

Social worker: Allan Hall

Registration number: SW26089

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review hearing

Date of hearing: 29 May 2025

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Final order being reviewed:

Suspension order (expiring 10 July 2025)

Hearing outcome:

Extend the current suspension order for a further six months with effect from the expiry of the current order

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final suspension originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a panel of adjudicators on 12 June 2024.
2. Mr Hall attended and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow, counsel, instructed by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Gill Mullen	Chair
Julie Brown	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Andrew Brown	Hearings officer
Ruby Wade	Hearings support officer
Jane Lakin	Legal adviser

Documentation

4. The panel considered the following documentation ahead of the hearing:
 - Final Order Review Hearing Bundle comprising 260 pages.
 - Service and Supplementary Bundle comprising 14 pages.

Service of notice:

5. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 29 April 2025 and addressed to Mr Hall at their email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 29 April 2025 detailing Mr Hall's registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 29 April 2025 the writer sent by email to Mr Hall , at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
6. Having had regard to Rules 16(a)(i) and 16(ac) – Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Hall in

accordance with Rule 16(a)(i) and 16(ac) – Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended). The panel noted that Mr Hall was in attendance at the hearing and had confirmed within his written communication with Social Work England that he had received the Notice of Hearing.

Preliminary matters:

Privacy application

7. The panel noted the exceptions set out in Rule 38(a) and (b) in relation to the hearing of medical information within private session and Mr Hall was advised to inform the panel if he was intending to make reference to a personal health matter.

Review of the current order:

8. 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).
9. The current order is due to expire at the end of 10 July 2025

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

(2) During the period November 2017 and 1 April 2019 whilst working for Coventry City Council as a registered social worker you subjected colleagues to;

(b) Personal and inappropriate comments on their physical appearance in that you,

(i) Said to AH on more than one occasion words to the effect of;

(a) 'oh you look the part today.'

(b) 'she's looking good today' or words to that effect

(5) Whilst working as a registered social worker and Operational Lead for your team for Coventry City Council December 2017 – April 2019 you failed to make and/or record decisions in a timely manner in that you,

(b) On or around 20 November 2018 and thereafter did not do the voice of child dip sample as required by an audit.

(d) On or around 29 November 2018 and thereafter, failed to provide a briefing to your supervisor relating to the case of Service User 4.

(e) On or around 29 November 2018 failed to arrive at a timely decision as to what you thought should happen to Service User 5.

(f) On or about the 31 January 2019 and thereafter, failed to make a timely decision to report Child 2 as missing and/or escalate the case of Child 2 as a missing child to your line manager.

(6) On 16 March 2020 whilst working as an Independent Reviewing Officer for Gloucestershire County Council you used discriminatory and inappropriate language in relation to a young person's gender identity before, and/or during and/or after a looked after child review meeting, in that you,

(a) Did not use the young person's preferred name.

(c) Made reference to your own church condemning transgender people as 'sinful.'

(7) Failed to provide Social Work England with your current and former employer details as requested on 15 June 2020.

(8) Between 3 March 2020 and 3 April 2020 your record keeping was inadequate in that you;

(a) Failed to record the minutes and decisions taken during three child review meetings that you chaired during the week of 3 – 10 March 2020 within the statutory timescale or at all.

(b) Failed to record the decisions taken for six out of seven child review meetings that you chaired during the week of 19 – 26 March 2020 within the statutory timescale.

(c) Failed to record the decisions taken for five child review meetings that you chaired during the week 27 March – 3 April 2020 within the statutory timescale.

The final hearing panel on 12 June 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:

10. The panel considered that Mr Hall's misconduct was capable of remediation. However, Mr Hall has failed to fully acknowledge both the impact or harm that his behaviour had upon service users and the wider public.
11. Despite making lengthy submission before the panel, the panel considered that Mr Hall had failed to appropriately consider the risk of harm posed to service users by the allegations found proved.

12. The panel consider Mr Hall's insight is embryonic and he has not fully acknowledged the extent of his failings.
13. The panel concluded that Mr Hall sought to minimise his role and deflect his responsibilities in relation to the allegations found proved. The panel accepts that Mr Hall perceived there to be inappropriate attitudes displayed towards him, which at times he described as racism. Despite his significant experience in the profession, the panel noted that he failed to raise such issues as and when they occurred.
14. Despite making reference to reflecting upon the allegations, the panel considered Mr Hall has failed to provide tangible evidence of his reflections, which adequately address the risk of repetition. The reflective material Mr Hall relied upon is significantly outdated, dating back to 2020, and fails to correctly acknowledge the panel's findings.
15. Mr Hall, through his submissions, referred to the impact that matters have had upon him. However, whilst Mr Hall has apologised, the panel considered that he has not fully acknowledged the potential harm caused to child service users by his conduct, nor has he sufficiently addressed the panel on steps he would take to prevent such failures re-occurring in the future.
16. While Mr Hall engaged in the hearing process and was able to articulate certain matters that he would approach differently, the panel considered that both his current responses to the allegations found proved, and his past actions, demonstrate a failure to adhere to some professional standards. Further, his responses demonstrate a failure to understand many basic tenets of the Social Work profession.
17. While Mr Hall has shown some remorse for his actions, and referred to his apology, the panel considered that he has failed to demonstrate within his evidence an appropriate level of insight, at this time, into the seriousness of the allegations found proved and the potential risks to service users.
18. While the panel notes that there is potential for remediation in this case, the panel considered that Mr Hall's focus upon the actions of others and failure to understand the significance of his failures to adhere to professional standards, has hindered his ability to remediate fully.
19. Further, the panel concluded that Mr Hall has not sufficiently evidenced remediation, for example a demonstration of efforts on his part to retrain or specifically address the identified failings in his practice. While the panel noted that Mr Hall has engaged in CPD, the panel considered that the evidence of the CPD he has undertaken to date does not sufficiently address the failings identified. The panel considered that unfortunately the CPD undertaken was more generalised in nature.
20. The panel has information regarding Mr Hall's significant previous work history and is aware of his previous good character, which the panel has taken into account. The panel noted that it had no evidence before it in relation to any further training undertaken by Mr Hall. While the panel understands Mr Hall is currently restricted from working in a social work capacity, the panel considered that this should not have

prevented Mr Hall from undertaking meaningful and focused training to address the concerns raised.

21. The panel noted that the majority of the testimonials placed before it, do not acknowledge that the persons providing the testimonial is aware of the current proceedings. As such the panel considered that these testimonials had limited weight. The panel noted that some testimonials were either from family or related to unrelated matters.
22. The panel considered that Mr Hall had not demonstrated sufficient remediation or insight. Mr Hall's conduct placed child service users at risk of harm. His misconduct related to failings in his core obligations as a social worker. The panel considered that Mr Hall's conduct amounted to a breach of a fundamental tenet of the profession. Due to these findings, together with an absence of evidenced remediation and embryonic insight, the panel concluded that there was a risk of repetition of the misconduct.
23. The panel was satisfied that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the public, particularly service users. Further, the panel considered that reasonable, well informed, members of the public would be concerned about Mr Hall's conduct and the potential consequences of his failings. The panel therefore concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to maintain and promote public confidence in the social work profession.
24. The panel was satisfied that professional standards would not be promoted and maintained by a finding that Mr Hall's fitness to practise is not currently impaired, particularly considering the panel's assessment of his embryonic insight and limited remediation.
25. The panel therefore concluded that, because of Mr Hall's misconduct, a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the public, promote and maintain public confidence in the social work profession and declare and uphold proper professional standards.
26. In respect of Mr Hall's inclusion on the barred list by the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), the panel noted the following conclusions reached by the DBS;

"We are satisfied a barring decision is appropriate. This is because you have repeatedly failed to live up to your commitment and obligations as a social worker placing the vulnerable at risk of significant harm. Your failure to make decisions and complete records in a timely manner placed a child at significant risk..."

In your case, it is considered that the repeated irresponsibility shown by you in failing to complete records in a timely manner, poses potential harm as it is important that all professionals have up to date and accurate records in respect of children and vulnerable adults that they are working with in order to appropriately safeguard children and vulnerable adults. Furthermore, your lack of regard for the appropriateness of your conversations held with foster carers and your colleagues...presents too serious a risk to the vulnerable going forward to ignore. You

have failed to acknowledge your responsibility in your alleged actions and as such it is considered that you have shown no acknowledgement, insight or remorse regarding your misdemeanours

The DBS are satisfied that there is a substantial risk that you may demonstrate similar harmful behaviour towards children and vulnerable adults in the future if allowed to work in regulated activity with them, and that this outweighs your Article 8 rights. Consequently, the imposition of a bar on the Children's and Adults' Barred List is a necessary, appropriate and proportionate measure to protect them from the potential harm that you pose."

27. While the panel did not agree with all of the conclusions reached by the DBS, the panel agreed with the conclusions of the DBS that Mr Hall's actions posed potential harm, as it is important that all professionals have up to date and accurate records in respect of children and vulnerable adults, that they are working with, in order to appropriately to safeguard them.
28. The panel noted the conclusions set out above in respect of risk and noted that Mr Hall has demonstrated a failure to understand many basic tenets of the profession. The panel concluded that this in turn presented a risk of harm to members of the public.
29. The panel considered that a reasonable, well informed, member of the public would be concerned about some of the findings of the DBS in respect of Mr Hall. The panel therefore concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to maintain and promote public confidence in the social work profession.
30. Given that Mr Hall is included on the DBS barring list, and this relates to some of the findings made by the panel, the panel was satisfied that professional standards would not be promoted and maintained by a finding that Mr Hall's fitness to practise in this regard is not currently impaired.
31. In conclusion, for the above reasons the panel consider that Mr Hall's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal element and the wider public interest element.

The final hearing panel on 12 June 2024 determined the following with regard to sanction:

32. The panel considered that taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not adequately reflect the serious nature of Mr Hall's misconduct. These outcomes would not adequately protect the public, as they would not restrict Mr Hall's practice. The panel has assessed there to be a risk of repetition, and so considered that the public could not currently be adequately protected unless Mr Hall's practice is restricted.
33. Further, taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not maintain public confidence in the profession or promote proper professional standards, considering

the panel's finding that Mr Hall breached fundamental tenets of the profession and put child service users at a risk of harm.

34. The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be sufficient to protect the public and wider public interest. The panel, however, noted paragraph 114 and 128 of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, which states:

114. Conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where (all of the following):

- *the social worker has demonstrated insight*
- *the failure or deficiency in practice is capable of being remedied*
- *appropriate, proportionate, and workable conditions can be put in place*
- *decision makers are confident the social worker can and will comply with the conditions*
- *the social worker does not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice*

35. The panel noted its findings in relation to insight and remediation and further considered the fact that at present Mr Hall is the subject of a barring order by the DBS. The panel was not satisfied that workable or proportionate conditions could be formulated which would not be tantamount to a suspension, given the restrictions placed upon Mr Hall by the DBS.

36. The panel went on to consider making a suspension order. The panel considered paragraphs 137 -138 of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, which state as follows:

"137. Suspension may be appropriate where (all of the following):

- *the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards*
- *the social worker has demonstrated some insight*
- *there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings"*

138. Suspension is likely to be unsuitable in circumstances where (both of the following):

- *the social worker has not demonstrated any insight and remediation*
- *there is limited evidence to suggest they are willing (or able) to resolve or remediate their failings"*

37. The panel noted that all of the conditions set out in paragraph 137 were present. The panel considered that while the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards, Mr Hall's insight was developing and there was evidence that he was willing and able to resolve or remediate his failings.
38. The panel noted that Mr Hall has had a long and unblemished career and the panel considered that Mr Hall ought to be provided an opportunity to remedy his failings and reflect upon his practice.
39. The panel considered paragraph 148 of the SG, which states:
- "148. A removal order must be made where the decision makers conclude that no other outcome would be enough to (do one or more of the following):*
- protect the public*
 - maintain confidence in the profession*
 - maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England"*
40. The panel considered that a removal order in the present case would not be proportionate. Mr Hall has demonstration of some, albeit emerging, insight and has demonstrated to the panel a willingness to reflect upon his practice.
41. The Panel determined that this was not a case in which no other outcome would be enough to either protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession or maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.
42. The panel considered that a removal order would remove an experienced practitioner from the workplace, in circumstances where there is clear potential for Mr Hall to remediate the concerns.
43. The panel therefore determined that the most appropriate sanction in this case was a suspension order.
44. Having determined that a suspension order ought to be imposed, the panel went on to consider the length of such an order. The panel concluded that a 12-month order ought to be imposed.
45. The panel noted that 12 months was a sufficient period to mark the seriousness of the concerns, but also would provide Mr Hall with sufficient time to begin the remediation process and develop his insight. The panel therefore considered that 12 months was an appropriate and proportionate length for the suspension order.
46. The panel recognised the impact a 12-month suspension order would have on Mr Hall and took this into account. However, it considered the public interest outweighed Mr Hall's interests. The panel therefore concluded that the only sanction which achieved the aim of public protection in all three limbs was a 12-month suspension order, with no lesser sanction being sufficient.

47. This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, should Mr Hall choose to engage at a future date, a future reviewing panel would expect Mr Hall to attend the review hearing. It would be of assistance to that panel if he was able to provide evidence that he has undertaken steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. The panel suggested a further reviewing panel may wish to see the following information:

- i) A reflective piece focusing on his failings found proved preferably using a recognised reflective tool such as Gibbs reflective cycle or an equivalent;
- ii) Current testimonials and character evidence, which demonstrate that the persons providing such evidence are aware of the concerns found proved;
- iii) Evidence of learning self-directive or otherwise on a course;
- iv) Evidence of relevant CPD.

Social Work England submissions:

48. The panel heard submissions from Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow as to the background to the proceedings and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanction.

49. Social Work England invited the panel to review the evidence submitted to date, and any further evidence provided prior to and at the review, and to consider if the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of the concerns found proven by the previous panel. Social Work England submit that if the panel find the concerns remain then they should extend the suspension order for a further six months.

50. Social Work England invited the panel to consider that there is an absence of testimonial or character evidence from individuals who are aware of the findings made against Mr Hall. Social Work England submit that there is no evidence of adequate record keeping or an ability to make decisions within a timely manner. These concerns are not addressed with the Continuing Professional Development ("CPD") material provided for the panel's consideration.

51. Social Work England also invite the panel to note that Mr Hall remains included on the DBS barred list in relation to both children and adults. There is a overlap between some areas of the DBS findings and those of the previous panel of adjudicators. There are some areas of the DBS findings which relate to matters not found proven by the previous panel of adjudicators but some which do overlap. An example relates to the DBS finding in relation to poor record keeping between March 2018 and March 2019 , which resulted in a child being placed at significant harm.

52. Social Work England invited the panel to note that whilst the original DBS decision was made in respect of some matters which were not found proven by Social Work England's adjudicators, or that did not form part of the final fitness to practise allegations, the barring decision does overlap with the Panel's findings regarding the following concerns:

- *Between March 2018 and March 2019 you failed to make and record decisions in a timely manner resulting in at least one child being placed at significant harm.*
- *On 16 March 2020 you used discriminatory and inappropriate language in relation to a young person's gender identity during and after a looked after child review, in that you:*
- *Did not use the young person's preferred name and/or pronoun*
- *Made reference to your own church condemning transgender people as 'sinful'*
- *Between 3 March 2020 and 14 April 2020 you did not record decisions, recommendations and / or minutes of looked after child reviews in compliance with the statutory timescales detailed in the IRO handbook.*
- *On unspecified dates you subjected female colleagues to inappropriate comments on their physical appearance.*
- *You failed to provide Social Work England with your current and former employer details as requested on 15 June 2020.*

53. Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow stated that Mr Hall had advised that he has not sought to appeal the DBS decision stating that it would be his intention to do so should the review find that he is no longer currently impaired. It is unclear at this stage whether or not the Social Worker has provided the final hearing outcome to the DBS. Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow stated that Mr Hall's continued inclusion on the DBS barred list would mean that any proposed conditions of practice order, which would enable Mr Hall to demonstrate that on return to practice the same concerns did not arise again, would be unworkable.

54. Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow therefore invited the panel, if they consider that Mr Hall has not fully remediated, to consider extending the current Suspension Order for a further six months to allow the Social Worker time to provide the outstanding requested evidence of remediation and to resolve his inclusion on the DBS barred list. Should the Panel decide to extend the Suspension Order for a further six months they may wish to provide the Social Worker with recommendations as to additional evidence that he can provide to demonstrate that his fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

55. Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow suggested that the panel may wish to invite Mr Hall to share this Final Order Review Decision, along with the Final Hearing Outcome with the DBS so that

Social Work England and the next reviewing Panel can be assisted by understanding what the prospects are of the DBS barring decision being lifted.

Social worker submissions:

56. Mr Hall invited the panel to note that a large number of the original allegations against him had not been proven. He stated that in relation to those matters where the allegation had been found against him; he had taken these findings on board. He submitted that he had undertaken a detailed range of CPD in order to support his return to social work practice. This involved him engaging in some self-directed learning, reading and reflection about the importance of a variety of social work related matters, including interpretative services. Mr Hall had also reflected on the difficulties that he had experienced in relation to record keeping.
57. Mr Hall invited the panel to consider that he was an experienced and committed social worker as evidenced by his CV. His period of time in Coventry and Gloucester, where the findings relate to, had been a relatively short part of his career. Following the allegations he had worked in a COVID team and also in a practice development team where he had not experienced the same difficulties.
58. **[PRIVATE]** A member of his team had been absent and he had been trying to cover this person's workload along with his own. Mr Hall stated however that he understood his failing and had undertaken detailed reflection on these as evidence by the reflective practice document before the panel. He did ask the panel to note though that his failings in terms of sharing information may have been contributed to by others not sharing information with him.
59. Mr Hall asked the panel to note that whilst he had not completed review documentation within timescales, he had completed the documentation, albeit this may have been late.
60. **[PRIVATE]** he had not been able to work as a social worker for a number of years. He was currently working as a vehicle recovery driver, where he is very focussed on delivering excellent customer service which is a transferable skill he could bring to social work.
61. He has considered the finding relating to the comments made by him. He considers these may have been misconstrued but nonetheless has reflected carefully on the findings and considers that he has learnt from these findings and would not repeat this in the future if he is permitted to return to work as a social worker.
62. Mr Hall indicated that it is his intention to challenge the DBS finding but he was awaiting the outcome of this hearing before doing so. He hopes that the panel will find that he is no longer impaired and that he can return to the DBS with this position.

Legal advice

63. The legal advisor reminded the panel that the review process should not undermine the original decision made by the previous panel and the purpose of the review was to review evidence in relation to what had occurred since the making of the original order.

The purpose of a review is to consider whether (all of the following):

- the social worker has demonstrated remediation, insight and/or remorse
- the social worker has demonstrated they are now safe to practise and/or there is no longer a risk to the public
- the social worker has taken steps to maintain their skills and knowledge
- the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired (and if so, whether the existing order or another order needs to be in place)
- the adjudicators should consider whether the social worker has sufficiently addressed the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment

The outcome of a review could be to (any of the following):

- extend the period for which the previous order is in place (provided that any extension does not exceed 3 years at a time)
- replace a suspension order with a conditions of practice order
- make an order that case examiners or adjudicators could have made at the time (provided that the order does not exceed 3 years at a time)
- revoke the order in place from the date of the review

The panel should consider the purpose and nature of misconduct proceedings in reaching their decision and that in determining sanction the least restrictive option should be considered first.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

64. 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'.

65. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel and any new documentation provided by Mr Hall which included the material referred to above and appearing at pages 168-247 of the bundle. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr Hall.

66. 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.
67. The panel first considered whether Mr Hall's fitness to practise remains impaired.
68. The panel noted that the original panel found that Mr Hall had limited insight and had demonstrated insufficient remediation in particular in relation to record keeping. This panel noted the extent to which Mr Hall has acted upon the recommendations of the previous panel as to what might assist a future reviewing panel. The panel noted the CPD which Mr Hall had undertaken and the comprehensive reflective practice document which he had submitted. The panel noted that Mr Hall had not been able to provide any testimonials from people who had been appraised of the previous panel findings and who had been able to comment as to whether Mr Hall had remediated or shown increased insight into the findings made regarding his fitness to practise.
69. The panel noted that Mr Hall remained subject to inclusion in the DBS barred list and was therefore unable to undertake social work practice with children or adults.
70. The panel gave credit to Mr Hall for his ongoing commitment to improvement and his commitment to the process, including the submission of evidence and attendance at the hearing and the submissions which he made. The panel did consider that there was evidence of a developing insight but that remediation was not yet complete. The panel considered that testimonials from people and colleagues who were fully appraised of the panels findings would be very helpful in demonstrating the further development of insight. The panel also considered that remediation was not complete in relation to record keeping. The consequences of poor record keeping for children can be very serious in terms of the services of they receive and that adherence to this is not simply an administrative concern but a safeguarding one.
71. The panel note that findings had been made in relation to inappropriate comments being made by Mr Hall and the panel considered that it would be helpful for Mr Hall to evidence that he had undertaken specific equality, diversity and inclusion training to minimise the risk of repetition of this.
72. The panel appreciated that the options available for Mr Hall in terms of demonstrating appropriate record keeping were limited but could be improved by addressing the inclusion on the barred list with the Disclosure and Barring Service.
73. The panel concluded that Mr Hall's fitness to practice remained impaired on the personal and public elements.

Decision and reasons:

74. Having found Mr Hall's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to

the submissions made along with all the information and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.

75. The panel considered the submissions made by Ms Adjoa Adjei-Ntow , on behalf of Social Work England, during which she invited the panel to consider imposing a further six month suspension order. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
76. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Hall, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Mr Hall's interests with the public interest.

Taking No Action / Revoking the Suspension. Issuing a Warning:

77. The panel noted that these sanctions would not restrict Mr Hall's ability to practise and were therefore not appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety. In any event, the deficiencies identified with Mr Hall's practice had the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences and therefore some restriction on his practice is required. Therefore, the panel concluded that these options would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

Conditions of practice order

78. The panel took the view that the deficiencies identified with Mr Hall's practice are potentially capable of being remedied but were not satisfied that appropriate, workable conditions could be formulated given the continuing restrictions which exists as a result of his inclusion within the DBS barred list.

Suspension order

79. The panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time to enable Mr Hall to fully remediate and to address his inclusion on the DBS barred list. The panel considered that this was the appropriate outcome in all the circumstances of the case.
80. A suspension order would prevent Mr Hall from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest. Having determined that a suspension order ought to be imposed, the panel went on to consider the length of such an order. The panel concluded that a further 6 month order ought to be imposed.

81. The panel noted that a further 6 months would provide Mr Hall with sufficient time to continue the remediation process and further develop his insight and to progress matters regarding his DBS status.
82. The panel recognised the impact a further 6- month suspension order would have on Mr Hall and took this into account. However, it considered the public interest outweighed Mr Hall's interests. The panel therefore concluded that the only sanction which achieved the aim of public protection in all three limbs was a further 6- month suspension order, to take effect on 10th July 2025, with no lesser sanction being sufficient.
83. This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel would expect Mr Hall to attend the review hearing and it would be of assistance to that panel if they were able to provide evidence that they had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. This may include:
- (i) Evidence that Mr Hall had taken steps with the Disclosure and Barring Service to address his inclusion on the barred list in relation to working with children and adults. This could include sending a copy of the full decision relating to the finding made and this review to the DBS and seeking confirmation from them as to how to appeal or review his inclusion in the barred list.
 - (ii) Seeking testimonials from colleagues who were fully apprised of the initial findings would also be of assistance to future panels in providing evidence in relation to impairment.
 - (iii) Evidence that they have kept their social work skills and knowledge up to date, such as:
 - Training courses (online or otherwise);
 - Training specifically related to Equalities , Diversity and Inclusion in order to offer assurance to a future panel that the risk of inappropriate comments being made was diminished.

Removal order

84. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Mr Hall's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of one or more grounds as set out in regulation 25(2)(a), (c), (d), (f) or (g).
85. The panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest. The panel took the view that a removal order would not be appropriate because Mr Hall has demonstrated developing insight and has demonstrated to the panel a willingness to reflect upon his practice.

Right of appeal

86. 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.
87. 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.
88. 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.
89. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

90. Under regulation 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended):
- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
 - 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
 - 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5).

91. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority

92. 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>