



Social worker: Enid Menas

Registration number: SW11919

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Meeting

Date of meeting: 14 May 2025

Meeting venue: Remote meeting

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 25 June 2025)

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

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a panel of adjudicators on 27 November 2023.
2. Ms Menas did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Capsticks LLP and their written submissions are set out within the notice of hearing letter.

Adjudicators	Role
Carolyn Tetlow	Chair
Glenys Ozanne-Turk	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Andrew Brown	Hearings officer
Heather Hibbins	Hearings support officer
Abimbola Johnson	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 9 April 2025 and addressed to Ms Menas at her email address which she had provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 9 April 2025 detailing Ms Menas’ registered email address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 9 April 2025, the writer sent by email to Ms Menas at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
6. Having had regard to Rules 15, 16a, 16ab, 16b and 44 and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Menas in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

7. The notice of final order review informed Ms Menas the review would take place as a meeting. The notice stated:

“If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm 28 April 2025. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England’s submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide.”

8. The panel received no information to suggest that Ms Menas had responded to the notice of final order. The panel, therefore, concluded that Ms Menas had chosen voluntarily to absent herself. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Ms Menas’ attendance. The panel noted this was a mandatory review of a final order. Having weighed the interests of Ms Menas 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 Menas’ absence.

9. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides:

“Where the registered social worker does not state within the period specified by the regulator whether they intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may determine whether to make an order by means of a meeting.”

10. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c).

Review of the current order:

11. This final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

12. The current order is due to expire at the end of 25 June 2025.

The proved allegations which amounted to misconduct were as follows:

13. Allegations, 2a, 2b, 7, 8, and 10b:

Allegation 2(a): You failed to refer the cases of Service Users RH and JH to a Resource Allocation Panel before you caused one or both of them to be moved from Retirement Home 2 to Retirement Home 1 on or around 11 May 2018.

Allegation 2(b): You failed to refer the cases of Service Users RH and JH to a Resource Allocation Panel before you caused one or both of them to have their placements at Retirement Home 1 extended beyond the initial expiry of around 11 June 2018.

Allegation 7: You failed to complete the needs assessment [for Service User RS] in a timely way in that you

(a) did not complete the needs assessment within two weeks of your initial visit to Service User RS on 4 November 2015, namely by the end of November 2015;

(b) did not complete the needs assessment in advance of being prompted by your manager on or around August 2017; and

(c) did not complete the assessment by the deadline provided by your manager, namely 31 August 2017.

Allegation 8. You failed to conduct a safeguarding enquiry in a timely way or at all when you suspected Service User RS was potentially subject to financial abuse or exploitation.

Allegation 10(b): You failed to make initial contact with Service User MJ following a referral by the required date of 30 August 2017.

Your conduct above amounts to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of the statutory ground of misconduct.

The final hearing panel on 27 November 2023 determined the following with regard to impairment:

14. The following is taken from the final hearing panel's decision on impairment §129 - 138:

Panel's decision on Impairment

129. *Having found that the conduct of Ms Menas described in Allegations 2, 7, 8 and 10(b) amounted to misconduct, the panel then considered whether her fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of that misconduct.*
130. *The panel first considered whether Ms Menas' fitness to practise was currently impaired in terms of the need to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public. For that purpose, the panel considered, firstly, whether Ms Menas' misconduct had caused any harm to the public or given rise to a risk of such harm being caused and, secondly, the likelihood of her misconduct being repeated.*
131. *With regard to the first of those matters, as described in its decision on grounds, the panel considered that Ms Menas' misconduct under Allegations 7, 8 and 10(b) had exposed the service users concerned to a risk of harm due to their needs for support not being met or to a risk of continuing harm from domestic or financial abuse. Her failure to take the required action to address those risks (i.e. completing a needs assessment, undertaking a safeguarding enquiry and making first contact) had persisted for an unacceptable length of time. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Menas' misconduct posed a risk to the health, safety or well-being of the public.*
132. *When considering the risk of Ms Menas' misconduct being repeated, the panel considered Ms Menas' past history and her conduct since the events to which these proceedings relate and the extent to which she had developed insight into, and remedied, her misconduct.*
133. *With regard to Ms Menas' past history and conduct since 2018, Ms Menas had no previous regulatory findings against her or criminal convictions and there was no evidence of her misconduct having been repeated (although she did not appear to have worked as a social worker since her contract with the Council was terminated in February 2019).*
134. *With regard to Ms Menas' insight into her misconduct, the panel noted that, in her email to Social Work England of 22 March 2022, Ms Menas had recognised that she had problems balancing work with her role as a carer and that she should have sought help with her health issues much sooner. However, Ms Menas had not shown any remorse for her misconduct or any appreciation of its potential effects on service users, colleagues, her employer and the public's perception of social workers; nor had she demonstrated a thorough [understanding] of her misconduct and its causes and how it might be avoided in the future. In the circumstances, the panel considered that Menas had shown only limited insight into her misconduct.*
135. *With regard to remediation, the panel considered that, given its apparent causes, Ms Menas' misconduct should be remediable with, among other things, appropriate measures to address her health issues and problems with time and workflow*

management. However, there was no evidence to show that Ms Menas had taken any steps to address the causes of her misconduct and prevent its reoccurrence in the future. Instead, Ms Menas appeared to have made a decision not to return to social work.

136. Given Ms Menas' limited insight into her misconduct and the lack of any evidence of remediation, and given that Ms Menas' misconduct had persisted over a period of four years, the panel concluded that the risk of her misconduct being repeated, should she return to practice as a social worker, was high. That there had been no repetition of her misconduct since she was dismissed from her employment with the Council appeared to be due to her not having returned to work as social worker.
137. Given the panel's conclusions regarding the risk which Ms Menas' misconduct posed to the health, safety and well-being of service users and the risk of her misconduct being repeated, **the panel found that Ms Menas' fitness to practise was currently impaired in terms of the need to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public.**
138. With regard to the public component of impairment:

*The panel considered that, given the nature of Ms Menas' misconduct, its possible consequences for service users and her lack of insight and remediation, informed and reasonable members of the public who were aware of the circumstances of the present case would be very concerned, if they were to learn that she was free to return practice without restriction, notwithstanding her decision to retire from social work. **The panel therefore found that Ms Menas' fitness to practise was currently impaired in that such a finding was required in order to maintain public confidence in social workers in England.***

*Similarly, the panel considered that, given that Ms Menas' misconduct related to safeguarding, which lies at the core of social work, and given its possible consequences for service users and her lack of insight and remediation, professional standards for social workers would be compromised, if Ms Menas were free to practice without restriction, notwithstanding that she is no longer a practising social worker. **The panel therefore found that Ms Menas' fitness to practise is currently impaired in that such a finding was required in order to maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.***

The final hearing panel on 27 November 2023 determined the following with regard to sanction:

15. The following is taken from the final hearing panel's decision on impairment §147 – 149, and 155 - 159:

Panel's decision on Sanction

147. *In determining the appropriate sanction, the panel first considered the aggravating and mitigating factors of the present case.*
148. *In terms of aggravating factors, the panel noted that:*
- *Ms Menas' misconduct related to several cases.*
 - *The instances of Ms Menas' misconduct had occurred over an extended period of time.*
 - *Ms Menas' misconduct related to more than one area of practice.*
 - *Ms Menas had shown only limited engagement with the fitness to practise process.*
 - *Ms Menas had shown limited insight and no evidence of remediation.*
149. *In terms of mitigating factors, the panel noted the following:*
- *Ms Menas had worked as a social worker for a long period of time.*
 - *During that period, there had been no previous adverse regulatory findings against her.*
 - *During the time at which Ms Menas' misconduct occurred, she had taken significant periods of sick leave. However, the panel had no information about the medical reasons for this sick leave or how her health had affected her ability to practise safely and effectively.*
 - *In her email of 21 March 2022 to Social Work England, Ms Menas had mentioned the pressure placed on her by having to balance her work with her caring responsibilities at home but without detailing those responsibilities. Although there was no medical evidence to support this, the panel nevertheless considered that it was a real issue which may have had a bearing on Ms Menas' performance at work.*
 - *The supervision notes provided to the panel did not address Ms Menas' sick leave or her caring responsibilities but dealt solely with her casework. However, as it appeared that the panel may not have been given all of the documentation relating to the period when Ms Menas' misconduct occurred, and as Ms FD had not been asked about the matter when she gave oral evidence, the panel was uncertain whether*

it could rely on those notes as evidence of a lack of personal supervision.

- *Ms Menas had a caseload of 41 cases. In this regard, Ms FD, in her oral evidence, had recalled that there was an expectation that a number of a social worker's cases would be inactive but added that she would not advocate that approach now, as inactive cases can become active at any time.*

155. *However, the panel considered that, given that Ms Menas had a record of long service, that she lacked any previous adverse history, that her misconduct, given its nature, might well be remediable and might, to a large extent, be due to other pressure in her life, it would be both in the public interest and fair to Ms Menas to give her an opportunity to reconsider her position and return to social work practice, should she decide to do so. With that in mind, the panel considered that the appropriate and proportionate order would be a suspension order, as this would be sufficient to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public and maintain public confidence and professional standards whilst, at the same time, affording Ms Menas an opportunity to decide her future with the benefit of the panel's findings.*

156. *In terms of duration, the panel considered that a suspension order of 18 months duration would afford Ms Menas reasonable opportunity to reflect on the panel's findings, reconsider her position and either engage with Social Work England with a view to either (i) remedying the failings in her practice and returning to social work or (ii) making an application for voluntary removal from the Register, should she decide not to return to social work. In arriving at that decision, the panel had regard to paragraph 144 of the Sanctions Guidance, which states, "There may be instances where the social worker does not intend to remediate or practise in the short term but wishes to do so later. This could include cases of chronic ill health. If so, it may be in the interests of the social worker to impose a longer period of suspension. This avoids the stress for the social worker of a review hearing before they have recovered to full health. If the social worker makes an earlier recovery, Social Work England can schedule an early review hearing to consider either revoking the suspension or allowing a phased return to practice through conditions."*

157. *The panel therefore determine that, in the circumstances of the present case, an 18-month suspension order was the appropriate and proportionate final order.*

158. **FINAL ORDER: that Ms Menas be suspended from practising for a period of 18 months.**

Things which may assist the review panel

159. *The panel considered that the panel which reviews the final suspension order would be assisted by Ms Menas providing the following:*
- *a written reflective piece covering the matters described below;*
 - *evidence that Ms Menas has undertaken remedial training focussed on the areas of her practice to which the panel's findings of misconduct relate, in particular, safeguarding and the Care Act 2014;*
 - *testimonials, addressing the points described below; and*
 - *evidence that she has kept up to date with social work practice.*

Social Work England submissions:

16. The panel read the written submissions by Capsticks on behalf of Social Work England:

Subject to any evidence of further insight or remediation received after the notice of hearing is sent, Social Work England invite the panel to impose a Removal Order, on the grounds that such an Order is necessary for the protection of the public.

The Social Worker has not made any contact with Social Work England since the Suspension Order imposed. The Case Review Officer sent correspondence to the Social Worker on 2 January 2024 and 4 March 2025 in relation to the Suspension Order, referring specifically to any evidence the Social Worker may wish to provide in advance of the upcoming review hearing.

The Final Hearing Panel determined that despite the Social Worker's limited insight, lack of remediation and stated wish to be removed from the Register; given that she had a record of long service, lacked any previous adverse history and, that her misconduct was likely to be remediable and to a large extent, may be due to other pressure in her life, it would be both in the public interest and fair to the Social Worker to give her an opportunity to reconsider her position and return to social work practice, should she decide to do so. With that in mind, the Panel considered that the appropriate and proportionate order would be a Suspension Order, as opposed to a Removal Order.

At the date of this Notice, the Social Worker has not provided any further evidence to address the concerns the Panel raised, or to engage with the recommendations that were set out for her to address. The risk of repetition has not changed. There is no evidence of the Social Worker's insight, reflection, or remediation.

The Social Worker does not appear willing (or able) to satisfactorily address her failings and therefore Social Work England invite the Panel to impose a Removal Order.

Social Work England reserve the right to reconsider this position if the Social Worker provides evidence in advance of the Final Order Review.

Social Worker's Submissions

17. Ms Menas had not provided any submissions for today's hearing. However the panel noted the submissions that had been before the previous panel and were contained in their decision at §50 – 52:

Submissions from Ms Menas

50. In an email to Social Work England of 22 March 2022, Ms Menas set out her *comments* on the concerns about her practice which Social Work England proposed to put before its case examiners. In that email Ms Menas stated:

I was unable to read any of the documents as simply looking at it brought back so many negative emotions that subsequently led to a drastic deterioration in both my physical and mental health.

I take ownership and responsibility for my life. I was most probably about 12 or 13 when I decided to become a Social Worker and worked hard to gain my qualification. Despite the challenges, I have always enjoyed working with people from various backgrounds, being able to work with people to make positive changes in their lives and improving the quality of their lives. I was absolutely proud of being able to contribute towards society in my role as Social Worker.

[PRIVATE]. *Due to my family circumstances I am not in a position to maintain a work life balance and have no intention of practicing as a Social Worker now or in the future.*

51. On 10 November 2023, immediately prior to this hearing, Ms Menas sent an email to Social Work England in which she stated, *"I am writing to advise that I am unable to attend the hearing scheduled for week commencing 13/11/2023.*

Mentally and emotionally, I have not been able to focus on any of the evidence or information provided. After almost 5 years away from practicing as a Social Worker, I still feel as burned out and traumatised as I was for the last number of years of my career. [PRIVATE]. I am therefore requesting to be permanently removed from the Social Work Register.”

52. Ms Menas did not provide any medical or other evidence in support of the statements which she made in her emails to Social Work England of 22 March 2022 and 10 November 2023.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

18. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s *‘Impairment and sanctions guidance.’*
19. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel. It noted that it did not have any new documentation provided by Ms Menas for example the reflective statement, references or training certificates that had been suggested by the final hearing panel.
20. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
21. The panel first considered whether Ms Menas’ fitness to practise remains impaired.
22. The panel noted that the original panel acknowledged that Ms Menas had demonstrated some insight through recognition of the difficulties she had experienced in balancing her personal responsibilities and role as a carer with her duties at work. However, the previous panel had also found that Ms Menas had not shown any remorse for her misconduct or appreciated the potential effects on service users, colleagues, or the public or demonstrated how she might avoid those issues arising in future. This panel noted that Ms Menas has not acted upon the recommendations of the previous panel as to what might assist today’s review. Ms Menas had not attended today’s hearings, the previous hearing, or maintained contact with her regulator in the intervening period.

23. The panel also noted the email extracts quoted in the previous panel's decision in which Ms Menas herself, on 10 November 2023, had expressed quite clearly that she felt unable to balance practising as a social worker with her personal life. **[PRIVATE]**.
24. In the circumstances therefore, the panel concluded that there was no indication that since November 2023, Ms Menas' level of insight had changed. She had not provided the panel with any information showing compliance with recommendations of the previous panel. Therefore the panel concluded that the reasons given by the previous panel when considering impairment continued to apply today. Although the conduct found proved was remediable, given the lack of action taken by Ms Menas, presumably due to her ongoing personal circumstances, there continues to be a risk to the health, safety and well-being of service users and the risk of Ms Menas' misconduct being repeated remains. This is compounded by the fact that a further 18 months has now passed without any engagement or remediation by Ms Menas. Therefore the panel found that Ms Menas' fitness to practise is currently impaired in terms of the need to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public.
25. Due to the nature of the misconduct and the lack of insight and remediation, the panel also found that informed and reasonable members of the public who were aware of the circumstances of the present case would be very concerned, if they were to learn that she were free to return practice without restriction, notwithstanding Ms Menas' decision to no longer engage in social work. The panel therefore found that Ms Menas' fitness to practise is currently impaired in that such a finding is required in order to maintain public confidence in social workers in England.

Decision and reasons:

26. Having found Ms Menas' fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to the submissions made along with all the information before it and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.
27. The panel considered the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, in which they invited the panel to consider imposing a removal order. It noted the clear indications which had been given by Ms Menas throughout the proceedings that she no longer wished to work in the profession. The panel also took into account the '*Impairment and sanctions guidance*' published by Social Work England.
28. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Menas, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its

regulator and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Ms Menas' interests with the public interest.

Take No Further Action / Advice / Warning

29. The panel noted that these options would not restrict Ms Menas' ability to practise and were therefore not appropriate in a case such as this where there is a current risk to public safety. In any event, the deficiencies identified with Ms Menas' practice had the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences and therefore some restriction on her practice is required. Therefore, the panel concluded that taking no action or issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

Conditions of practice order

30. The panel took the view that the categories of deficiencies identified with Ms Menas' practice may have been capable of being remedied. However, there was a lack of specific and up to date information about Ms Menas' current circumstances. Therefore, the panel did not consider that it was in a position to formulate conditions which could be tailored to address the failings in Ms Menas' practice and their causes so as to ensure adequate protection for service users.
31. It appeared that Ms Menas had taken no steps to remedy the failings in her practice which led to the previous panel's finding of misconduct. Similarly, she had demonstrated no interest in developing her insight into her misconduct. She had, in her email of 10 November 2023 to Social Work England, requested to be removed from the Register and further had not complied with the recommendations made by the previous panel. In the circumstances, the panel had little confidence that, at this stage, Ms Menas would be sufficiently motivated to comply with any conditions which it might impose.

Suspension order

32. The panel considered whether it should extend Ms Menas' suspension order. Such an order would prevent Ms Menas from practising during the further suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest.
33. However, the panel noted that Ms Menas has already been subject to an 18 month period of suspension and has had a lengthy opportunity to reflect on whether she wishes to continue in the profession. The last clear indication from Ms Menas in November 2023 was that she no longer wanted to work in the profession and in fact she

had explained that she would not be able to to balance practising as a social worker with her other responsibilities “now or in the future.”

34. In the circumstances, the panel concluded that a suspension order was no longer suitable. Ms Menas has not demonstrated the required insight or remediation and she is not able to resolve or remediate her failings.

Removal order

35. The panel was satisfied that it was entitled to consider the imposition of a removal order, as Ms Menas’ fitness to practise had originally been found to be impaired on the basis of Regulation 25(2)(a), namely misconduct.
36. The panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort, to be imposed only where no other measure would adequately protect the public or serve the wider public interest. The panel further noted that paragraph 149 of Social Work England’s *Impairment and Sanctions Guidance* confirms that removal orders may be appropriate to impose on “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).” The panel considered that a removal order was appropriate in this case, given the clear indications from Ms Menas in 2023 that she no longer wished to practise as a social worker, and her continued lack of engagement with her regulator since then.

Right of appeal:

37. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:
- a. the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order,
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
38. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.

39. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.
40. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

The Professional Standards Authority

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

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