person A to face Ms Young during her evidence.

9. The parties agreed that this panel should have sight of the Case Management Meeting Determination but restricted to paragraphs 41 to 49, 65 to 68 and 94(c).
10. The panel heard and accepted legal advice in relation to this application. The panel accepted that in accordance with Rule 29, they were bound by the case management direction unless they considered there had been a material change of circumstances or that it was not in the interests of justice.
11. This panel decided that the information provided by Ms Young did not evidence a material change of circumstances so as to justify departing from the presumption that they were bound by the decision of the previous panel and it was not in the interests of justice to do so.
12. Ms Young then asked the panel to address her by her first name or as “the Social Worker” during the hearing. The panel determined that due to the formality of the proceedings it was most appropriate to address Ms Young, using her surname as it appeared on Social Work England’s register.
13. Mr Khan made an application to amend the wording of allegation 5 (b) to add the word “said” so that it reads:

“on 13 May 2022, you informed Social Work England that Lynne Schofield of Bradford City Council [SAID] that you could not return to work as they were not aware of the conditions”.

14. Finally, Mr Khan submitted that the amendment was necessary to correct a typing error. Ms Young did not object to the application. The panel heard and accepted the advice from the Legal Advisor and agreed to the amendment. The allegations as set out in this document reflect the amendment.

Allegations:

Whilst registered as a Social Worker:

1. *On 16 January 2017, you*

(a) sent Person A an image of Service User 2, wearing a mankini when you knew Service User 2 was a minor at the time of sending the image; and/or

(b) in breach of confidentiality, told Person A that Service User 2 had raped a girl or used words to that effect.

2. Between April 2019 and August 2019, you breached professional boundaries with Service User 1, in that you:

- (a) sent Service User 1 text messages as set out at Schedule 1; and/or*
- (b) disclosed details Service User 1's case to members of your own family; and/or*
- (c) encouraged Service User 1's son, Child A, to speak to your son; and/or*
- (d) sent Service User 1 photographs and videos as set out in Schedule 2 ; and or*
- (e) gave Service User 1 reassurances about Child A's safeguarding concerns by:*
 - i. text messaging Service User 1 in respect of a report that "it's negative to read but you just gotta suck that up and prove them wrong" when there was a chance Child A would be removed or words to that effect; and/or*
 - ii. text messaging Service User 1 that "you struggle with your emotions due to all the crap you have been through" and that this is "not a criticism" or words to that effect; and/or*
 - iii. apologising to Service User 1 using text message that "the reports are geared up to be really negative" or words to that effect.*

Schedule 1

- a) "Been working from home...In the garden with my gorgeous boy";*
- b) "I'd rather be on an outing with you guys. Ok have fun";*
- c) "Put tissue in [your] bra so they stopped picking on [you] for being flat chested";*
- d) "[your] mum found [your] bra with tissue sellotaped to the inside one day and absolutely tormented [you] for it";*
- e) That you used to be called "flat Stanley"*
- f) that Jersey had "screwed [you] over", or words to that effect;*
- g) that you were "feeling really sad and missing Jersey";*
- h) told Service User 1 to "stop being a victim"*
- i) that [Jersey] "would have [you] hack in a heart beat but they need to make it possible rather than messing [you] and your family around"*
- j) responding to Service User 1 with "hun" or words to that effect;*

Schedule 2

- a) photographs of yourself; and/or*
- b) photographs of you and your son and/or daughter; and/or*
- c) a video showing your children and partner in a swimming pool;*

3. *Between 20 April 2021 and 2 June 2021, you did not comply with an Interim Conditions of Practice Order in that you:*

- (a) failed to inform your regulator that you started employment with Bradford City Council on 19 April 2021 within 7 days; and/or*
- (b) failed to provide your regulator with the end date of your previous role at Herefordshire Council and start date of your new role at Bradford City Council; and/or*
- (c) failed to nominate and/or obtain approval from Social Work England of a workplace Reporter at Bradford City Council in compliance with your Conditions of Practice Order; and/or*
- (d) failed to inform Bradford City Council of the Conditions in your Interim Conditions of Practice Order in place.*

4. *Between 19 April 2021 and 28 May 2021, you had two separate employment contracts with two different local authorities at the same time, namely Herefordshire Council and Bradford City Council, that affected and/or potentially affected your ability to practise safely.*

1.

5. *Your conduct in relation to paragraphs 3 and/or 4 above was dishonest in that:*

- a. you intended to conceal that you had two separate employment contracts at the same time from your regulator; and/or*
- b. on 13 May 2022, you informed Social Work England that Lynne Schofield of Bradford City Council [SAID] that you could not return to work as they were not aware of the conditions.*

6. *Between March 2020 and 2 June 2021, you failed to:*

2.

a. undertake statutory visits and/or core group meetings within the relevant timescales or at all, on the following cases:

- i. Family 1*
- ii. Family 2*
- iii. Family 3*
- iv. Family 4*
- v. Family 7*
- vi. Family 8*
- vii. Family 9*

b. Keep case records and/or tasks up to date, either adequately or at all, on the following cases:

- i. Family 1*
- ii. Family 2*
- iii. Family 3*
- iv. Family 4*
- v. Family 5*
- vi. Family 6*
- vii. Family 7*
- viii. Family 8*
- ix. Family 9*

7. *Between August 2020 and 28 May 2021, you failed to communicate with colleagues and/or service users and/or other professionals, either adequately or at all, in that:*

(a) on 28 August 2020, you were uncontactable; and/or

(b) you did not respond to emails or phone calls from Person B on 28 August 2020 and/or 1 September 2020 and/or between 13 April 2021 and 14 May 2021; and/or

- (c) on 16 April 2021, having informed Person B that you had broken down, you did not respond to a request from Person B to be kept updated on your absence so that they could monitor duty; and/or*
- (d) did not respond to further attempts of contact from Person B on 20 May 2021; and/or*
- (e) did not attend for duty work on 27 and/or 28 May 2021 and were unable to be contacted by Person B.*

Your actions in allegations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired as a result of your misconduct.

Admissions:

15. Rule 32c(i)(aa) Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the 'Rules') states:
Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved.
16. Following the reading of the allegations the panel chair asked Ms Young whether she admits any of the allegation.
17. Ms Young informed the panel that she admitted allegation 2a in relation to the messages included in Schedule 1 at a), f) and g), and allegation 4.
18. The panel therefore found allegations 2a (as detailed above) and 4 proved by way of Ms Young's admissions.
19. The panel noted that Ms Young denied allegations 1, 2b)-e), 3, 5, 6 and 7.
20. In line with Rule 32c(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel then went on to determine the disputed facts.

Background:

21. Social Work England received three referrals in respect of the Social Worker. These were as follows:
 - On 4 March 2020, from Lesley Darwin, Head of Case Management with the Government of Jersey and the Social Worker's previous employer.
 - On 22 July 2020, from Person A, a member of the public and formally a friend of the Social Worker. At the time of the alleged events, the Social Worker was working as a social worker for Warwickshire County Council.

- On 2 June 2021, from Katie Grayson-Purdy, a Case Review Officer at Social Work England. At the time of the alleged events, the Social Worker was working for Herefordshire/Bradford City Council.

Summary of evidence:

Person A

22. Person A gave evidence with the assistance of special measures granted at an earlier pre-trial hearing. As Ms Young was not represented, Special Counsel (Colette Renton) attended to ask questions on Ms Young's behalf.
23. [PRIVATE]
24. [PRIVATE]
25. [PRIVATE]
26. [PRIVATE]
27. [PRIVATE]
28. Person A gave evidence under affirmation and confirmed and adopted the contents of her witness statement. Person A was initially supported at the hearing by [PRIVATE]. However it quickly became apparent that this person was referred to in the witness statement of the social worker. The panel therefore raised the issue with the parties and it was agreed by consent that the witness would proceed to give her oral evidence without a supporter. She was content to do this. The panel heard that Person A and Ms Young had been very close friends but had not spoken since an incident in January 2017. Shortly before, on 16 January 2017, Person A alleged that she had had a telephone conversation with Ms Young in which she told her confidential information about an individual under the care of social services (Service User 2) who had raped or molested a 12 year old girl. During the conversation Ms Young sent Person A a photograph of Service User 2 dressed in a mankini because she found the image comical. Person A referred the panel to WhatsApp messages exhibited within her witness statement.
29. In cross examination, Person A denied that she had made the incident up and falsified the messages as part of a campaign of harassment which was calculated to "take down" Ms Young. Person A denied that she was motivated to do this because she believed Ms Young had disrespected her family and because she was jealous. She denied that inconsistencies in her account about the age of Service User 2 was evidence that she was "making it up as she went along". Person A said that she had decided to come forward because she believed she had a duty to and because it was the right thing to do.

Natalie Sanders

30. Natalie Sanders is a social worker and was Ms Young's Line Manager between November 2016 and December 2017, when she had been employed at Warwickshire Council as a

newly qualified social worker. Ms Sanders confirmed and adopted the contents of her witness statement.

31. In November 2020, Ms Sanders was contacted by Social Work England in relation to concerns that Ms Young had shared a photograph of a service user with a friend in January 2017 and had told her he had raped a child. She confirmed that the photograph was of a vulnerable service user (Service User 2) who would have been sixteen at the time the photograph was allegedly shared. Ms Sanders confirmed that Ms Young had been the allocated social worker for a young person (Service User 3) who had alleged that Service User 2 had raped them. Service User 3 would have been fourteen or fifteen at the time. This information was not in the public domain. There had been a strategy meeting to discuss the allegation on 17 January 2017, which the records showed Ms Young had attended. Ms Sanders told the panel that Ms Young would have been aware of Service User 2, and his age, and the fact he was a vulnerable service user, before the strategy meeting as there had been discussions about his relationship with Service User 3 before the allegation had been made.
32. Ms Sanders told the panel that the photograph of Service User 2 was not on the social services files but was on his public Facebook page. In her opinion this did not change the fact that if Ms Young had sent the photo to her friend this would amount to a significant breach of the standards, because in the context she could not think of any reason it could have been innocently shared.
33. In cross examination Ms Sanders reiterated that it had been an allegation of non-consensual sexual intercourse. She agreed that it was likely that Service User 2 had been moved from the care of the team Ms Young worked in, to the leaving care team, prior to her arrival. Ms Sanders said that she was not aware of a fake Facebook page used by the team and would be very concerned if that was the case. Ms Sanders agreed that there were often WhatsApp groups set up by teams of social workers but would be very concerned if the photograph of Service User 2 had been sent in that group.

Service User 1

34. Service User 1 gave evidence with the assistance of special measures granted at an earlier case management hearing and was accompanied at today's hearing by a supporter. As Ms Young was not represented, Special Counsel (Colette Renton) attended to ask questions on Ms Young's behalf. Ms Young had been Service User 1's son's allocated social worker between December 2018 and August 2019.
35. Service User 1 confirmed and adopted the contents her witness statement. Service User 1 had made a complaint about the Social Worker to her former employer alleging unprofessional behaviour. In oral evidence Service User 1 said that she thought Ms Young had been friendly and compassionate towards her, which was in contrast to the negative experience she had had with other social workers. She had not found any of the messages inappropriate. All of her interactions with Ms Young had been professional. The video of Ms Young's family had been on her WhatsApp "story" and had not been sent to Service User 1 directly. Service User 1 said that her evidence at the hearing was different to what had

been said in her witness statement because she had been scared that if she did not say what Jersey States expected her to say it might be held against her and she might lose her son.

36. In cross examination Service User 1 agreed that she had made a formal complaint about the way she had been treated by Jersey States but believed that Jersey States had used Ms Young as a scapegoat to avoid addressing the real issues.

Rebekah Shepherd

37. Rebekah Shepherd is a social worker and was Ms Young's team manager at Jersey States from January/February 2019. Ms Shepherd attended and gave evidence at the hearing. She confirmed and adopted the contents of her witness statement. She recalled that Ms Young had raised concerns with her at the time that Service User 1 was messaging her and "being needy". Rebekah Shepherd had told Ms Young not to answer her phone after core working hours and to keep all conversations brief.
38. Rebekah Shepherd had been shocked when Service User 1 had shown her the messages that Ms Young had sent. Ms Shepherd explained to the panel that although it is necessary to try and build positive relationships with service users it is very important that these do not become personal. The messages lacked appropriate transparency about the professional concerns.
39. In cross examination Ms Shepherd agreed that maintaining boundaries in relation to phone contact was made more difficult because it had been necessary at the time for social workers to use their personal phones for work. However, Ms Shepherd told the panel that it was each social worker's professional responsibility to maintain proper boundaries with service users.
40. When shown a picture and video Ms Shepherd confirmed that she had been aware Ms Young had sent Service User 1 a personal picture depicting herself and one of the her children and a video of her family, which she had been shocked to discover particularly as she had set out expectations in an earlier conversation with the social worker regarding professional boundaries.

Katie Grayson-Purdy

41. Katie Grayson-Purdy is a social worker and, at the relevant time, was a case review officer at Social Work England. Ms Grayson-Purdy attended the hearing and gave evidence. She confirmed and adopted the contents of her witness statement. Ms Grayson-Purdy was Ms Young's case review officer following a panel of adjudicators decision to impose an interim conditions of practice order on 11 January 2021. Her role was to provide guidance and ensure compliance. Mr Khan informed the panel that in light of the evidence provided last week, he would not be pursuing concerns in relation to condition 11 of Ms Young's interim conditions of practice order. The relevant conditions for the panel to consider were:

1. You must notify Social Work England within seven 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.

3a. 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.

42. Ms Grayson-Purdy accepted that the wording of condition 3 did not specify that a workplace reporter must be appointed before any work commenced but said that it was implied in the language and that the requirement had been communicated to Ms Young by email. Ms Grayson-Purdy accepted that Ms Young had sent her an email on 20 April 2021, which stated that Lynne Schofield had agreed to be her nominated workplace reporter for the new role at Bradford Social Services.
43. Ms Grayson-Purdy told the panel that this email was not sufficient to satisfy condition 1 or 3. The email did not inform Social Work England of the start date of her new role and did not provide sufficient information about Ms Schofield for a suitability assessment. Ms Grayson-Purdy took the panel to emails she had sent to Ms Young chasing this additional information on 20 April, 4 May and 25 May 2021. Ms Grayson-Purdy said that she was informed that Ms Young had already commenced the role at Bradford Social Services when she spoke to Ms Schofield on 1 June 2021. Ms Schofield informed her that Ms Young had been working with her since 19 April 2021. Ms Grayson-Purdy therefore formed the opinion that Ms Young had breached the conditions of her interim order.
44. Ms Grayson-Purdy took the panel to an email dated 2 June 2021 13:28 from Ms Young to her and Hannah Appleyard (the manager of the case review team), in which she was informed that Bradford City Council had terminated her contract because Ms Schofield did not wish to be a workplace reporter.
45. In cross examination, Ms Grayson-Purdy said that she felt she had fulfilled her role by providing Ms Young with the relevant information and had said that she should contact her if she needed more guidance on complying with the conditions. Ms Grayson-Purdy said that it was for Ms Young to provide the necessary information and not for her to chase the nominated workplace reporter. She confirmed that she followed the same process with all suitability assessments.

Deborah Morgan

46. Deborah Morgan is a registered social worker and, at the relevant time was a team manager at Herefordshire Council. She attended the hearing and gave evidence under affirmation. She confirmed and adopted the contents of her witness statement. Ms Young had been an agency worker within her team between March 2020 and May 2021. When Ms Young first joined the team Ms Morgan had been impressed and hoped that she would become a permanent member of the team. This had started to change in July 2020 when Ms Morgan's supervision records showed that there were concerns about Ms Young's level of communication with her. This issue continued and was raised in the monthly supervision

sessions between September 2020 and April 2021, as well as concerns about Ms Young missing statutory visits and meeting deadlines and delays in recording. Ms Morgan told the panel that as the situation did not get better both parties decided Ms Young would finish work at the end of May 2021.

47. Ms Morgan told the panel it was her expectation that Ms Young would continue to be responsible for her case load until 28 May 2021. However, she found it increasingly difficult to get in touch with her after 7 May 2021 culminating in no contact at all after 20 May 2021. On 28 May 2021, Ms Morgan received an update from the system support team regarding outstanding tasks on Ms Young's caseload. Ms Morgan realised that there were significant outstanding visits, meetings and assessments in relation to seven of Ms Young's cases. On 27 and 28 May 2021 Ms Young was supposed to have been on duty and therefore based in the main office but she did not attend and could not be contacted.
48. In cross examination Ms Morgan denied that she had had a conversation with Ms Young about her staying on at Herefordshire Council for a few extra weeks in order to complete some final pieces of work. Ms Morgan did not accept that she had been told by Ms Young that she would be starting a new role with another local authority at the end of April. Ms Morgan told the panel that she would not have allowed her contract with Herefordshire Council to have continued if she had known about the new role, as it would not be possible to undertake two social work jobs at the same time.

Claire Smith

49. Claire Smith is a registered social worker and, at the relevant time was a service manager at Bradford Social Services. She managed Lynne Schofield, who managed Ms Young between 20 April 2021 and 2 June 2021. She attended the hearing and gave evidence under affirmation. She confirmed and adopted the contents of her witness statements. Claire Smith confirmed that Ms Young was recruited as part of a "project team" of agency workers as Bradford Social Services were finding it difficult to recruit full time social workers. The expectation of this team was that they were experienced social workers who could "hit the ground running". Lynne Schofield, who had interviewed Ms Young, had told her that Ms Young had disclosed that she was currently under investigation by Social Work England but not that she was under any restrictions. Claire Smith also said that she would not have employed her if she had any restrictions as that would mean extra work for the management team. She would not have employed her if she had known she was also contracted to work elsewhere as the Bradford role was full time and required her full attention.
50. Claire Smith told the panel that there were also concerns that Ms Young had not undertaken statutory visits or kept her case records up to date in relation to some of her cases, in particular Service User 4 (Family 8) and Service User 5 (Family 9). Claire Smith took the panel to the relevant case notes and records.
51. In cross examination Claire Smith accepted that she would be surprised if there was evidence that showed Ms Young informing Ms Schofield about her interim conditions and/or asking her to be her workplace supervisor at the time she was employed. She

agreed that it would be normal practice for a social worker to finish off pieces of work for her previous employer after starting a new role. She would not find this a concern and would not expect to be told about it. It would be a concern if there were two different contracts of employment going on at the same time, with allocated service users for both.

Lynne Schofield

52. Lynne Schofield is a retired social worker but remains on the Social Work England register. She attended the hearing and gave evidence under affirmation. She confirmed and adopted the contents of her witness statement. At the relevant time she was a project team manager at Bradford City Council. Ms Schofield told the panel that she spoke with Ms Young shortly before she began her role as part of the project team and that Ms Young had informed her of her conditions. Ms Young had come to them via an agency, who she expected to have conducted their agency checks. Ms Schofield recalled Ms Young telling her that she was under investigation by Social Work England. Ms Schofield accepted email evidence that Ms Young had sent her details of the conditions on her practice on 20 April 2021. Ms Schofield accepted that Ms Young had requested further details from her to provide to Social Work England in order for Ms Schofield to become her work-place supervisor and had attached guidance on what the role involved, by email on 21 April 2021. Ms Schofield said that she had gone back to Social Work England to ask why they needed all her private details, but that they did not respond until 1 June 2021. Ms Schofield no longer had access to the records and could not assist the panel with any more details about the allegations of “poor performance”. This would have related to the completion of assessments and not Ms Young’s interaction with service users and families about which she did not have any concerns.
53. In cross examination Ms Schofield could not recall Ms Young starting later than 19 April 2021 due to an administrative issue, or a three-way conversation with Ms Young and Ms Grayson-Purdy at Social Work England or that she had told Ms Young on the telephone that Bradford City Council were ending her contract because it had not been aware of her conditions. Ms Schofield’s recollection was that she could not get hold of Ms Young so informed the employment agency.

Rhynne Young

54. Ms Young provided the panel with a witness statement. She took the affirmation and confirmed the truth of the contents of her statement.
55. Ms Young provided the panel with a witness statement. She took the affirmation and confirmed and adopted her statement as part of her evidence in chief.
56. In relation to allegation 1, Ms Young strenuously denied sending the image or disclosing confidential information to Person A. She told the panel that Person A had invented the story and falsified the screen shot as part of a campaign to hurt Ms Young after their friendship had ended. Ms Young said that Person A was not a trustworthy witness and highlighted the following inconsistencies in her evidence:

- At the relevant time Ms Young was not aware Service User 2 had allegedly raped a child so could not have shared this information.
- The photograph of Service User 2 was his Facebook profile image and was in the public domain, Ms Young had not sent it to Person A.
- The order and timing of the alleged WhatsApp messages do not make sense and related to an innocent conversation about a night out.
- The format of the photograph on the screenshot is not how such images appear in WhatsApp and had been faked by Person A.
- Person A's account of the information allegedly shared, had changed over time.

57. Ms Young denied knowing Service User 2's age or any details about him including that he was known to social services albeit that she heard 'chatter' in the office.

58. In relation to allegation 2:

- Ms Young agreed that in sending messages about her frustration with Jersey States she had crossed professional boundaries and had learned and reflected on this. In addition to previous admissions Ms Young accepted that the message in allegation 2a schedule 1 i) also breached professional boundaries.
- Ms Young accepted sending but denied that the messages at Allegation 2a, schedule 1 b), c), d), e), h) and j) and 2e breached professional boundaries. She explained that at the time it had been necessary for social workers to use their personal mobile phones for work purpose and that due to the international element of working in Jersey, WhatsApp was the preferred method of communication.
- She told the panel that she adapted her style of communication to suit individual service users and that she was trying to be positive and supportive and balance the negative aspects of the work with lighter, more "jokey" comments.
- The account Service User 1 had given in their oral evidence was correct as opposed to her written statement.
- Ms Young accepted sending a single photo of herself with her son to Service User 1.
- Ms Young denied sending a video to Service User 1 and explained that she had posted this video (which included footage of one of her children) on her WhatsApp "stories" which Service User 1 would have been able to access.
- Ms Young denied that she had disclosed details of Service User 1's case to members of her own family, other than to say in general terms that she had had a good day as she had taken a young boy home to his mummy.
- Ms Young denied that she had encouraged Service User 1's son, Child A, to speak to her own son. At most Child A might have babbled on in the background if her children had phoned when he was in the car.

59. In relation to allegation 3, Ms Young denied that she had breached her interim conditions of practice order and said that she had tried at all points to do what she needed to comply.

- She had informed Social Work England by email when she had been offered the new role with Bradford City Council and had not intentionally withheld details of her end date at Herefordshire or her start date with Bradford City Council. She had had a telephone conversation with Ms Grayson-Purdy and Ms Schofield on 20 April 2021. She did not see Ms Grayson-Purdy's email of 4 May 2021 requesting the information.
- Condition 3 did not say that she needed to have a new approved reporter in place before beginning a new role.
- It was not for Ms Grayson-Purdy to vary her conditions which were set by a panel (of adjudicators).
- Deborah Morgan had remained her nominated reporter at Herefordshire Council until she stopped work.
- She had nominated and provided Social Work England with Lynne Schofield's name and contact details on 20 April 2021. She believed she had told Lynne Schofield what was required of her and had assumed that she would be contacted if anything else was needed.
- At a subsequent interim review hearing a panel had agreed her interim conditions were vague and had amended the wording.

60. In relation to allegation 5:

- Ms Young strenuously denied that she had acted dishonestly. She told the panel that this was not something she had ever done and felt this was a serious slur on her character which was not supported by the evidence.
- At all times she had tried to comply with her conditions. She had no reason to lie and it would have been very foolish to do so as she knew all the parties were talking to each other.
- Ms Young said that she had been telling the truth when she reported to Social Work England her reasons for leaving Bradford City Council. Lynne Schofield had told her by telephone that she could not stay at the Council because of the conditions on her practice.
- Ms Young said that she had not been aware of any concerns about her work until this hearing. Ms Young said that this was supported by the evidence as the concerns about her work were not raised until after she had left Bradford City Council and were not shared with her.

61. In relation to allegation 6 (not subject to cross examination):

- Ms Young said that she had not been case holding at Herefordshire Council after 20 April 2021, so was not responsible for any missed deadlines after this date.
- Ms Young asserted that the impact of the pandemic made her role more difficult.
- Ms Young said that she had told Deborah Morgan that she had a new agency role so would be leaving.
- Deborah Morgan had asked Ms Young to complete a conference report and undertake a careful handover in relation to Family 1. She had agreed to work 2.5 days a week until the end of May to complete this specific work at the same time as beginning her new role at Bradford City Council.
- Ms Young told the panel that there had been a 'mosaic system' update justified to her leaving which caused delays in write ups.
- Ms Young accepted that sometimes there was a delay in writing up visits but that she is 100% confident that she always saw the children she was responsible for.

62. In relation to allegation 7 (not subject to cross examination):

- Ms Young denied that she had failed to adequately communicate with colleagues.
- If she had failed to respond to phone-calls and emails there would have been good reason, for example being on a visit or training.
- Ms Young told the panel that **[PRIVATE]** between 28 August 2020 and 1 September 2020 and had informed Deborah Morgan in advance.
- Ms Young told the panel that Deborah Morgan did make repeated attempts to contact her using many different methods.
- On 16 April 2021 she thinks her car had broken down and she assumes her phone battery died.
- Ms Young told the panel that after 20 May 2021 (and the contact with Ms Grayson-Purdy about the alleged breach of her conditions) she stopped speaking to anyone **[PRIVATE]**.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

63. Ms Young attended and engaged with the proceedings for the first nine days. On a number of occasions the panel allowed Ms Young time for childcare, health, work commitments and breaks. There was also at least one unexplained absence. Accordingly, Ms Young was warned that if she was absent and had not sought prior permission from the panel, then the panel may consider an application to proceed in her absence. On day nine, Ms Young gave evidence and Mr Khan cross examined her in relation to the first five allegations. Ms Young did not attend the hearing in the morning of day ten. Ms Young sent an email to Social

Work England to explain that she had found the process of cross examination difficult and expressed that she “*could not take another day of being treated like that*”. [PRIVATE].

64. The panel heard the submissions of Mr Khan on behalf of Social Work England. He drew the panel’s attention to the fact that the assessment appeared to be nearly a year old and was not produced for the purpose of this hearing. Mr Khan reminded the panel that Ms Young had not made any application for special measures, although she had been aware of the option as she had attended a previous case management hearing where these had been discussed and granted for some of the witnesses. Mr Khan submitted that Ms Young was clearly aware of the proceedings given her recent email and having attended for the previous nine days. There had been no application for an adjournment and as such it seemed unlikely that adjourning today’s proceedings would secure her attendance. Mr Khan further submitted that Ms Young had voluntarily absented herself and invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.
65. Mr Khan informed the panel that Ms Young had recently provided him with two statements from witnesses she intended to call to give evidence.
66. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering this application. This included reference to Rule 43 and 32 of the Rules and the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5*; *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. The panel also took into account Social Work England guidance ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’.
67. The panel considered all of the information before it, together with the submissions made by Mr Khan on behalf of Social Work England. The panel took into consideration the assessment Ms Young had provided and the fact that the cross-examination process is a difficult but necessary one. The panel felt that Mr Khan’s cross-examination so far had been thorough but fair.
68. The panel concluded that Ms Young had chosen voluntarily to absent herself in the full knowledge of the proceedings and an understanding of the potential consequence of not attending. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in her attendance. Having weighed the interests of Ms Young in regard to her attendance at the hearing with those of Social Work England and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing, the panel determined to proceed in Ms Young’s absence.
69. In the absence of Ms Young and her witnesses, the panel concluded that Ms Young had closed her case and requested to hear closing submissions from Mr Khan in relation to the facts.
70. Ms Young re-joined the hearing at 2pm and made the following submissions:
 - The hearing had not been conducted in a fair or lawful manner.
 - No attempts had been made to consider any reasonable adjustments she needed as a result of her [PRIVATE], which had been requested in February and June 2023. [PRIVATE]

- Mr Khan had been permitted to repeatedly make false accusations about her dishonesty.
- During her evidence she had repeatedly been interrupted and asked to slow down and/or answer the question.
- She had not had an opportunity to be heard or to call her witnesses.
- There had been a severe lack of communication from Social Work England about the hearing process and she had not been told in advance about the timings and structure of the hearing to allow her to plan and organise her time.
- Other witnesses had been afforded adjustments in light of their personal circumstances which she had not.
- She had not been given time during the hearing to deal with childcare issues, **[PRIVATE]** and her full-time work commitments.
- Mr Khan's cross examination had unlawfully discriminated against her.
- Ms Young provided evidence of emails to Social Work England where she provided a **[PRIVATE]** which had not been placed before this panel.

71. Ms Young requested that the hearing be stopped on the basis that it had been conducted in an unfair and unlawful manner. She intended to seek urgent legal advice on this issue. Ms Young also informed the panel that she had an urgent appointment that afternoon **[PRIVATE]**.

72. In the alternative Ms Young submitted that she should be entitled to restart her evidence from the beginning with the appropriate adjustments in place. The appropriate adjustments would be more regular breaks and protection from "interrogation style" questions in cross examination.

73. Mr Khan objected to the application. He advised the panel that Ms Young had made Social Work England aware of **[PRIVATE]** in September 2022 but had not consented to an independent assessment. The panel was provided with emails showing attempts to engage with Ms Young about what adjustments she would require. Mr Khan referred the panel to the guidance on Social Work England's website entitled "postponements and adjournments of fitness to practise hearings" and, in particular, part five of the guidance which states:

"In some cases, the social worker may note a stress-related illness as the reason for their application to delay the hearing. However, stress caused solely by the fitness to practise proceedings will usually not be enough to support an application. This is because the stress will recur when the hearing resumes [8]. This means an adjournment or postponement is unlikely to serve any useful purpose. The adjudicators or the regulator should instead consider what adjustments may be made to support engagement."

74. Mr Khan submitted that every effort had been made during the hearing and during his numerous meetings with Ms Young and the legal adviser to ensure that Ms Young understood each stage of the proceedings and understood the need to provide evidence in a timely fashion. At points during the hearing Ms Young had requested and had been granted short adjournments to allow for her other responsibilities. At no point during the hearing had Ms Young requested any other adjustments to support her engagement. Mr Khan submitted that Ms Young had been aware of her right to seek legal guidance or representation and had been given ample opportunity to introduce new evidence. It would not be appropriate to adjourn the proceedings now for these reasons nor to allow Ms Young to call witnesses to the facts at this stage.
75. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in respect of the approach to take in deciding whether to adjourn and/or allow Ms Young to “restart” her evidence. The legal adviser provided advice as per the guidance on adjournments already referred to on Social Work England’s website and *Forresters Ketley v Brent & Another [2012] EWCA Civ 324*. The panel were reminded that they needed to balance the rights of Ms Young and the impact any adjournment would have on the overarching objective of public protection, including the need to deal with matters expeditiously. On the second application, whether to allow Ms Young to start her evidence again and call witnesses, the panel were referred to *TZ v General Medical Council [2015] EWHC 1001 (Admin)* which provided that before a factual decision is announced further evidence can be admitted should the panel find it fair to do so in accordance with Fitness to Practise Rule 32.
76. The panel retired to consider the applications. In reaching its decision the panel carefully considered the email correspondence between Ms Young and Social Work England in advance of the hearing. The panel noted that the assessment Ms Young had sent to Social Work England gave details of modifications that could be made in a workplace and did not appear relevant to the conduct of a hearing. The panel was satisfied that Ms Young had been told in writing that she could apply for special measures and asked what reasonable adjustments she wanted in place, but had not seen a response. The panel had sight of emails from Ms Young to Social Work England which stated Ms Young wanted to choose how she would present medical evidence as part of her own bundle.
77. The panel was satisfied that Mr Khan had conducted his cross examination in a fair and even manner. Ms Young might not like questions about alleged dishonesty, but this was an allegation before the panel and it was therefore proper that the questions be asked. The panel was satisfied that Ms Young had demonstrated an ability to self-advocate on numerous occasions during the hearing, but had not requested any specific adjustments **[PRIVATE]**. The panel was also satisfied that Ms Young had the opportunity to instruct a lawyer in advance of the hearing, but had chosen not to do so. The panel was satisfied that Ms Young had been given ample opportunities and reminders to submit all of the evidence she wanted the panel to consider. The panel appreciated that at various times during the hearing time had been given to allow Mr Khan and the legal adviser to assist Ms Young of her understanding of the hearing process and her rights within it. The panel was mindful of its overarching objective to protect the public and did not find that it was necessary or

proportionate to allow Ms Young to start her evidence again, or admit new evidence for this stage. The panel therefore rejected Ms Young's application.

78. The Panel went on to consider the final submissions on the facts from Mr Khan and Ms Young in written and oral form.

Finding and reasons on facts:

79. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in respect of the approach to take in making findings of facts and the burden and standard of proof. The burden of proof rests on Social Work England and it is for Social Work England to prove each of the allegations.
80. The legal adviser provided advice on the issues of credibility and reliability, as per the guidance in R (Dutta) v GMC [2020] EWHC 1974 (Admin) and hearsay. Advice was also given in relation to Ms Young being a person of good character who had no previous regulatory concerns found against her.

1. On 16 January 2017, you

(a) sent Person A an image of Service User 2, a service user, wearing a mankini when you knew

Service User 2 was a minor at the time of sending the image;

81. The panel found this allegation proved. The panel accepted the legal advice on issues of credibility and reliability as per the guidance in R (Dutta) and were mindful that the alleged telephone conversation and messages were said to have taken place a significant period of six years ago.
82. The panel accepted Mr Khan's submission that the motivation behind Person A reporting the issue to Social Work England was not relevant to its consideration of the facts, other than to the extent it supported Ms Young's account that the whole incident had been fabricated in order to cause her harm.
83. The panel considered whether the accounts given were plausible and consistent with the objectively verifiable evidence, including evidence of what the parties had said on previous occasions and other known or probable facts. The panel noted that Ms Young had been very clear in her evidence to it during the course of the hearing that she had not sent the image to Person A. However, when Social Work England had first described the image of Service User 2 to Ms Young on 24 November 2020, Ms Young had said:

"I know what picture you are talking about. That is not a young boy. He was either 18 or 19 years old. A colleague had sent it to me from his Facebook profile picture. I know it was totally inappropriate to share that but he is certainly not a child."

84. In addition, in previous written submissions Ms Young had stated that;

"There is a possibility that I may have forwarded this image as a funny picture. However, this is extremely unlikely. It is not something I have ever done before or since. If I did send the image, it was through a lack of experience and some naivety."

And

"I fully agree that sharing a photo with her was stupid and thoughtless but this was a one off incident that did not come from any place from myself other than momentous stupidity albeit with serious implications and consequences."

85. The panel was satisfied, on the basis of Ms Young's own accounts and the evidence of Natalie Sanders, that Service User 2 had been an individual known to Ms Young in her professional capacity and that he would have been at the forefront of her mind, on and around 16 January 2017 because of an upcoming strategy meeting concerning Service User 3 who Ms Young was the allocated social worker for, which had been convened due to concerns about her ongoing inappropriate relationship with Service User 2. The panel was also satisfied, based on Ms Young's evidence, that she had been in possession of the image of Service User 2 on or around January 2017.
86. The panel carefully considered Ms Young's assertion that the screenshot had been fabricated by Person A and her submissions that Person A's telephone had not been independently interrogated. However, the panel concluded that there was no logical explanation on the available evidence, that explained how Person A knew that Service User 2 was linked to Ms Young at the relevant time, other than if Ms Young had told her, in the manner alleged. Nor was there any logical explanation on the available evidence to explain how Person A could have known that that image of Service User 2 had been shared with Ms Young at work, other than if Ms Young had shared it with her, in the manner alleged.
87. The panel accepted the evidence of Natalie Sanders that Ms Young would have been aware that Service User 2 was a minor at the time of her involvement. The panel also accepted Ms Young's written statement which had been provided as part of her evidence in chief, in which she referred to her supervision session on 9 December 2016 which discussed *"Service User 3 is in a relationship with a peer called Service User 2 who is 17 years old ... and a care leaver"*.

(b) in breach of confidentiality, told Person A that Service User 2 had raped a girl or used words to that effect.

88. The panel found this allegation proved. The panel accepted the evidence of Natalie Sanders, that in January 2016 as a result of her role as the allocated social worker for Person A's girlfriend, Ms Young would have been aware that the police were investigating Service User 2 in relation to an allegation of rape. The panel found that as a qualified social worker, Ms Young would have known that this evidence was highly confidential.
89. The panel noted that in her written response to Social Work England dated 27 November 2020, Ms Young had said;

“I was an ASYE and admittedly, I do believe I might have spoken generally about what was going on at work. At that time social work was all new and interesting, and if I am honest, all consuming ... [Person A] was my best friend and I may have had general conversations about what sort of work I was doing but I do not recall sharing detailed information about anything I was working on”.

90. The panel carefully considered Ms Young’s assertion that Person A was making up this allegation to cause her harm. However, the panel could find no plausible reason to explain how Person A had been able to triangulate the image of Service User 2 (which had been in Ms Young’s possession), Ms Young’s involvement in a related case at the relevant time and the confidential information about the police concerns unless Ms Young had told her. Whilst there was information in the public domain in relation to Service User 2 before Person A had made the allegation, the panel found that this would have been insufficient to make the link between Person A and Service User 2.

2. Between April 2019 and August 2019, you breached professional boundaries with Service User 1, in that you:

(a) sent Service User 1 text messages as set out at Schedule 1; and/or

91. Ms Young admitted sending the messages. The panel went on to consider whether, by sending the messages, Ms Young had breached professional boundaries. The panel found allegation 2a proved by way of admission in relation to messages a), f) and g) of schedule 1. In relation to message i), the panel found the allegation proved by way of Ms Young’s admissions during her evidence. For the reasons set out below, the panel found that Social Work England proved that messages b), c), d), e) and j) also breached professional boundaries.
92. The panel accepted the evidence of Rebekah Shepherd in relation to the background and complexities of Service User 1’s case. The panel accepted that Ms Young had sought assistance and advice from Rebekah Shepherd about the level of contact she was receiving from Service User 1. The panel accepted that Ms Young’s situation was made more difficult by the need to use her personal telephone to contact and be contacted by service users during her time at Jersey States because she had not been provided with a functioning work telephone. The panel agreed that because this was her personal phone it would have been difficult for Ms Young to follow Rebekah Shepherd’s advice to turn it off after work. However, regardless of the challenging circumstances Ms Young remained responsible for maintaining proper professional boundaries by communicating with service users in a professional manner and at appropriate times.
93. The panel carefully considered the evidence of Service User 1 and found that as a result of the stark contradictions between her written and oral statements it could apply little to no weight to her evidence. In any event, the panel concluded that a service user may not be best placed to understand the standards in relation to the professional boundaries and

expectations between a social worker and service users or form an opinion as to whether those boundaries had been crossed.

b. "I'd rather be on an outing with you guys. Ok have fun"

94. The panel found this part of allegation 2a proved. This message should not have been sent to a service user and went beyond being "friendly" and was more akin to a message sent between friends. The message diminished the professional role Ms Young was undertaking as the allocated Social Worker for Service User 1's child, by implying that their contact and engagement was something Ms Young looked forward to and enjoyed.

c. "Put tissue in [your] bra so they stopped picking on [you] for being flat chested";

d. "[your] mum found [your] bra with tissue sellotaped to the inside one day and absolutely tormented [you] for it";

e. "That you used to be called "flat Stanley"

95. The panel found this part of allegation 2a proved. The messages c), d) and e) were overly personal to Ms Young and that the information was not appropriate to share with a service user. These messages went far beyond being friendly and were more akin to messages which might be sent to a close friend.

f. "stop being a victim"

96. The panel found this part of allegation 2a proved. This message was poorly worded and together with the time it was sent (19.42) was not an appropriate way to communicate with a service user.

j. responded to Service User 1 with "hun" or words to that effect.

97. The panel found this part of allegation 2a proved. The panel carefully considered the extent of the messages between Ms Young and Service User 1 and concluded that the use of the term "hun" in the context of those messages and the fact that many were sent outside standard working hours was inappropriate and contributed to the blurring of the professional boundaries.

2(b) disclosed details Service User 1's case to members of your own family; and/or

98. The panel found this allegation proved by reference to a text message within the bundle of exhibits which was sent by Ms Young to Service User 1 at 23.24 on 12 July 2019:

"Was just telling my kids about [Child A]. They are crying now too."

99. The panel are aware from the context of this message and the evidence of Ms Young, that at the time this message had been sent, Child A had recently returned to the care of Service User 1 having been placed in foster care. Ms Young accepted that she had shared this

information with her children, including that there had been a “welcome home banner”. The panel found it likely that in order for her children to cry, case specific information would have been shared. In any event Child A returning to his mother from foster care was key private information about the case which should not have been discussed with members of Ms Young’s family and that by doing so Ms Young had breached professional boundaries.

(c) encouraged Service User 1’s son, Child A, to speak to your son; and/or

100. The panel found this allegation not proved. For the reasons set out above, the panel did not find Service User 1 a reliable witness. The panel found that Social Work England had not provided any independent, objectively verifiable evidence that Ms Young had encouraged Child A to speak to her son.

(d) sent Service User 1 photographs and videos as set out in Schedule 2;

101. The panel considered each element included in Schedule 2 separately and found this allegation part proved for the reasons set out below.

a. Photographs of yourself;

102. The panel found this part of allegation 2(d) not proved. For the reasons set out above, the panel did not find Service User 1 a reliable witness. The panel found that Social Work England had not provided any independent, objectively verifiable evidence that Ms Young had sent Service User 1 photographs of herself (other than the image referred to at b. below which was accompanied by text messages providing the relevant context).

b. photographs of you and your son and/or daughter

103. The panel found this part of allegation 2(d) proved. The panel had sight of a redacted image which Ms Young accepted was a photograph of herself and her son which had been sent to Service User 1. The sending of this image is referenced as 25/07/2019 20.07 – Karin2: [media omitted] within the transcript of messages. The panel found that additional media images were sent, also recorded as [media omitted] and were able to infer from their context as part of discussions about Ms Young’s son and family life that those images were more likely than not photographs subject to the allegation.
104. The panel concluded that it was not appropriate for the social worker to share personal photographs of themselves and their children with the Service User and that this amounted to “over-sharing” personal information which crossed a professional boundary.

c. a video showing your children and partner in a swimming pool;

105. The panel found this part of allegation 2 (d) proved. The panel have seen a video of Ms Young’s partner and two children in a swimming pool. Ms Young accepted that she uploaded the video to her “WhatsApp stories” but denied sending the image to Service User 1 directly. Whilst Ms Young maintained that the video had been shared via her WhatsApp story rather than in a message, the panel found that in light of the [media omitted] entries

in the message trail, it was more likely than not that this video had been shared as a WhatsApp message.

106. Ms Young told the panel that only one of the children in the video was her child. The panel decided that there would be no material difference in the substance of the allegation if one or both children were biologically Ms Young's. If the female child was not part of Ms Young's family this would only increase the panel's concern about the image being shared with a service user.
107. The panel concluded that sending personal videos of family members and/or friends to the Service User amounted to "over-sharing" personal information and crossed professional boundaries.

(e) gave Service User 1 reassurances about Child A's safeguarding concerns by:

- i. **text messaging Service User 1 in respect of a report that "it's negative to read but you just gotta suck that up and prove them wrong" when there was a chance Child A would be removed or words to that effect; and/or**
- ii. **text messaging Service User 1 that "you struggle with your emotions due to all the crap you have been through" and that this is "not a criticism" or words to that effect; and/or**
- iii. **apologising to Service User 1 using text message that "the reports are geared up to be really negative" or words to that effect.**

108. The panel found allegation 2e proved in its entirety. The panel considered each of these messages in the context of the evidence Rebekah Shepherd had provided about Service User 1's case. The panel accepted Rebekah Shepherd's evidence that at the time the messages were sent Ms Young and other professionals had real safeguarding concerns about Child A remaining in Service User 1's care. The panel found that these messages were at odds with those concerns and that by sending these messages Ms Young had not been upfront and open with Service User 1. By reassuring Service User 1 in this way, Ms Young had acted as more of a friend than a professional involved in the protection of Child A and had crossed professional boundaries. In addition the panel were concerned that all of the messages were sent outside core working hours, in particular the message at iii) which was sent at 22.14.

3. Between 20 April 2021 and 2 June 2021, you did not comply with an Interim Conditions of Practice Order in that you:

(a) failed to inform your regulator that you started employment with Bradford City Council on 19 April 2021 within 7 days;

109. The panel found this allegation proved. Condition 1 required Ms Young to “*notify Social Work England within seven day of any professional appointment you accept*”. The panel carefully considered the email evidence between Ms Young and Katie Grayson-Purdy, in particular the email on 19 April 2021 in which Ms Young informed Katie Grayson-Purdy that she had been offered a new role and the email on 20 April 2021 in which Ms Young informed Katie Grayson-Purdy that her nominated reporter was Lynne Schofield and provided her contact details at Bradford City Council. However, despite specific requests from Katie Grayson-Purdy on 19 April 2021, 4 May 2021, 25 May 2021 and 27 May 2021 for information about the start date of her new role, Ms Young did not provide Social Work England with the information.

3 (b) failed to provide your regulator with the end date of your previous role at Herefordshire Council and start date of your new role at Bradford City Council; and/or

110. The panel found this allegation not proved. The panel have carefully considered the wording of the conditions of practice order. Although it would have expected Ms Young to share the end date of her role at Bradford City Council with Social Work England in order to facilitate the oversight of the other conditions, the panel are not satisfied that Social Work England have proved that by failing to do so Ms Young had breached her conditions.

3 (c) failed to nominate and/or obtain approval from Social Work England of a workplace Reporter at Bradford City Council in compliance with your Conditions of Practice Order; and/or

111. The panel found this allegation proved. Condition 3 of the interim Conditions of Practice Order stated that “*at any time you are providing social work services ... you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England*”.
112. The panel was satisfied that by sending the email dated 20 April 2021 in which she nominated Lynne Schofield as her workplace reporter, Ms Young had complied with the first part of the condition. However, the panel found that Ms Young failed to provide Social Work England with the necessary information to allow for Lynne Schofield to be approved.
113. The panel did not accept that it was Katie Grayson-Purdy’s responsibility to chase Ms Young or Lynne Schofield for the information. Ms Young was responsible for complying with the conditions. The panel noted that Katie Grayson-Purdy had requested the additional information on 21 April 2021, 4 May 2021 and 25 May 2021.
114. The panel considered the evidence Ms Young provided about the process she had undertaken when Deborah Morgan had been approved as her previous workplace reporter. The panel noted that on that occasion Ms Young had clearly been aware that her nominated reported needed to be approved before she undertook any work as a social worker and had

personally ensured all the relevant information was available for the assessment to take place.

115. The panel did not accept Ms Young's account that she remained compliant with the condition after she had started work at Bradford City Council because Deborah Morgan remained her workplace reporter at Herefordshire Council until she had submitted her outstanding report. The panel found that this interpretation of the condition was illogical. The purpose of the condition was to monitor Ms Young's work. Deborah Morgan would not have been able to monitor Ms Young's work at Bradford City Council as she did not work there. As a qualified social worker, this would have been apparent to Ms Young.

3 (d) failed to inform Bradford City Council of the Conditions in your Interim Conditions of Practice Order in place.

116. Mr Khan offered no evidence in relation to this allegation. The panel therefore found it not proved.

4. Between 19 April 2021 and 28 May 2021, you had two separate employment contracts with two different local authorities at the same time, namely Herefordshire Council and Bradford City Council, that affected and/or potentially affected your ability to practise safely.

117. The panel finds this allegation proved by reason of admission.

5. Your conduct in relation to paragraphs 3 and/or 4 above was dishonest in that:

(a) you intended to conceal that you had two separate employment contracts at the same time from your regulator;

118. The panel found this allegation proved. The panel approached this allegation in accordance with the guidance set out in /vey. It noted that Ms Young admitted that she had two separate employment contracts with two different local authorities at the same time. The panel carefully considered the email communication between Ms Young and Social Work England during this period and decided that Ms Young had not informed her regulator about this situation.
119. The panel went on to consider why Ms Young had omitted to provide Social Work England with this information and whether this had been an act of deliberate concealment. Ms Young told the panel that she had not deliberately concealed any information and had tried very hard to engage with Social Work England throughout a process that she had found very difficult and stressful.

120. The panel gave careful thought to whether there was an innocent, careless or negligent explanation for Ms Young's omission. The panel rejected this explanation as less than probable for the following reasons:
- Deborah Morgan, Lynne Schofield, Claire Smith and Katie Grayson-Purdy were consistent in their evidence that Ms Young had not informed them that she had two separate contracts of employment with different authorities at the same time.
 - Katie Grayson-Purdy had written to Ms Young on 19 April, 20 April, 4 May, 25 May and 27 May 2021 and requested further information including her contract end date at Herefordshire Council and her contract start date at Bradford City Council. Despite this, Ms Young had not provided this information.
 - Ms Young was aware that Social Work England needed to maintain oversight of her work as a social worker during this time. The panel found that it was implausible that Ms Young would not have realised that this was relevant information necessary to allow her regulator to comply with its duty.
 - Although a slight delay in providing the information might have been explained by a genuine error or oversight, the panel did not find that this remained plausible for the six-week period.
 - The panel found that there was a benefit to Ms Young in concealing this information thereby allowing her to undertake both roles.
121. The panel concluded that ordinary decent people would think that by concealing the fact she had two separate employment contracts from her regulator at a time when she was subject to interim conditions of practice at a time when her regulator was actively enquiring into her employment status, Ms Young had acted dishonestly.
- (b) on 13 May 2022, you informed Social Work England that Lynne Schofield of Bradford City Council SAID that you could not return to work as they were not aware of the conditions.**
122. The panel found this allegation not proved. The panel approached this allegation in accordance with the guidance set out in /vey and found that there was a likely innocent explanation for Ms Young's comment to Social Work England about her reasons for not returning to Bradford City Council.
123. The panel considered the contents of Lynne Schofield's evidence and found, given the passage of time since the incident and the fact that she no longer had access to the records, she was unclear about what had been said to Ms Young about the reasons for asking her to leave and when. The panel considered whether Social Work England had provided objectively verifiable information that proved Ms Young had been informed about Bradford City Council's concerns regarding the standard of her work in addition to the concerns about her conditions. The panel could find no evidence that Ms Young had been informed.

6. Between March 2020 and 2 June 2021, you failed to:

(a)undertake statutory visits and/or core group meetings within the relevant timescales or at all, on the following cases:

124. The panel found allegation 6 a) and b) proved.
125. Before approaching each of the cases individually, the panel considered the general circumstances of Ms Young's employment at the time and the conflict between the evidence given by Ms Young and Deborah Morgan (her manager at Herefordshire Council) and Lynne Schofield/Claire Smith (her managers at Bradford City Council). The panel noted that most of the failures alleged were said to have taken place between 20 April 2021 and 28 May 2021. The panel accepted that in order to consider whether Ms Young had failed in the manner alleged, it needed to first decide if Ms Young had been professionally responsible for the tasks (in Herefordshire Council with regard to families 1 to 7 and in Bradford City Council with regard to families 8 and 9).
126. Ms Young told the panel throughout her evidence that after 20 April 2021, she was no longer case holding for Herefordshire Council as she had begun her new contract at Bradford City Council. Ms Young said that she had agreed with Deborah Morgan that she would work for two and a half days a week to finish key pieces of work only, primarily for Family 1. Ms Young told the panel that Deborah Morgan was aware that she was leaving to start a new contract with Bradford City Council and so would not be available to undertake statutory visits and/or core group meetings in Herefordshire after 20 April 2021.
127. Deborah Morgan told the panel that she fully expected Ms Young to continue with her professional duties to the service users on her caseload up until 28 May 2021, when her contract with Herefordshire Council ended. Deborah Morgan said that she was not aware Ms Young had started a new contract at Bradford City Council on or around 20 April 2021 and would not have agreed to this if she had known. The panel found that Deborah Morgan had expressed genuine surprise at the suggestion Ms Young had been working full time elsewhere after 20 April 2021. The panel decided that her evidence was plausible and consistent with the documentary evidence. In particular the numerous attempts Deborah Morgan had made to contact Ms Young after 20 April 2021 to find out where she was and chase the outstanding work, the evidence that she remained the allocated social worker on the case records and the diary entries which showed that Ms Young was expected to attend supervisions sessions and act as the duty social worker up to and including 28 May 2021.
128. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Young remained the allocated social worker and was responsible for the families on her caseload at Herefordshire Council after 20 April 2021.

The panel accepted the evidence of Deborah Morgan that Ms Young's professional responsibilities included:

- undertaking statutory visits every 28 days for children subject to a Child Protection Plan / Child In Need Plan;
- organising and attending core group meetings on a monthly basis;
- the maintenance of case records and keeping the tasks up to date; and
- participating in the duty rota.

129. The panel have had careful regard to the case records for each of the Families (i – vii) and are content that the allegations are supported by the contemporaneous documents. The panel therefore accepted the evidence of Deborah Morgan and Claire Smith in relation to these allegations.

*i. **Family 1***

130. The panel found that Ms Young was the allocated social worker for the children in this family between 17 March 2020 until 28 May 2021. The children were subject to a Child Protection Plan and visits needed to be every 28 days. The children had been visited on 25 March 2021, with another visit on 22 April 2021. The panel found that despite being reminded by Deborah Morgan on 18 and 25 May 2021, Ms Young failed to undertake a statutory visit with this family before 20 May 2021, in the relevant time frame.

*ii. **Family 2***

131. The panel found that Ms Young was the allocated social worker to these children between 25 January and 28 May 2021. The children were on a Child Protection Plan and visits needed to be every 28 days. The panel found that Ms Young was due to visit one of the children on 6 May 2021 and had seen an email to confirm this. The children were not visited until 7 May 2021, in the relevant time frame.

*iii. **Family 3***

132. The panel found that Ms Young was the allocated social worker between 25 January 2021 and 28 May 2021 and the children were subject to a Child Protection Plan. Core group meetings were required for this family every 28 days. Ms Young failed to organise or attend a core group meeting until 23 April 2021, which was outside of the relevant time frame.

*iv. **Family 4***

133. The panel found that Ms Young was the allocated social worker between 13 March 2021 and 28 May 2021. The children were subject to a Child Protection Plan and should have been visited every 28 days. The panel found that despite being reminded by Deborah Morgan on 12 May 2021, Ms Young failed to undertake a statutory visit within that timeframe.

134. The panel found that a core group meeting should have taken place within 10 days of the Review Conference on 31 March 2021. Ms Young was responsible for organising and attending the Core Group Meeting. The panel could find no evidence that a Core Group Meeting had happened.

v. Family 7

135. The panel found that Ms Young was the allocated social worker between 12 March and 28 May 2021. There are no records of the statutory Child in Need visits being completed during the period of allocation within the relevant time frame. In oral evidence Deborah Morgan confirmed that there was no Core Group Meeting in May meaning Ms Young had failed to adhere to the relevant time frame.

vi. Family 8

136. The panel found that Ms Young was allocated to this case by Bradford City Council on 26 April 2021. Ms Young should have undertaken a statutory Child In Need visit by 10 May 2021. Ms Young did not visit the child until 20 May 2021, which was outside of the relevant time frame.

vii. Family 9

137. The panel were satisfied that this was a looked after child subject to child in care proceedings and that Ms Young was allocated to their case on 21 April 2021 and carried out a statutory visit on 29 April 2021. A statutory visit was required every 28 days and the next visit was due by 27 May 2021. The panel accepted the evidence of Claire Smith that Ms Young did not undertake the following statutory visit meaning the relevant time frame was not adhered to.

(b) Keep case records and/or tasks up to date, either adequately or at all, on the following cases:

138. The panel accepted the evidence of Deborah Morgan that there was an expectation that social workers should record Child Protection visits within 24 hours and other visits within 48 hours. The panel accepted that Ms Young would have been aware of these expectations and the reasons behind them.

i. Family 1

139. The panel found that Ms Young had undertaken a Child Protection visit to the family on 3 March 2021 but that the record of the visit was not completed until 7 March 2021. The panel found that Ms Young visited the family on 25 March 2021 but that the record of the

visit was not completed until 5 April 2021. Additionally, within the email from Systems support, the following tasks were also noted as outstanding:

- Core Group Meeting;
- Chronology Report;
- Report to Conference;

ii. Family 2

140. The panel found that Ms Young had undertaken a Child Protection visit to the family on 18 February 2021 but that a record was not completed until 1 March 2021. Ms Young also visited the family on 11 March 2021 but a record of the statutory Child Protection visit was not completed until 19 March 2021. Ms Young visited the family on 7 May 2021 but a record of the statutory Child Protection visit was not completed until 9 May 2021. Additionally, within the email from Systems Support, the following tasks were noted as outstanding

- Review Child Protection Conference;
- Report to Conference;
- Graded Care Profile 2 Assessment;

iii. Family 3

141. The panel found that Ms Young had undertaken a child protection visit with the family on 2 February 2021. The record of the Statutory Child Protection Visit was typed on 8 February 2021. One of the children was visited on 5 March 2021, but this record of the Statutory Child Protection Visit was not written up until 7 March 2021. Ms Young visited the family on 18 March 2021 but the record of the Statutory Child Protection Visit was not written up until 23 March 2021. Another visit occurred on 25 March 2021 and this was not recorded until 6 April 2021. The Social Worker visited the family on 7 May 2021 but the record of the Statutory Child Protection visit was not finalised until 9 May 2021.

iv. Family 4

142. The panel found that Ms Young had been allocated to the children on 13 March 2021 until 28 May 2021. The tasks noted by System Support as outstanding included;

- Report to Conference
- Record of Statutory Child Protection Visit
- Core Group Meeting notes
- Chronology Report

- There was no recorded evidence of Core Group Meetings having taken place. The last Core Group Meeting took place on 31 March 2021 but Ms Young had not written up the meeting notes.

v. Family 5

143. The panel found that Ms Young had undertaken a Child Protection visit with the family on 18 March 2021 but that the record of the visit was not completed until 5 April 2021. Ms Young visited the family on 19 March 2021 but the record was not completed until 24 March 2021 which was not adequate. Ms Young visited the family on 15 April 2021 but the record was not completed until 21 April 2021 which was not adequate.

vi. Family 6

144. The panel found that this child was subject to a Child Protection Plan until 24 February 2020, when care proceedings were issued and a supervision order was obtained. The panel was satisfied that Ms Young had been asked on 25 August 2020 by the Council's Solicitor, to complete a statement in relation to the child's mother, and was chased on 14 and 15 September and 7 October 2020 before the updated position statement was provided on 8 October 2020 which was not adequate.

vii. Family 7

145. The panel was satisfied that Ms Young was responsible for a Child and Family Assessment and Plan Review which were supposed to be completed prior to 20 April 2021, when the next core group meeting was scheduled. There were no records of this being completed and the meeting had to be cancelled. Ms Young was also responsible for the minutes for the Child in Need Meeting dated 24 March 2021 which were not recorded.

viii. Family 8

146. The panel was satisfied that Ms Young was allocated to this child on 26 April 2021. An assessment was due on this case on 18 May 2021. A Child and Family assessment was generated, but this was blank. It was then completed by another social worker after Ms Young left in June 2021.

ix. Family 9

147. The panel was satisfied that Ms Young had been informed during supervision on 4 May 2021, that she needed to have a "*discussion with legal to get update of expectations and understanding of the case*" by 14 May 2021. A Parenting Assessment was also due in June 2021. There was no evidence that Ms Young had taken any steps to begin either task before she left Bradford City Council.

7. Between August 2020 and 28 May 2021, you failed to communicate with colleagues and/or service users and/or other professionals, either adequately or at all, in that:

(a) on 28 August 2020, you were uncontactable; and/or

148. The panel found this allegation proved. It accepted the evidence of Deborah Morgan, which was consistent with the contemporaneous email and telephone evidence, that on 28 August 2020, she had asked Ms Young to “call me or email me urgently” as she needed to know whether she was getting a Parenting Assessment on a case or not. Within this email, Deborah Morgan stated that *“your phone is off and I am unable to contact you”*.
149. The panel considered Ms Young’s explanation that she had not been at work that day [PRIVATE]. The panel found Deborah Morgan’s account, that she had not been made aware of this, was supported by the evidence of her actions on the day. The panel found that Deborah Morgan would not have tried to contact Ms Young multiple times if it was known to her that [PRIVATE]. The panel accepted that it was Ms Young’s responsibility to ensure that her team and manager were aware of any times she was not available to work which she failed to do.

7. (b) you did not respond to emails or phone calls from Person B on 28 August 2020 and/or 1 September 2020 and/or between 13 April 2021 and 14 May 2021; and/or

150. The panel found this allegation proved. It accepted the evidence of Deborah Morgan which was consistent with the contemporaneous evidence that on 1 September 2020, she had asked Ms Young if she could please ring me “urgently”. She had then separately forwarded an email to Ms Young confirming that Child Protection Visits were outstanding for four families.
151. Ms Young had told the panel that she was not at work on 1 September 2021 [PRIVATE]. The panel adopted the reasons for their decision in relation to allegation 7a).
152. The panel accepted that between 13 April and 14 May 2021, Deborah Morgan tried to call Ms Young twelve times (four of which occurred on 11 May 2021) on [PRIVATE] by reference to the call log. This was because Deborah Morgan *“felt that the Social Worker was not logging in and [she] needed to ask her why she was not in work and when they would be coming back”*. The panel found that this evidence was consistent with Ms Young’s explanation that between April and May 2021 she was undertaking work for both Herefordshire Council and Bradford City Council.

(c) on 16 April 2021, having informed Person B that you had broken down, you did not respond to a request from Person B to be kept updated on your absence so that they could monitor duty; and/or

153. The panel found this allegation proved. It accepted Deborah Morgan’s evidence which was consistent with the contemporaneous evidence that on 16 April 2021 she had sent a text to Ms Young which said *“can you keep me posted so I can monitor duty”*, following notification that she had broken down. At 16:39, Deborah Morgan texted you again to say *“Hi Rin, I haven’t heard from you as I’d asked. You also haven’t been logged in as far as I am able to ascertain so duty has not been covered as I’d have wanted. Can you let me know you’re safe”*.

154. The panel found that if she had been unable to attend work, it remained Ms Young's responsibility to keep in touch with her manager and to ensure her professional responsibilities were being covered.

(d) did not respond to further attempts of contact from Person B on 20 May 2021; and/or

155. The panel found this allegation proved. The panel accepted the evidence of Deborah Morgan which was consistent with the contemporaneous evidence. On 20 May 2021, Deborah Morgan texted Ms Young to ask her if she was in "*Hereford today...families are trying to make contact with you and aren't able to*" and received no further communication. On 26 May 2021, Deborah Morgan sent an email to Ms Young with the subject matter "*YOU NEED TO CALL ME AS A MATTER OF URGENCY PLEASE*".
156. The panel found that this evidence was consistent with Ms Young's explanation that in May 2021 she had been undertaking work for both Herefordshire Council and Bradford City Council and that she had stopped working altogether after receiving communication from Ms Grayson-Purdy on or around 25 May 2021. The panel found that if she had been unable to attend work, it remained Ms Young's responsibility to keep in touch with her manager and to ensure her professional responsibilities were being covered.

(e) did not attend for duty work on 27 and/or 28 May 2021 and were unable to be contacted by Person B.

157. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 123 and 124 above, the panel concluded that Ms Young was still under contract to work for Herefordshire Council on 27 and 28 May 2021 and had a professional responsibility to fulfil her duties under that contract. The panel accepted the evidence of Deborah Morgan that those duties included attending work on 27 and 28 May 2021 to be the duty social worker. Ms Young accepted that she did not attend on that day and told the panel that she did not feel able to work. The panel found that if she had been unable to attend work, it remained Ms Young's responsibility to keep in touch with her manager and to ensure her professional responsibilities were being covered.

1 July 2024 notice of hearing:

158. Mr Khan referred the panel to the documents in the Resuming Service Bundle. These included the Notice of Hearing dated 15 February 2024 which informed Ms Young of the date and time of the hearing and that it would be conducted remotely. This notice was sent by e-mail to the e-mail address provided by Ms Young to Social Work England. The panel was also provided with a statement of service. The panel was also provided with a copy of the Notice of Hearing sent by post on 26 March, containing the same information, together with a statement of service. Mr Khan submitted that Ms Young had been served with the appropriate Notice in accordance with Social Work England Fitness to Practise Rules (2019) (as amended) ("the Rules").

159. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. She referred the panel to Rule 14, 44 and 45 of the Rules.
160. Having considered the documents in the Resuming Service Bundle, the Panel was satisfied that good service had been effected.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

161. Mr Khan invited the panel to exercise its discretion under Rule 43 of the Rules to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Young. He submitted that all reasonable efforts had been made to notify Ms Young of the resuming hearing, but that she had disengaged and declined to attend. Mr Khan referred the panel to correspondence from Ms Young and submitted that in a terse manner she had indicated that she had no wish to take part in the proceedings. Mr Khan submitted that Ms Young had received ample notice of the hearing and that efforts had been made to engage with her. Mr Khan submitted that it would be fair to Social Work England and in the public interest for the case to proceed so that it can be concluded expeditiously.
162. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. Her advice included references to case law and the guidance in *General Medical Council v Adeogba* EWCA Civ 162. The panel should exercise its discretion with the utmost care and caution and should consider the factors drawn from the criminal case *R v Jones* [2001] QB 862.
163. The panel carefully considered the circumstances of Ms Young's absence. The dates for the reconvening hearing were canvassed with Ms Young at the conclusion of the hearing on 31 January 2024 and her availability was taken into account in the selection of the appropriate dates. Ms Young also has an understanding of the panel's power to proceed in her absence and the factors that are taken into account because this issue arose on the tenth day of the January 2024 hearing and the panel's decision to proceed in her absence formed part of the written determination provided to Ms Young.
164. The panel reviewed Ms Young's correspondence with Social Work England. On 12 March 2024 Ms Young sent an email stating:

"Why have you ignored my request to refrain from contacting me?Don't email me again unless its confirmation of my removal from the register"

On 19 March 2024 she sent a further email which stated:

"Trust me. There won't be a final hearing. I'm not a social worker....So fuck off and leave me alone"

165. The panel inferred from the content and tone of Ms Young's e-mails that she had decided to totally disengage from the process and that she no longer wished to participate in any hearing, including this resuming hearing. The panel concluded that Ms Young's absence is voluntary and that an adjournment would be very unlikely to secure her attendance.

166. The panel acknowledged that it is usually beneficial for a social worker to attend a hearing to make submissions and present evidence relating to issues such as misconduct and current impairment, and that Ms Young might be disadvantaged by not attending the resuming hearing. Nevertheless, the panel considered that there was a strong public interest in the expeditious conclusion of the case. The panel made its findings of fact in this case in January 2024 and the matter should be disposed of expeditiously. There is also a public interest in the case, which relates to events dating back several years, to be brought to a conclusion. Ms Young has also stated that she expects to receive information about the outcome of the case.
167. The panel concluded that Ms Young's interests were outweighed by the public interest in the expeditious conclusion of the case. In all the circumstances it was fair and in the interests of justice for the case to proceed in Ms Young's absence.

Review of previous decision:

168. The panel reviewed its decision on facts and noticed a recording error in paragraph 90. The last sentence of that paragraph should read;

"Whilst there was information in the public domain in relation to Service User 2 before Person A had made the allegation, the panel found that this would have been insufficient to make the link between ~~Person A~~ Service User 3 and Service User 2."

The panel was of the view that this recording error should be highlighted but emphasised that it made no difference whatsoever to any of the panel's findings or reasons for coming to the conclusions that it did.

Finding and reasons on grounds:

169. The panel took into account Mr Khan's submissions. It reread all the documents provided by Ms Young and contained in the social worker response bundle and the additional documents Ms Young provided during the course of the hearing in January 2024 contained in a supplementary bundle.
170. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. She advised that the question of misconduct was a matter for the panel's judgment and referred the panel to the guidance in the case of Roylance v GMC that *"misconduct is a word of general effect involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a ...practitioner in the particular circumstances"*. A breach of standards is not determinative, and the conduct must be serious for the panel to conclude that it amounts to misconduct.
171. The legal adviser also referred the panel to the case of *Ahmedsowida v General Medical Council* [2021] EWHC 3466 and advised that generally it would not be appropriate to consider an allegation which the panel has concluded is not sufficiently serious to amount to

misconduct cumulatively with other allegations, unless it is clear from the formulation of the allegation that the matters should be considered together.

172. The panel considered its findings of fact under each allegation. In respect of allegation 1 the applicable standards were the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics (2016). The panel considered that Ms Young's conduct was a breach of the following standards:

- You must treat service users and carers as individuals, respecting their privacy and dignity (Standard 1.1)
- You must use all forms of communication appropriately and responsibly, including social media and networking websites (Standard 2.7)
- You must treat information about service users as confidential (Standard 5.1)
- You must make sure that your conduct justifies the public's trust and confidence in you and your profession (Standard 9.1)

173. In the Panel's judgment sharing a photograph and confidential information regarding a minor who was alleged to have sexually assaulted a young girl is very serious. The photograph showed a semi-clad minor who was extremely vulnerable due to the nature of the allegation against him. The information shared by Ms Young was highly confidential, involving the allegation of rape, and such information was only provided to her because of her trusted status as a professional social worker. The disclosure of the confidential information involved a serious breach of the trust placed in Ms Young to maintain the confidentiality of such information. The information and photograph shared by Ms Young had the potential to lead to the further sharing of the information, identification of the minor, and the consequent risk of significant harm to a vulnerable individual.

174. The panel considered that Ms Young's culpability was significant because she knew that Service User 2 was a minor and that the information about the allegation of rape was highly confidential and had been provided to her in her responsible role as a social worker.

175. In the panel's judgment Ms Young's conduct in particular 1 was a breach of the fundamental tenet of the profession to maintain the confidentiality of sensitive information relating to service users and was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.

176. In respect of allegation 2a, b, d and e, the applicable standards were the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The panel considered that Ms Young's conduct was a breach of the following standards:

- You must treat service users and carers as individuals, respecting their privacy and dignity (Standard 1.1)
- You must keep your relationships with service users and carers professional. (Standard 1.7)

- You must use all forms of communication appropriately and responsibly, including social media and networking websites (Standard 2.7)
- You must treat information about service users as confidential (Standard 5.1)
- You must make sure that your conduct justifies the public's trust and confidence in you and your profession (Standard 9.1)

177. Ms Young's conduct in breaching professional boundaries was a pattern of conduct that persisted notwithstanding the advice and guidance from her manager, Rebekah Shepherd, on the importance of maintaining boundaries. In the panel's view Ms Young's culpability was high because she knew that she was not maintaining appropriate professional boundaries. In considering the seriousness of the conduct the panel took into account that there were multiple messages, some of which were sent outside office hours. Ms Young also continued to send messages when she was no longer employed by the Government of Jersey. The over-sharing of personal information with Service User 1 was deliberate rather than careless and it undermined the professional relationship which should have existed between herself and Service User 1.
178. When considering the impact of Ms Young's conduct the panel took into account the vulnerability of Service User 1 who had been deemed to be manipulative of social services. The impact of Ms Young's conduct in blurring the professional boundaries with Service User 1 was that her ability to act professionally with regard to the concerns relating to Child A was compromised. By sending friendly messages and over-sharing personal information Ms Young gave Service User 1 false hope, and this undermined her authority and the professional work she was undertaking with Service User 1 which might include appropriately challenging Service User 1. The friendly reassurances Ms Young gave to Service User 1 were entirely inappropriate and were at odds with the view of the professionals working with Service User 1. Ms Young's conduct in breaching professional boundaries had the potential to cause serious harm to Service User 1 and Child A.
179. Ms Young's conduct had an impact on her colleagues and on the Social Services department of Jersey Government which was obliged to carry out work to rebuild confidence in its services. Her conduct also had the potential to undermine the public's trust in Jersey Social Services and in the profession.
180. In the panel's judgment Ms Young's conduct in allegation 2, as found proved, fell far below the standards for social workers and was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.
181. The panel next considered allegation 3a, and 3c, in conjunction with the related finding in allegation 5 that the breach of the conditions of practice order was dishonest in that Ms Young intended to conceal the two simultaneous employment contracts from the regulator. The applicable standards were Social Work England's Professional standards. The panel identified the following breaches:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.

5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker whilst at work, or outside of work.

6.7. Cooperate with any investigations by my employer, Social Work England, or another agency, into my fitness to practise or the fitness to practise of others

182. The purpose of the regulation of social workers is to protect the public in accordance with Social Work England's overarching objective. The interim conditions of practice order, which the panel found was breached by Ms Young, had been imposed by a panel of adjudicators who had identified that an interim order was required to protect the public. It was therefore imperative that Ms Young should comply with the order and that she should be open and frank with the regulator about her employment circumstances. The purpose of a workplace reporter is to enable information relating to Ms Young's practice and her compliance with the conditions of practice to be shared with Social Work England. Ms Young's conduct undermined the ability of Social Work England to ensure that the interim conditions of practice order was being adhered to and therefore undermined its ability to undertake its function of protecting the public.
183. Ms Young's conduct in deliberately concealing from the regulator that she was working for two employers concurrently involved the highest degree of culpability. It is disgraceful conduct for a social worker. Ms Young's dishonest conduct undermined public confidence in the profession and in this case her dishonest conduct also impacted on public safety because Social Work England was unable to fulfil its monitoring role. Ms Young had several opportunities to provide the information requested and to be open and frank with Ms Grayson-Purdy about her circumstances, but she chose to ignore the correspondence, to put her own interests first, and to persist in her dishonest conduct. The panel which imposed the interim conditions of practice order placed trust and confidence in Ms Young as a professional to comply with the conditions of practice. Her dishonesty was an abuse of the trust and confidence which was placed in her.
184. Ms Young's dishonest conduct was a breach of the fundamental tenet of the profession to be honest and was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.
185. The panel next considered allegation 4 in conjunction with the related finding of dishonesty in allegation 5a. The panel identified the following breaches of Social Work England's professional standards:
- 2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.
- 3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.
- 5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker whilst at work, or outside of work.

6.7. Cooperate with any investigations by my employer, Social Work England, or another agency, into my fitness to practise or the fitness to practise of others

186. Ms Young's conduct in holding two employment contracts simultaneously for two authorities which affected her ability to practise safely involved a high degree of culpability. Ms Young was aware at the time that her practice was subject to scrutiny by Social Work England and that she was subject to an interim conditions of practice order. The overlap between the two contracts was for a sustained length of time of over one month. Ms Young was required to work in two geographically different areas of the country and both employment contracts involved onerous statutory responsibilities to conduct visits to children in accordance with the required timescales. Ms Young's respective managers were not aware of the other employment contracts and gave evidence stating that they would not have agreed to such an arrangement.
187. Ms Young's conduct involved the risk of significant harm to service users because it was not possible for her to work safely and effectively while undertaking duties under two contracts of employment. She would not be able to comply with the requirements to visit children and families and her other statutory responsibilities.
188. In the panel's judgment Ms Young's conduct in allegation 4 was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.
189. The panel next considered allegation 6. The panel identified the following breaches of Social Work England's professional standards:
- 1.3 Work in partnership with people to promote their wellbeing and achieve best outcomes, recognising them as experts in their own lives
 - 2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.
 - 3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.
 - 3.11 Maintain clear, accurate and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions
 - 5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker whilst at work, or outside of work.
190. Ms Young's actions in failing to carry out statutory visits and arrange core group meetings in accordance with the statutory timescales and her failures to maintain up to date records put vulnerable service users at risk of significant harm. The purpose of statutory timescales is to monitor the safety of vulnerable children and families, and delays involved the risk of harm and impacted on Ms Young's colleagues. Ms Young had not completed the required work for Family 8 and one of her colleagues was required to pick up this responsibility. Ms Young's failings in relation to visits, core group meetings, and recording involved a high degree of culpability because they involved multiple families over a period of time. This

included the period of time when she had chosen to enter into an employment contract with two employers at the same time. Her conduct was a breach of the fundamental tenet of the profession to safeguard vulnerable service users.

191. In the panel's judgment Ms Young's conduct in allegation 6 fell far below the standards for social workers and was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.
192. The panel next considered allegation 7. The panel identified the following breaches of Social Work England's professional standards:

1.3 Work in partnership with people to promote their wellbeing and achieve best outcomes, recognising them as experts in their own lives

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

2.4 Practise in ways that demonstrate empathy, perseverance, authority, professional confidence and capability, working with people to enable full confidence and participation in discussions and decision making.

3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgment appropriately

5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker whilst at work, or outside of work.

193. In the panel's view Ms Young's conduct in allegation 7 was serious because there was a pattern of behaviour over a significant period of time. The panel noted that Ms Young has provided an explanation for some of the occasions when she could not be contacted as described in its decision on facts. However, if Ms Young was unable to undertake her professional responsibilities it was her obligation to keep her manager fully informed and to arrange cover for her workload in her absence. Ms Young's conduct had an impact on her manager who spent some time trying to get hold of her, and this impacted on the department's ability to safeguard service users. The inability to contact Ms Young or ascertain her whereabouts on repeated occasions undermined confidence in her, the reputation of the profession, and on the professionalism of the social services department.
194. In the panel's judgment Ms Young's conduct in allegation 7 was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.

Finding and reasons on current impairment :

195. Mr Khan submitted that Ms Young's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal element and the public element. The panel reviewed and took into account all the documents provided by Ms Young and included in the Social Worker's Response bundle and the supplementary bundle. It also took into account Ms Young's oral evidence and her submissions at the January 2024 hearing.

196. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. Her advice included reference to case law including *Meadow v GMC* [2006] EWCA 1360, *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581, and *CHRE v NMC and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927. When considering the question of impairment, the panel took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' (the 'Guidance').
197. The panel noted that Ms Young has provided character references. The panel gave these references little weight because the majority of the individuals providing a reference had not confirmed that they were aware of the Social Work England's allegations or that the reference was provided for the purpose of fitness to practise proceedings (see paragraph 54 of the Guidance). The references also date back to 2022 and they did not inform the panel's assessment of Ms Young's current level of understanding or insight in relation to the findings of fact made by the panel.
198. The panel considered first whether the misconduct is remediable. It was of the view that some aspects of the misconduct are potentially remediable, such as those relating to the breach of confidentiality, and the breach of professional boundaries, but other aspects of the misconduct, particularly the dishonesty, would be very difficult to remedy. It would be difficult for Ms Young to demonstrate that she would in the future be open and transparent with the regulator, given that she has in the past chosen to conceal information in her own interests and to the detriment of others. The panel was also of the view that the misconduct, in this case, is so wide ranging, involving conduct over a substantial period of time, that remediation would be so onerous that it would be impracticable.
199. Ms Young's current position is that she does not wish to engage with Social Work England. Her recent e-mail correspondence demonstrates that she now has no respect for the regulator. While the panel could understand an expression of anger or frustration as an immediate response to a decision that Ms Young does not agree with, Ms Young's disdain for her regulator has persisted over several months. Examples of her correspondence are as follows:

"Why have you ignored my request to refrain from contacting me? ...SWE have a serious difficulty in understanding the difference between fact and fiction and I have absolutely no interest in hearing the opinion of a judgemental and irrelevant panel? Don't email me again unless its confirmation of my removal from the register" (12 March 2024)

"The reason I asked you to stop contacting me is because I know that anything I receive is going to infuriate me further.....Honestly, I just can't deal with this nonsense any more. I will be deleting this email account and refusing delivery of any further postal information from yourselves...." (13 March 2024)

“Trust me. There won’t be a final hearing. I’m not a social worker. Haven’t been for three years. Couldn’t give a flying toss about your emails, processes or procedures. Could give a toss about the complaint. I have less changed my names since the incompetent goons breached my confidentialitySo fuck off and leave me alone” (19 March 2024)

“What part of leave me alone do you lot not understand. Do I need to look at getting a non molestation order out” (23 May 2024)

200. The panel drew the inference from Ms Young’s rude and disrespectful emails that her position is entrenched and that she has no interest in remediation or in any further engagement with her regulator.
201. Although Ms Young’s most recent position indicated that she is unwilling to undertake any remediation, the panel nevertheless considered the documents previously provided by Ms Young to consider whether she has demonstrated any insight. The panel concluded that Ms Young has not demonstrated any insight in relation to her dishonest conduct, or the breach of the interim conditions of practice order. She has not attended this hearing to provide any comment on the findings of fact made by the panel at the hearing in January 2024 and she has not provided any written submissions for the panel to consider.
202. The panel noted that in her statement for the final hearing Ms Young appeared to demonstrate partial insight in respect of allegations 1 and 2. She acknowledged that she struggled to keep her communication with Service User 1 professional, and that some of them overstepped the mark in respect of professional boundaries. She stated that she would not engage in such communication in the future. In her comments on allegation 1, she stated that if she did share the photograph, she was extremely remorseful and would not repeat such an action. She also stated that if she had shared the image and told members of the public that he had raped a 12 year old it could have placed him at serious risk of harm. In her written statement Ms Young appeared to accept that she could have sent the photograph, but in the hearing in January 2024 her evidence was that the screenshot could have been fabricated by Person A. The panel was unable to give weight to Ms Young’s apparent expressions of remorse and insight because of the inconsistencies between her statement and her oral evidence as explained in the panel’s decision on facts. Ms Young provided multiple explanations and contradictory accounts, which did not reassure the panel that any expression of insight or remorse by Ms Young could be relied upon.
203. The panel was also of the view that in her statements Ms Young has not taken full responsibility for her own actions and not reflected in any depth on the impact of her conduct on service users, her colleagues, her employer, her profession, or Social Work England. She has sought to blame and criticise others, such as Katie Grayson-Purdy, Case Review Officer at Social Work England at the time of the alleged events, and Rebekah Shepherd, social worker and team manager at Jersey States.

204. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Young has not demonstrated a sufficient level of insight. She has now disengaged from the regulatory process and is therefore unable to demonstrate that her level of insight is developing.
205. The panel noted that Ms Young provided evidence that she completed a GDPR training course on 19 July 2019, but as pointed out by Mr Khan, her conduct in breaching professional boundaries in allegation 2 continued after she had completed the course.
206. Having considered the level of Ms Young's insight and the absence of sufficient remediation, the panel concluded that the risk of repetition is high and that there remains an ongoing risk of harm to the public. This risk of repetition applies to all elements of Ms Young's misconduct. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Young's fitness to practise is impaired on the basis of the risk of harm to members of the public.
207. The panel next considered the wider public interest including the need to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold and maintain standards for social workers. The panel has concluded that Ms Young's misconduct involves breaches of fundamental tenets of the profession including the requirements to be honest, to safeguard service users, to maintain confidential information, and to maintain professional boundaries with service users. A finding of current impairment is required to reaffirm clear standards of professional conduct.
208. The panel considered that an informed and reasonable member of the public would be shocked by the nature and gravity of Ms Young's misconduct involving multiple allegations over a period of time and including dishonesty to her regulator in deliberately concealing that she was working under two employment contracts at the same time. They would expect that appropriate regulatory action should be taken to mark the seriousness of Ms Young's misconduct. The panel therefore decided that a finding that Ms Young's fitness to practise is impaired is required to maintain public confidence in the profession.
209. The panel concluded that all aspects of the test for fitness to practice were met.
- Ms Young has in the past and is liable in the future to act so as to put service users at unwarranted risk of harm
 - Ms Young has in the past brought and is liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute
 - Ms Young has in the past breached and is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenet of the profession
 - Ms Young has in the past acted dishonestly and is liable to act dishonestly in the future

210. The panel concluded that Ms Young's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Panel's decision to proceed in Ms Young's absence:

211. The panel was informed that in the evening on 2 July 2024 Ms Young contacted Capsticks stating that she would like to attend the hearing. Ms Young was provided with a copy of the panel's decision on the statutory ground and impairment and was advised that the hearing would resume on 3 July 2024 to hear submissions on sanction.
212. The panel decided that it was appropriate to delay the start of the hearing to 10.30 a.m. and then 11 a.m. to allow Ms Young to participate in the hearing if she wished to do so.
213. Mr Khan informed the panel that there was no further contact from Ms Young. Attempts were made to contact her by members of the hearings team and by Capsticks, by e-mail and by telephone, but there was no response. The links for the hearing were sent both by the hearings team and by Capsticks. Ms Young did not join on the links provided to her.
214. Mr Khan invited the panel to draw the inference that having received the panel's decision on grounds and impairment Ms Young had reflected and decided that she no longer wished to participate. He submitted that Ms Young is aware of the panel sitting and that if she had any difficulty in logging into the hearing she could have contacted Capsticks. Mr Khan submitted that the panel should proceed with the hearing in Ms Young's absence.
215. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. She referred to the advice she gave to the panel at the commencement of the reconvening hearing.
216. The panel reviewed the correspondence and attendance notes relating to Ms Young's attendance. The panel considered that Ms Young had been given ample opportunity to join the hearing if she wished to do so. She had been informed that the hearing would reconvene at 11 a.m. and that the panel may decide to proceed with the hearing in her absence. There has been no further communication from Ms Young since her e-mail sent at 18.05 on 2 July. Ms Young previously participated in the hearing in January 2024 and is aware of how to make contact with Capsticks or the hearings team if she has any technical difficulty in joining the hearing. Ms Young has not requested an adjournment or asked the panel to further delay the start of the hearing. The panel inferred that Ms Young, having received the panel's decision on grounds and impairment, decided that she did not wish to participate in the hearing and that further delay was not likely to secure her attendance.
217. The panel acknowledged that Ms Young might be disadvantaged by not attending the hearing to present submissions on the appropriate sanction, but it considered that her interests were outweighed by the public interest in the expeditious conclusion of this case. The panel therefore decided that it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the hearing in Ms Young's absence.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

218. The panel heard submissions from Mr Khan on sanction. His submissions included reference to aggravating and mitigating features and to the Guidance. He invited the panel to impose a removal order.
219. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. She reminded the panel that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish Ms Young, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. She advised that the panel should take into account Social Work England's Guidance. She advised the panel to consider each available sanction in ascending order of severity and to apply the principle of proportionality, carefully balancing Ms Young's interests and the public interest. She referred the panel to case law on sanction in dishonesty cases including *Abbas v General Medical Council* [2017] EWHC 51 and *General Medical Council v Theodoropoulos* [2017] EWHC 1984.
220. The panel identified the following mitigating features:
- Ms Young's admissions of some of the allegations;
 - Medical evidence presented by Ms Young;
 - The absence of any fitness to practise history.
221. In the panel's judgment these mitigating factors carried little weight. Ms Young's admissions were limited and qualified and they have not resulted in the level of reflection and insight the panel would expect. The medical evidence presented by Ms Young had no bearing on dishonesty, and its relevance to the other elements of misconduct was limited. Although the medical evidence was presented to the panel, Ms Young made little reference to it in the January 2024 hearing and did not expand on its relevance in her submissions to the panel. Although the panel noted the absence of fitness to practise history, the panel noted that Ms Young had only practised without concern for about a year. This factor carried little weight when considered in the context of the wide-ranging and sustained nature of Ms Young's misconduct.
222. The panel identified the following aggravating features:
- the nature of Ms Young's dishonest conduct involving deliberate concealment of information from the regulator for her own benefit;
 - dishonest conduct connected to Ms Young's professional role;
 - wide-ranging misconduct involving potential risk of harm to service users
 - pre-meditated conduct in accepting two employment contracts;
 - misconduct over a substantial period of time;
 - breach of trust placed in her by her employer and by the regulator;
 - absence of insight and remorse

- disregard for the regulatory process and orders imposed by the regulator.

223. Having considered the aggravating features, the panel was of the view that the misconduct in this case was very serious, as explained in the panel's decisions on misconduct and current impairment. The dishonesty in this case was at the higher end of the scale of seriousness because it involved deliberate conduct over a significant period of time, impacting on service users, and was intertwined with Ms Young's professional role.

224. The panel noted the Guidance on dishonesty at paragraphs 172-178. The guidance at paragraph 174 states:

"Concerns that raise questions of character (such as dishonesty) may be harder to remediate. This is because it is more difficult to produce objective evidence of reformed character. Evidence of professional competence cannot mitigate serious or persistent dishonesty. Dishonest conduct is highly damaging to public confidence in social work. Therefore, it is likely to warrant a finding of impairment and a more serious sanction of suspension or removal."

225. The Guidance at paragraph 175 states:

"The most serious instances of dishonesty in professional practice are those which (do either of the following):

- directly harm service users
- have the potential to put service users at risk

226. Ms Young's dishonesty was within professional practice and it had the potential to put service users at risk. The concealment of information that Ms Young held two employment contracts prevented Social Work England from effectively monitoring Ms Young's compliance with the conditions of practice order, thereby exposing service users to the potential risk of harm.

No action, advice or warning

227. The panel considered that the misconduct in this case was very serious, for the reasons set out earlier in this decision, and there were no exceptional reasons to merit taking no action. The option of giving advice to Ms Young or imposing a warning would not be sufficient to protect the public because these options do not restrict practice and are not appropriate where there is a risk of repetition and an ongoing risk to the public.

Conditions of practice

228. The panel decided that conditions of practice would be insufficient and inappropriate. The misconduct was attitudinal in nature and there were no appropriate conditions that could be formulated to address the risk of repetition. Ms Young has not attended the resumed hearing and has chosen to disengage from the regulatory process. The panel had no confidence that she would comply with conditions of practice, particularly as it has found that she did not comply with the interim conditions of practice order. Ms Young's conduct was also of such a serious nature that conditions of practice would be insufficient to maintain public confidence in the profession.

Suspension order

229. The panel noted paragraph 138 of the Guidance which states that suspension is unlikely to be suitable where the social worker has not demonstrated any insight and remediation and there is limited evidence that they are willing or able to resolve and remediate their failings.

230. Ms Young told the panel that she is now working in a different sphere and in recent correspondence she has stated that she does not regard herself as a social worker. Having carefully reviewed Ms Young's documents, e-mail correspondence, and her evidence and submissions at the hearing in January 2024, the panel considered that there was very little prospect that she would be willing or able to resolve and remediate the misconduct.

231. Although a suspension order would prevent Ms Young practising as a social worker for the duration of the suspension order, and thereby protect the public against the risk of repetition, the panel was of the view that it would be insufficient to maintain public confidence in social workers and the regulation of the profession.

232. In reaching this conclusion the panel took into account the perspective of reasonable and informed social workers and members of public. Ms Young's behaviour was contrary to the fundamental values of social work which involve honesty, maintaining confidential information, maintaining professional boundaries, and protecting and assisting vulnerable service users. Ms Young's misconduct, including her dishonesty, brought the profession into disrepute and would be regarded as deplorable by members of the profession. It involved disregard for the regulator and orders made by the regulator. For these reasons, the panel decided that Ms Young's conduct was fundamentally incompatible with continued registration as a social worker.

233. The panel noted the mitigating features, but as explained above it gave little weight to those features when balanced against the aggravating features, alongside the dishonest conduct found by the panel.

234. In the panel's view the sanction of a suspension order would be insufficient to mark the gravity of Ms Young's misconduct. It would not be in the public interest for Ms Young's registration to continue in circumstances where she has decided to disengage from the regulatory process and does not wish to practise as a social worker. The panel decided that

a period of suspension was not sufficient or appropriate to maintain public confidence in the profession and the regulator.

Removal order

235. A removal order is the sanction of last resort where no other sanction would be sufficient to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession and maintain proper professional standards for social workers. The panel noted that paragraph 149 of the Guidance indicates that a removal order may be appropriate in the following cases:

- Abuses of position or trust
- Dishonesty
- Persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of their actions or consequences
- 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)

236. In the panel's judgment all the above circumstances applied.

237. It was the judgment of the panel that any lesser sanction than a removal order would be insufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest, given the seriousness of Ms Young's misconduct, the seriousness of the dishonesty, the risk of harm to service users, the absence of remorse or remediation, and the very limited insight demonstrated by Ms Young.

238. The panel carefully considered Ms Young's interests. She does not wish to recommence work as a social worker and is pursuing a different career. Nevertheless, the panel acknowledged that there may be a negative impact on Ms Young's interests from the imposition of a removal order. The panel decided that Ms Young's interests were outweighed by the need to protect the public and the wider public interest. The panel therefore decided that the appropriate and proportionate sanction was a removal order.

Interim order:

239. In light of its findings on sanction, the panel next considered an application by Mr Khan for an interim suspension order to cover the appeal period before the final order becomes effective. Mr Khan informed the panel that an interim order is currently in place, but that such orders are subject to regular review and may need to be extended by the High Court. He submitted that reliance on the existing order would not be a good use of the regulator's resources.

240. The panel considered whether to impose an interim order. It was mindful of its earlier findings and decided that it would be wholly incompatible with those earlier findings if there were to be no restriction on Ms Young's practice during the appeal period. The panel considered that it was appropriate to impose an interim suspension order to cover the appeal order as an efficient means of ensuring the necessary protection for the public. The panel considered Ms Young's interests, but decided that they were outweighed by the need to protect the public and the wider public interest.

241. Accordingly, the panel concluded that an interim suspension order is necessary for the protection of the public. When the appeal period expires this interim order will come to an end unless an appeal has been filed with the High Court. If there is no appeal, the final order of removal shall take effect when the appeal period expires.

Right of appeal:

242. Under Paragraph 16(1)(a) of Schedule 2 of the regulations, the social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:

- 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.
- the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.

243. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of the regulations 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.

244. Under Regulation 9(4) of the regulations this order may not be recorded until the expiry of the period within which an appeal against the order could be made, or where an appeal against the order has been made, before the appeal is withdrawn or otherwise finally disposed of.

245. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended).

The Professional Standards Authority:

246. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a final 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>.