

Social worker: Siobhan Sullivan

Registration number: SW7511

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Meeting

Date of Meeting: 08 August 2025

Meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:

Suspension order (expiring 21 September 2025)

Meeting 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 an agreed accepted disposal suspension order originally imposed for 24 months by the case examiners on 18 September 2023.
2. Ms Sullivan 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
Eileen Carr	Chair
Liz Murphy	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Poppy Muffett	Hearings officer
Molly-Rose Brown	Hearings support officer
Gerrard Coll	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators (the panel) had careful regard to the documents in the final order review service bundle:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 8 July 2025 and addressed to Ms Sullivan at their email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 8 July 2025 detailing Ms Sullivan's registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 8 July 2025 the writer sent by email Ms Sullivan 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 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended) (the rules) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice had been served on Ms Sullivan under the rules.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

7. The notice of final order review told Ms Sullivan that the review would take place as a meeting. The notice stated:

"If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on 23 July 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 Sullivan had responded to the notice of final order review.
9. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser regarding rule 16(c) 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 to conduct the review as a meeting under Rule 16(c).

Review of the current order:

11. This agreed accepted disposal order (the final order) review meeting is taking place under paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (the regulations) and the rules.
12. This review reviews the current order, which is due to end at the end of 21 September 2025. The order subject to review is a suspension order.

The concerns which were admitted by Ms Sullivan which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

Regulatory concern 1

While registered as a social worker on or around 26 January 2022:

You were under the influence of alcohol when at work and/or when driving to work

Regulatory concern 2

While registered as a social worker:

PRIVATE set out in Schedule 1 which impacts on your ability to practise as a social worker

Schedule 1

- *PRIVATE*
- *PRIVATE*

Regulatory concern 3

You did not cooperate with the regulator, Social Work England, in relation to their investigation into your fitness to practise

The matters outlined in regulatory concern 1 and/or regulatory concern 3 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct

PRIVATE.

Background

13. The case examiners received the following background to this case.
14. Prior to these concerns being raised, a fitness to practise final hearing was held by Social Work England on 26 March 2020. An unpublished warning was issued by the final hearing panel regarding an allegation that Ms Sullivan's fitness to practise was impaired because of her conviction in November 2018 for driving a motor vehicle while intoxicated. The police had recorded a breath/alcohol reading over three times the permitted limit. The panel expressed concerns regarding this incident but found that despite the conviction, Ms Sullivan's fitness to practise was not impaired at the point that they determined the case.
15. The case examiners considered this matter when considering the concerns in this case.

Regulatory concern 1

16. Regarding regulatory concern 1, the facts available to the case examiners were that Ms Sullivan had gone to work on 26 January 2022 as part of a phased return to work plan. Her managers were concerned as Ms Sullivan's breath smelled strongly of alcohol as did the room where she was. The social worker's line manager noted that the social worker had a visible hand tremor and their skin was 'red' and 'blotchy'.
17. Ms Sullivan's line manager was sufficiently concerned as to inform their own manager and ask for them to join them. The evidence indicated that Ms Sullivan's line manager challenged Ms Sullivan as to whether they had drunk alcohol before work. Ms Sullivan denied this but confirmed they had consumed alcohol the night before.
18. Ms Sullivan was subject to an investigation by their employer. During this investigation Ms Sullivan was interviewed and accepted that they drunk to excess the night before and did not refute the accounts from the witnesses.
19. The evidence before the case examiners supported the conclusion that Ms Sullivan drove their car to their place of work, and when informed by their manager that they were to leave the premises due to them being perceived to be under the influence of alcohol, indicated that they intended to again drive. However, following intervention by their manager, Ms Sullivan arranged for a taxi instead. Ms Sullivan went to their place of work while under the influence of alcohol. She had also been under the influence of alcohol when driving to work that day.

20. Ms Sullivan replied to the case examiners and in their submissions accepted this concern was true. They stated:

"Yes, I do admit this regulatory concern...I did not perceive, at time, that I remained under the influence of alcohol, however, fully accept the opinions given by the management team."

Regulatory concern 2

21. The case examiners had sight of:

- PRIVATE.
- PRIVATE.
- PRIVATE.

22. PRIVATE.

23. PRIVATE.

24. The case examiners also had access to Ms Sullivan's employer's report. This indicated that Ms Sullivan's PRIVATE had impacted on their ability to carry out their duties, such as not reporting for work and failing to keep in contact with their managers, including in May 2023.

25. PRIVATE.

26. Ms Sullivan also accepted this concern. They stated:

"PRIVATE."

27. The case examiners were satisfied that the social worker PRIVATE as set out in Schedule 1 which may affect their fitness to practise.

Regulatory concern 3

28. The case examiners reviewed the email correspondence and telephone call notes which were part of efforts made by Social Work England to obtain further information (PRIVATE) from Ms Sullivan regarding PRIVATE. The social worker in their submissions accepted this concern. They stated;

"Yes, I admit this regulatory concern. During the period leading up to this, PRIVATE, whereby, I was unable to cope effectively with day-to-day tasks and acknowledge my failure to engage."

29. The case examiners were satisfied that there was a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding this concern proved.

30. These admissions and the evidence led the case examiners to determine that there remained unresolved issues relating to Ms Sullivan's PRIVATE and engagement with regulatory requirements. They noted that while some steps had been taken to address

PRIVATE. The case examiners considered that ongoing risks to safe and effective practice persisted.

The case examiners on 10 August 2023 determined the following with regard to impairment:

Personal element

In considering the personal element of impairment, and the concerns before the regulator, the case examiners have considered the test as set out in the case examiner guidance, namely

- *whether the conduct is easily remediable; and*
- *whether the social worker has shown insight and/or*
- *conducted remediation to the effect that the risk of repetition is highly unlikely.*

The case examiners consider that the social worker's alleged conduct could be remediable.

Regarding the allegation of attending their place of work under the influence and/or driving to work under the influence, the social worker could take actions to indicate that they understand why the situation occurred and show steps they have taken to prevent a future reoccurrence. This could include a completion of a critical reflection with the overarching objectives of the regulator in mind. The case examiners note the social worker's comments which seem to suggest some insight:

"I fully acknowledge and accept the concerns raised both by my employer and Social Work England. I am deeply ashamed that I have behaved in a manner which would be viewed as bringing the profession into disrepute, both inside and outside of the workplace.

I also understand that the previous referral to the regulatory body will only serve to compound the current concerns.

I acknowledge that the concerns raised fall well below what we consider as acceptable as a social worker."

The case examiners note that the evidence indicates the social worker has not disputed the concerns and have recognised that their alleged conduct was unacceptable. The case examiners note however, that the social worker has not provided submissions considering what they should have done differently in the circumstances. That means they are of the view that the social worker's insight is limited.

The case examiners note that the evidence indicates that there have been no previous concerns raised in relation to the social worker's professionalism and conduct in the workplace during a long career. However, the case examiners have noted what they consider 'adverse history', suggesting a repeat of behaviour impacting on their fitness to practise linked to the consumption of excess alcohol.

In regard to PRIVATE, the evidence indicates the social worker has taken positive steps to manage this, for example they have actively sought and engaged with relevant support services. PRIVATE."

In their submissions, the social worker advises that they continue to experience challenging personal circumstances and are currently unable to work in what is currently a non-social worker role, due to PRIVATE. As such, the case examiners consider remediation and insight to be incomplete and are of the view that there is a high risk of repetition at this time.

Public element

The case examiners have next considered whether the social worker's actions have the potential to undermine public confidence in the social work profession, or the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

The case examiners are of the view that a member of the public would be concerned about allegations of a social worker being under the influence of alcohol when at work and/or when driving to work and not cooperating with the regulator's investigation of the social worker's fitness to practise.

The case examiners consider that there is also the potential for public trust and confidence in the social worker and the social work profession to be undermined, if these concerns were subsequently found proved.

The case examiners consider the alleged conduct speaks to the professional integrity of the social worker and can impact on the social worker's ability to carry out their duties in protecting children from risk of harm. Adjudicators may consider there is potential risk of harm to the wider public in terms of their ability to trust and have confidence in a social worker who is alleged to have acted in this manner, and who appears to have a PRIVATE that may impact on their ability to perform as a social worker effectively. Furthermore, the social worker's actions may undermine public confidence in the social work profession.

The case examiners also consider that such conduct, if proven, is a significant departure from the professional standards and that there is a risk of repetition.

The case examiners have noted the social worker's comments regarding their fitness to practise:

"Although, this is particularly difficult for me to answer, given that I would want to be in a position whereby I was able to state with confidence, that my current fitness to practise, is not impaired, I have to acknowledge the concerns raised.

In light of the fact that PRIVATE, I have to accept why my fitness to currently practise, without restriction would be the conclusion drawn. However, in mitigation, I would sincerely hope, with continued commitment from myself and support, these issues can be safely managed and that the suitability issues could be safely managed."

The case examiners consider that the social worker accepts that their fitness to practise may be impaired.

The case examiners on 10 August 2023 determined the following with regard to sanction:

The case examiners are of the opinion that any sanction that does not restrict the social worker's practise (i.e. advice or warnings) are inappropriate in the circumstances of this case, as they do not manage any ongoing risk to the public.

They have also concluded that a conditions of practice order is not suitable for this case, due to the fact that the social worker is not currently practising and the evidence suggests PRIVATE. Further, a conditions of practice order may not provide sufficient protection if there is evidence raising doubt about whether the social worker will be able or willing to comply with the order; the case examiners consider this may be the case as the social worker does not currently work in a social work role and there is evidence of the social worker failing to engage with Social Work England's investigation into their fitness to practise.

The case examiners have then considered a suspension order. PRIVATE

When considering a suspension order, case examiners are required to decide a period of suspension, and in doing so, consider the need to protect the public and the wider public interest. They should also balance the duration against the risk that a prolonged suspension may result in deskilling. The case examiners are also aware that where possible, it is in the public interest to support the return to practise of a trained and skilled social worker if this can be done safely.

The case examiners considered the length of time for the suspension order and considered 2 years to be proportionate in this case. PRIVATE

The case examiners considered a longer period of time to be disproportionate, given the evidence that PRIVATE.

Taking the above into account, the case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a suspension order of 2 years duration.

Social Work England submissions:

31. The panel received written submissions on behalf of Social Work England in the notice of hearing, which read:

Subject to any further information or submissions from the social worker, Social Work England invites the panel to consider that the fitness to practise of the social worker remains impaired because the social worker has provided no evidence of reflection, remediation or insight. There has been no change in circumstances since the imposition of the suspension order and the risk of repetition remains high.

Social Work England has tried to engage the social worker and obtain evidence of their current fitness to practise but there has been no engagement at all. The Case Review Officer has written to the social worker on five occasions but there has been no response from the social worker.

The panel are invited to continue the suspension order for a further 6 months to allow the social worker to provide evidence of reflection, remediation and insight and comply with the recommendations of the Case Examiners. In addition the social worker will be afforded a further opportunity to engage with the fitness to practise process.

In the event that the suspension order is continued and the social worker fails to engage over the following 6 months a future reviewing Panel may be invited to consider a Removal Order.

Social worker submissions:

32. There were no submissions for or on behalf of Ms Sullivan.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

33. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order given the current circumstances. It considered the decision of the case examiners. However, it has exercised its own independent judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also considered Social Work England's Impairment and sanctions guidance.

34. The panel had regard to the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the case examiners. There was no new material available to this panel such as a reflective statement, or any professional or personal references despite evidence that Ms Sullivan had been invited to do so on several occasions this year. The panel also took account of the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England. There were no submissions by or on behalf of Ms Sullivan.

35. The panel 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 maintain public confidence in the profession.

36. The panel reminded itself that that:

- i. The review should consider the evidence of any change which would help the panel to decide whether Ms Sullivan's fitness to practise is impaired
- ii. The extent to which Ms Sullivan has engaged with the regulatory process, the scope and level of her insight, and the risk of repetition
- iii. The persuasive burden falls upon Ms Sullivan
- iv. Regarding whether the regulatory concerns have been sufficiently, and appropriately remediated, relevant factors include whether Ms Sullivan:

- a. Appreciates the gravity of the previous finding of impairment;
 - b. has kept her skills and knowledge up to date;
 - c. is likely to place service users at risk if she returned to unrestricted practise.
- v. The panel should consider any information it has received relating to Ms Sullivan's ability to practise safely and effectively and the wider public interest which includes promoting and maintaining proper professional standards of behaviour and promoting and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
- vi. Only if the panel determine that Ms Sullivan's fitness to practise remains impaired, should the panel consider what sanction to impose by applying the guidance as set out in the Sanctions Guidance (SG), the Regulations and the principles of proportionality which require fairness and Ms Sullivan's interests to be considered, and that only the least restrictive but equally effective sanction be imposed to protect the public.

37. The panel first considered whether Ms Sullivan's fitness to practise remains impaired.

38. Ms Sullivan has not engaged with Social Work England in the two years since the final order was agreed and made effective. She had not engaged to allow this case to be heard at a hearing and had not explained her current insight, understanding, PRIVATE, or progress if any.

39. Ms Sullivan has not tried to PRIVATE to be provided for the panel. There are no written submissions. None of the things suggested to her by the case examiners has been taken up. There was no evidence that Ms Sullivan has acquired enough understanding of the seriousness of the regulatory concerns or the impact these concerns had upon the safety and wellbeing of vulnerable service users, her professional colleagues, on wider public safety issues and the reputation of the social work profession.

40. The panel noted that it has no information regarding any paid or unpaid work which Ms Sullivan may be undertaking.

41. In the absence of any evidence of insight and remediation, the panel concluded that there has been no material change in circumstances, since the adjudicators decision in September 2021. This was despite Ms Sullivan being provided with a clear list of the types of evidence a reviewing panel would be assisted by.

42. Although Ms Sullivan previously engaged with Social Work England to a limited extent until 2023, there has been no engagement by her with Social Work England since, which is a significant period. Therefore, there remains no demonstration of positive steps taken by her to address PRIVATE. The panel does not underestimate the amount of that task. It would be likely to take time and incremental supported steps. Setbacks might be expected. However, as a social worker, Ms Sullivan is expected to keep public safety in mind in addition to PRIVATE. The panel concluded that there is no evidence provided to suggest that the risks to service users identified due to Ms Sullivan's PRIVATE and

misconduct have reduced. There therefore remains a real risk of repetition which, were that to occur, would place service users at risk of harm.

43. The panel noted that a significant element of the public part of impairment is promoting and maintaining public confidence and promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers. Members of the public would be concerned if a social worker could resume unrestricted practise when the PRIVATE which led to a suspension order had not been remediated.
44. The panel concluded that, in these circumstances, a finding of no impairment would undermine public trust and confidence in the profession and Social Work England as a professional regulator. The panel concluded that Ms Sullivan's fitness to practise remains impaired.
45. The panel considered what sanction to impose.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

46. Having found Ms Sullivan's fitness to practise is impaired, the panel then considered what sanction it should impose. The panel can:
- with effect from the date on which the order would have ended, extend or further extend the period for which the order has effect if the extended period does not exceed three years,
 - with effect from the expiry of the order, make any order which the case examiners or the adjudicators could have made when they made the order,
 - in the case of a suspension order, with effect from its expiry make a conditions of practice order with which the social worker must comply if they resume practice as a social worker after the period of suspension specified in the order.
47. The panel noted that paragraph 15(1)(b) states;
- “with effect from the expiry of the order, [the panel may] make any order which the case examiners or the adjudicators (as the case may be) could have made at the time they made the order, provided that the period for which the orders have effect does not exceed three years in total”*
48. The legal adviser's advice was that the wording of paragraph 15(1)(b) was not truly ambiguous. Applying a strict construction to the wording of paragraph 15(1)(b), might result in the conclusion that the panel could not impose a removal order at this stage since that would affect greater than three years.
49. That construction, however, would be in conflict with the statutory intention (as clarified reading the regulations) that the panel does have power to make a removal order. A strict and limiting construction would be an absurd conclusion to reach and is not correct.

50. The purpose and intention of paragraph 15(1)(b) is that any extended suspension order should not exceed three years, considering the pre-existing suspension final order(s). That interpretation would harmonise with the broader regulations and the sanctions guidance, which states that suspension orders can be imposed for ‘...*up to three years*’ and cautions against suspension orders remaining in effect for periods which result in de-skilling of the social worker.
51. Based on the advice of the legal adviser, the panel determined that it should consider the sanctions available because it was not precluded from making a removal order.
52. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Sullivan, 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 Ms Sullivan’s interests with the public interest and by considering each sanction in ascending order of severity.
53. The panel took into account Social Work England's overarching goal which is to protect the public achieved by:
- a. protecting, promoting and maintaining the health, safety and wellbeing of the public;
 - b. promoting and maintaining public confidence in social workers in England; and
 - c. promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers in England.

Decision on whether to revoke order/make no further order

54. The panel noted these paragraphs of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance:

215. If a social worker remains not fit to practise, the adjudicators will make a decision on what order should be imposed.

216. A social worker must not be allowed to resume unrestricted practice unless the decision makers are satisfied their fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

55. The panel concluded that, because of the nature and seriousness of Ms Sullivan’s impairment which has not been resolved, and absent any evidence PRIVATE, developed insight or remediation, it would not be appropriate to take no further action. It would not protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession, given the risk of repetition.

Decision on whether to issue advice or warning on expiry of suspension order

56. The panel then considered whether to issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that neither sanction would restrict Ms Sullivan's ability to practise and is therefore not appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety. So, the panel concluded that issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

Decision on whether to impose a conditions of practice order on expiry of suspension order

57. The panel considered a conditions of practice order. The panel took the view that, given PRIVATE, the misconduct findings in this case which relate to attending work while under the influence of alcohol, and the lack of any recent engagement from Ms Sullivan, workable conditions could not be formulated. Further, Ms Sullivan had not said that she would commit to and abide within conditions of practice. In these circumstances, the panel had no reassurance that conditions of practice would be enough to keep the public safe from the risks identified.

Decision on whether to extend the period of suspension order

58. The panel next considered whether to extend the current period of suspension. The panel noted that Ms Sullivan had not responded to the notice of this final order review hearing. She also did not respond to the emails from Social Work England dated 27 March 2024, 30 August 2024, 27 March 2025, and 16 May 2025. These had provided templates to offer workplace and personal referees as well as requests for meaningful engagement. Despite this, Social Work England had invited the panel to impose a suspension order.
59. The panel was mindful that Ms Sullivan's PRIVATE were burdensome for her, as they would be for anyone. It could not be easy for her to contemplate the enormity of engaging with the steps necessary to permit a return to unrestricted practice. However, the panel observed from the papers available to the case examiners that Ms Sullivan had been a social worker since the 1990s. PRIVATE. Her employers had been supportive of her, and she had accessed support. The panel had no evidence to support the view that Ms Sullivan had become resigned to never returning to practice.
60. In the circumstances, the panel was satisfied that the public would be fully protected by ordering that the current suspension order be extended for six months on the expiry of the current order. That outcome was proportionate and fair.
61. The panel considered the sanctions guidance and the potential to make a removal order. However, the panel was satisfied that a removal order would be

disproportionate. It was not the only means by which the public could be fully protected.

62. The panel concluded that the appropriate sanction is a suspension order. A suspension order would prevent Ms Sullivan from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest.

63. The panel determined that the suspension order should be imposed for six months. The panel was satisfied that this period was appropriate because it would allow Ms Sullivan an opportunity to consider this determination and to take the appropriate steps. The panel concluded this would take at least six months to achieve. Therefore, the suspension period reflects the time that Ms Sullivan may need to reflect on the panel's findings and make a plan of action targeted towards an unrestricted return to the register.

64. This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel would expect Ms Sullivan to attend the review hearing and it would help that panel if they provided evidence that they had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. This may include:

- Evidence they have kept their social work skills and knowledge up to date, such as:
 - Write a reflective piece, for example, focusing on any learning they have undertaken.
 - Following the concerns raised, self-management skills learned from engaging with support services, and implications for the wider social work profession.
 - Provide evidence of their continued professional development.
 - Provide evidence of their engagement with relevant treatment and/or testing programmes, and health management.
 - Testimonials that provide a focus on their character, knowledge and skills.

Right of appeal:

65. 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.

66. 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.
67. 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.
68. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

69. 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).
70. 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

71. 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>