

Social worker: Odesanmi
Akinpeluola Odoginyon
Registration number: SW132166
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review meeting

Date of meeting: 15 August 2025

Meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 27 September 2025)

Meeting outcome:
Extend the current suspension order for a further period of 6 months 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 12 months by a panel of adjudicators on 30 August 2025.
2. Mr Odoginyon 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
Karen McArthur	Chair
Marva Kelly	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Tom Stoker	Hearings officer
Chiugo Eze	Hearings support officer
Chris Binns	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 8 July 2025 and addressed to Mr Odoginyon at their email address which he provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 8 July 2025 detailing Mr Odoginyon's registered email 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 to Mr Odoginyon at the email 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 16, 44 and 45 of the Fitness to practise 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 of this hearing had been served on Mr Odoginyon in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

7. The notice of final order review informed Mr Odoginyon 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 accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering this application. This included reference to Rule 43 and the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5*; *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. The panel also took into account Social Work England guidance ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’.
9. The panel received no information to suggest that Mr Odoginyon had responded to the notice of final order review. The panel, therefore, concluded that Mr Odoginyon had chosen voluntarily to absent himself. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Mr Odoginyon’s attendance. Having weighed the interests of Mr Odoginyon in regard to his 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 Mr Odoginyon’s absence.
10. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides:

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

12. 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).

The purpose of this meeting is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 27 September 2025. The order subject to review is a suspension order.

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

13. *While registered as a social worker and employed by Southend Borough Council:*

- 1) *In relation to Service User 1:*

- a) *On or after 8 January 2021, you did not put a plan in place for contact between Service User 1 and his grandfather.*
- b) *On or around 21 March 2021, did not prepare an adequate risk assessment for Service User 1 in that:*
 - i) *You did not obtain multiagency insight and/or feedback and/ or;*
 - ii) *You did not obtain Service User 1's views on the plan;*
- c) *Did not take appropriate safeguarding action after becoming aware of Service User 1's suicide attempt on or around 13 April 2021 in that you:*
 - i) *Did not visit Service User 1 and/ or;*
 - ii) *Did not contact medical professionals and/ or;*
 - iii) *Did not ascertain the trigger for Service User 1's actions and/ or;*
 - iv) *Did not call a timely strategy meeting.*

1) In relation to Service User 2:

- a) *Between around January 2021 and around May 2021, you did not familiarise yourself with the case notes of Service User 2 such that you were not sufficiently aware of his vulnerabilities and existing safeguarding concerns.*
- b) *On becoming aware that Service User 2 had on or around 8 March 2021, been in a volatile state and in need of calming down, you:*
 - i) *Did not make a welfare call to Service User 2 and/ or;*
 - ii) *Did not contact Service User 2 to ascertain what support he needed.*
- c) *Between around 23 March 2021 and around May 2021, you did not take appropriate safeguarding action after becoming aware that Service User 2 was engaged in sexual communications online with other service users in that you:*
 - i) *Did not inform the Team Manager of the incident and/ or;*
 - ii) *Did not undertake sexual exploitation work with Service User 2 and/ or;*
 - iii) *Did not complete a multiagency risk assessment.*
- d) *Between January 2021 and around 6 April 2021, you:*

- i) *Did not ensure a risk assessment was completed prior to Service User 2 having unsupervised contact with his parents and/or;*
 - iii) *Failed to action a home visit in a timely manner.*
 - e) *You did not take appropriate safeguarding action upon being made aware that Service User 2 was being bullied on or around 6 April 2021, in that you:*
 - i) *Did not discuss these concerns with the placement staff and/ or;*
 - ii) *Did not visit Service User 2 and/ or;*
 - iii) *Did not update Service User 2's Care Plan in a timely manner and/ or;*
 - iv) *Did not complete a safety plan and/ or;*
 - v) *Did not call a multiagency meeting.*
- 3) *In relation to Service User 3:*
- b) *On or around 26 January 2021, you prepared a risk assessment in relation to Service User 3 which was inadequate in that:*
 - i) *It incorrectly assessed Service User 3's health risk level as "low" where it should have been "high" and/ or;*
 - ii) *It did not include details about Service User 3's general health and/ or;*
 - iii) *It did not contain adequate detail on how risk factors could be reduced.*

The final hearing panel on 29 August 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:

- 14. *"The panel recognised that the risks of harm that Mr Odoginyon's inadequate and unimproved professional performance exposed vulnerable service users to were significant and unacceptable.*
- 15. *The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon's actions, even though conducted over a relatively short period of time and in relation only to one employer at an early stage in his career, did have the potential to bring the reputation of the profession into disrepute. Mr Odoginyon had failed to properly arrange important meetings with partner professionals on more than one occasion. That had attracted concern and criticism from his professional colleagues. In these circumstances, the well-informed member of the public would have little difficulty in understanding the loss of confidence in the profession that this might attract.*
- 16. *The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon had breached at least one of the fundamental tenets of the profession. Mr Odoginyon had failed to identify and act on*

clear and immediate risks for the service users in his caseload. He had not acted on information which pointed to a need for urgent protective steps to be taken. He had consistently demonstrated a lack of professional curiosity. He had failed to engage with fellow professionals both internally with his employer and externally in partner organisations including the police. Broader safeguarding matters had not been identified and dealt with. Mr Odoginyon's failures to build positive relationships with service users by responding to their needs was particularly concerning. Arising out of this Mr Odoginyon had not been an advocate for the service users and he had not prioritised their needs over his own. This ran contrary to the fundamental tenets of social work which Mr Odoginyon would, like all social workers, have been immersed in from the very beginning of his career.

- 17. The panel considered that the public would be concerned at Mr Odoginyon's unaddressed lack of capability and competence, unrecognised by him over an eight-month period of extensively supported ASYE practice. He had, in consequence of his unimproved competence placed at added risk a disadvantaged group of adolescent service users of being inadequately safeguarded.*
- 18. In all of these circumstances, a finding of impairment was necessary in order to declare and uphold Standards for social workers and to maintain the trust and confidence of the public in the profession.*
- 19. The panel, therefore, found Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise to be impaired on the grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest".*

The final hearing panel on 29 August 2024 determined the following with regard to sanction:

- 20. "The panel then considered whether a conditions of practice order would be proportionate and appropriate in the circumstances. The panel gave extensive thought to a conditions of practice order. However, given:*
 - the wide-ranging lack of competence or capability in Mr Odoginyon's practice;*
 - the panel's findings that Mr Odoginyon has put service users at unwarranted risk of harm;*
 - the high risk of repetition of conduct similar to that of the failures found in Mr Odoginyon's practice;*
 - Mr Odoginyon had been under close supervision during his ASYE year, yet significant concerns surrounding his practice existed;*
 - the continuing limited insight from Mr Odoginyon in relation to his failures, which has been exacerbated by Mr Odoginyon's continued belief that the failures in his practice were essentially due to inadequate supervision, management, and mentorship;*

The panel found that it could not formulate conditions which were proportionate or workable, or which were not so restrictive that they would be tantamount to suspension, in order to protect the public.

21. In any event, Mr Odoginyon has not engaged in over two years with his regulator or at all in this final hearing process. The panel could not have confidence that Mr Odoginyon would engage meaningfully with conditions of practice so that the public would be safe while he worked as a social worker under restrictions.

22. The panel next considered whether it was appropriate to impose a suspension order. For the following reasons, it considered a suspension order to be appropriate and proportionate to protect the public and the wider public interest:

- The proved allegations demonstrate failures in fundamental aspects of social work practice. The panel consider these to be a serious breach of the professional standards;*
- Mr Odoginyon has demonstrated only limited insight and has not undertaken remediation;*
- A suspension order will provide him with the time to reflect on the findings, and to develop and broaden insight. It will allow scope for opportunities to demonstrate remediation of his competence and capability in his practice, albeit not as a social worker; and*
- The panel noted that under paragraph 150 of the Social Work England Sanctions Guidance, a removal order is not available to it in the current situation.*

23. The panel also took into account the importance of publicly declaring the standards of conduct and behaviour expected of a registered social worker and maintaining public trust and confidence in the profession.

24. The panel noted that there is a public interest in permitting a social worker to continue to practise their profession for the public good, if it is safe to do so, provided that it is not inconsistent with the wider public interest objectives which must take priority. The panel concluded that permitting Mr Odoginyon to return to practice immediately and his professional and personal interests were outweighed by the panel's duty to uphold the wider public interest. Therefore, a Suspension Order would satisfy the public interest aspects of the case.

25. The panel had regard to the paragraph 142 of the Sanctions Guidance:

“Suspension up to one year may be appropriate if the suspension’s primary[...] aim is (one or both of the following):

maintaining confidence in the profession

ensuring the professional standards are observed”

In this case, there were real concerns for the safety of service users and the public which went beyond the public interest factors of the overarching objective. However, having balanced the factors outlined above, and upon considering all of the circumstances of the case, the panel found that a 12-month suspension order would be a sufficient period for Mr Odoginyon to develop full insight and to plan to remediate his practice if he wished to do so.

26. *The panel decided that this was a sufficient period of time to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the profession. Mr Odoginyon has not indicated a wish to return to social work practice. He might decide to do so having read this determination and considered the contents thoughtfully. The panel held in mind that it is in the public interest to support a trained and skilled social worker to return to practice. Further, a period of in excess of 12 months risks Mr Odoginyon becoming deskilled and the risk of deskilling is a public interest consideration.*

27. *The suspension order will be subject to review before expiry, during which a separate panel of adjudicators will consider whether Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise remains impaired and, if so, what, if any, sanction should be imposed. Mr Odoginyon will only be permitted to practise, under restrictions or otherwise, if he demonstrates sufficient insight and if the review panel is satisfied that his return to practise with or without a restriction would no longer pose a risk to the public and that allowing him to practise maintains public confidence in the profession. The reviewing panel would benefit from Mr Odoginyon's resumed engagement with Social Work England:*

- *Attendance at future hearings*
- *A reflective piece highlighting his past failings and the impact they had on the safety of service users, his colleagues, and on public trust and confidence in the profession.*
- *Mr Odoginyon may also wish to provide the reviewing panel with a history of his employment and training since the ending of his ASYE contract. That might include:*
 - *reflections on that work or training*
 - *how that has addressed and developed his competence and capability*
 - *explaining why he would not again be responsible for failings in practice related to a lack of competence or capability should he return to social work practice unrestricted."*

Social Work England submissions:

28. The panel read the submission of Social Work England set out in the notice of hearing dated 8 July 2025:

“Subject to any further information or submission from the Social Worker, Social Work England invites the Panel to consider that the Social Worker’s fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of lack of capability or competence. 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 sought to engage the Social Worker and obtain evidence of their current fitness to practise but there has been no engagement at all.

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 previous Panel. In addition the Social Worker will be afforded a further opportunity to engage with the fitness to practice 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”.

29. The panel had no written submission from Mr Odoginyon before it.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

30. 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’.

31. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel. The panel took into account the written submission of Social Work England.

32. 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 maintain public confidence in the profession.

33. The panel first considered whether Mr Odoginyon’s fitness to practise remains impaired.

Personal impairment

34. The panel considered the guidance provided in *Cohen v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 581 which invited panels to consider:

- whether the Registrant’s conduct was easily remediable;
- whether it had been remedied; and
- whether it was highly unlikely to be repeated.

35. The panel concluded that Mr Odoginyon's lack of capability or competence was remediable, albeit with some difficulty. Mr Odoginyon had not, the panel understood, been able to continue in practice as a social worker since being subject to an interim suspension order. However, he had taken up work in a related though unqualified adviser capacity in which there was evidence of good practice dating back to 2022. The panel had nothing more recent. The certificates produced by Mr Odoginyon all predated his ASYE employment. There was no evidence of any targeted remediation such as courses of training or insight and reflection dealing with competence and capability. Mr Odoginyon originally emphasised the alleged failings of others as being instrumental in his inability to progress and demonstrate competence. He said that he had been set up to fail by being placed in a demanding job without adequate supervision or training. He did not acknowledge the measure of support provided to him including a very restricted caseload.
36. The panel considered that Mr Odoginyon had not been able to provide any practical evidence or any up-to-date reflections which addressed a relevant degree of insight into his lack of competence or capability.
37. Mr Odoginyon had wholly failed to engage meaningfully with the serious and substantial failings captured in the allegations. In particular, Mr Odoginyon had not expressed any real grasp of his personal responsibility for his failings, particularly in respect of his working collaboratively with partner colleagues, identifying and acting on alarming risks for service users, and his failures to build relationships with his professional colleagues and the service users in his caseload.
38. There was no recognition by Mr Odoginyon of the impact that his actions had on vulnerable service users and others and the risks that his sustained lack of competence or capability had created. There was no fundamental engagement with the serious issues in this case. As a result, the panel could not be reassured that Mr Odoginyon would not repeat similar failings through an unaddressed lack of capability or competence.
39. The panel found that it could not conclude that it was highly unlikely that Mr Odoginyon's misconduct would be repeated.
40. The panel noted that the original panel considered that the review panel would be assisted by Mr Odoginyon:
- Engaging with Social Work England
 - A reflective piece highlighting his past failings and the impact they had on the safety of service users, his colleagues, and on public trust and confidence in the profession.
 - Mr Odoginyon may also wish to provide the reviewing panel with a history of his employment and training since the ending of his ASYE contract. That might include:

- i. reflections on that work or training
- ii. how that has addressed and developed his competence and capability
- iii. explaining why he would not again be responsible for failings in practice related to a lack of competence or capability should he return to social work practice unrestricted.

41. The panel found in the absence of any evidence that demonstrated the development on insight, remorse and competence and capability from Mr Odoginyon and continued lack of engagement with Social Work England since the original panel, the aggravating factors remain unchanged.

42. The panel concluded that Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise is currently impaired by virtue of the personal component.

Public impairment

43. The panel paid close regard to the Social Work England guidance from paragraph 60 onwards. The panel also considered that Mr Odoginyon's actions engaged limbs (a), (b) and (c) of the test formulated in the High Court by Cox J in *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) at paragraph 76:

'Do our findings of fact in respect of [Mr Odoginyon's] misconduct, ... show that his fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that [he]:

- a. has in the past acted and/or is liable to act in the future so as to put a [service user] or at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*
- b. has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the [social work] profession into disrepute; and/or*
- c. has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the [social work] profession;*

44. The panel recognised that the risks of harm that Mr Odoginyon's inadequate and unimproved professional performance exposed vulnerable service users to were significant and unacceptable.

45. The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon's actions, even though conducted over a relatively short period of time and in relation only to one employer at an early stage in his career, did have the potential to bring the reputation of the profession into disrepute. Mr Odoginyon had failed to properly arrange important meetings with partner professionals on more than one occasion. That had attracted concern and criticism from his professional colleagues. In these circumstances, the well-informed member

of the public would have little difficulty in understanding the loss of confidence in the profession that this might attract.

46. The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon had breached at least one of the fundamental tenets of the profession. Mr Odoginyon had failed to identify and act on clear and immediate risks for the service users in his caseload. He had not acted on information which pointed to a need for urgent protective steps to be taken. He had consistently demonstrated a lack of professional curiosity. He had failed to engage with fellow professionals both internally with his employer and externally in partner organisations including the police. Broader safeguarding matters had not been identified and dealt with. Mr Odoginyon's failures to build positive relationships with service users by responding to their needs was particularly concerning. Arising out of this Mr Odoginyon had not been an advocate for the service users and he had not prioritised their needs over his own. This ran contrary to the fundamental tenets of social work which Mr Odoginyon would, like all social workers, have been immersed in from the very beginning of his career.
47. The panel considered that the public would be concerned at Mr Odoginyon's unaddressed lack of capability and competence, unrecognised by him over an eight-month period of extensively supported ASYE practice. He had, in consequence of his unimproved competence placed at added risk a disadvantaged group of adolescent service users of being safeguarded.
48. In all of these circumstances, a finding of impairment was necessary in order to declare and uphold Standards for social workers and to maintain the trust and confidence of the public in the profession.
49. The panel, therefore, found Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise to be impaired on the grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest.

Decision and reasons:

50. Having found Mr Odoginyon 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. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England. The panel had no submission before it from Mr Odoginyon.
51. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Odoginyon, 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 Odoginyon's interests with the public interest.

52. The panel noted that Mr Odoginyon has not engaged with Social Work England since the determination of the original panel and there was no evidence before it that would mitigate the risks identified by the original panel.

53. The panel considered the least restrictive sanction first and then moved up the sanctions in ascending order as appropriate. The panel had regard to the Social Work England Sanctions Guidance, updated on 16 December 2022.

1. The panel considered the following remained as mitigating factors:

- There were contextual factors which should be accounted for including the lockdown restrictions imposed under the Covid-19 public health measures which limited his ability to access the office and colleagues. This was regrettable in the context of an ASYE employee.
- Mr Odoginyon had health issues at the point of his taking up ASYE employment. He said however that these factors were not significantly influential.
- Mr Odoginyon had acknowledged some failures in his practice although with incomplete insight and ownership.
- At the time of the concerns, Mr Odoginyon was at an early stage of his career.

54. The panel considered the following factors to be aggravating:

- Mr Odoginyon had put service users at risk of harm;
- The failures in Mr Odoginyon's practice were wide-ranging across a broad canvas of professional competences and were repeated, despite significant additional assistance and multiple reviews of his work;
- Mr Odoginyon in the absence of evidence to the contrary since the original panel continues to have limited insight into his failings, which is self-focused. In particular, Mr Odoginyon has failed to identify, understand, take ownership and appeared to be detached from the risk of harm that the concerns place on service users;
- Mr Odoginyon has not apologised for his failures or shown remorse; and
- Mr Odoginyon has not undertaken even limited remediation.

55. In light of the seriousness of its findings in relation to Mr Odoginyon's lack of competence and capability and current impairment, the panel found that taking no action or merely issuing advice would not adequately protect the public. Mr Odoginyon's practice would not be restricted so as to mitigate the risks of harm that stemmed from his deficiencies in competence and capability.

56. In addition, these sanctions would not adequately meet the wider public interest of maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

57. The panel then considered whether issuing Mr Odoginyon a warning. Paragraph 108 of the Sanction Guidance states that:

“A warning order is likely to be appropriate where (all of the following):

the fitness to practise issue is isolated or limited

there is a low risk of repetition

the social worker has demonstrated insight”

58. As set out above, the panel finds that Mr Odoginyon does not meet any of these criteria:

- The concerns were not isolated or limited. The failures in Mr Odoginyon’s practice were wide-ranging and repeated;
- For the reasons provided in the *“finding and reasons on current impairment”* section above, the panel finds that there is not a low risk of repetition;
- Although Mr Odoginyon had demonstrated limited insight, it is self-focused. In particular, Mr Odoginyon has failed to identify, understand, take ownership for his own failings. He appeared to be detached from the risks of harm that his practice shortfalls placed on service users.

59. Furthermore, a warning order would not adequately meet the wider public interest of maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

60. The panel then considered whether a conditions of practice order would be proportionate and appropriate in the circumstances. The panel gave extensive thought to a conditions of practice order. However, given:

- the wide-ranging lack of competence or capability in Mr Odoginyon’s practice;
- the panel’s findings that Mr Odoginyon has put service users at unwarranted risk of harm;
- the high risk of repetition of conduct similar to that of the failures found in Mr Odoginyon’s practice;
- Mr Odoginyon had been under close supervision during his ASYE year, yet significant concerns surrounding his practice existed;
- the continuing limited insight from Mr Odoginyon in relation to his failures, which has been exacerbated by Mr Odoginyon’s continued belief that the failures in his

practice were essentially due to inadequate supervision, management, and mentorship;

- The lack of engagement did not give the panel confidence that conditions would be adhered to;
- He had already had conditions applied by his employer in terms of additional support and a reduced caseload which had not ensured the protection of the public.

61. The panel found that it could not formulate conditions which were proportionate or workable, or which were not so restrictive that they would be tantamount to suspension, in order to protect the public.

62. In any event, Mr Odoginyon has not engaged in over two years with his regulator or at all in this final hearing process. The panel could not have confidence that Mr Odoginyon would engage meaningfully with conditions of practice so that the public would be safe while he worked as a social worker under restrictions.

63. The panel next considered whether it was appropriate to impose a suspension order. For the following reasons, it considered a suspension order to be appropriate and proportionate to protect the public and the wider public interest:

- The proved allegations demonstrate failures in fundamental aspects of social work practice. The panel consider these to be a serious breach of the professional standards;
- Mr Odoginyon has demonstrated only limited insight and has not undertaken remediation;
- A suspension order will provide him with the time to reflect on the findings, and to develop and broaden insight. It will allow scope for opportunities to demonstrate remediation of his competence and capability in his practice, albeit not as a social worker; and
- The panel noted that under paragraph 150 of the Social Work England Sanctions Guidance, a removal order is not available to it in the current situation.

64. The panel also took into account the importance of publicly declaring the standards of conduct and behaviour expected of a registered social worker and maintaining public trust and confidence in the profession.

65. The panel noted that there is a public interest in permitting a social worker to continue to practise their profession for the public good, if it is safe to do so, provided that it is not inconsistent with the wider public interest objectives which must take priority. The panel concluded that permitting Mr Odoginyon to return to practice immediately and his professional and personal interests were outweighed by the panel's duty to uphold

the wider public interest. The panel further considered that not imposing a suspension order in circumstances where the Mr Odoginyon had not engaged would undermine public confidence in Social Work England. Therefore, a Suspension Order would satisfy the public interest aspects of the case.

66. In this case, there were real concerns for the safety of service users and the public which went beyond the public interest factors of the overarching objective in the absence of any evidence from Mr Odoginyon that demonstrated he had developed sufficient insight, remorse and had developed his competence and capability. However, having balanced the factors outlined above, and upon considering all of the circumstances of the case, the panel found that extending the suspension order for a further period 6 months would be a sufficient period for Mr Odoginyon to develop full insight and to plan to remediate his practice if he wished to do so.
67. The panel decided that this was a sufficient period of time to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the profession. Mr Odoginyon has not indicated a wish to return to social work practice. He might decide to do so having read this determination and considered the contents thoughtfully. This panel, like the previous panel, held in mind that it is in the public interest to support a trained and skilled social worker to return to practice.
68. The suspension order will be subject to further review before expiry, during which a separate panel of adjudicators will consider whether Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise remains impaired and, if so, what, if any, sanction should be imposed. Mr Odoginyon will only be permitted to practise, under restrictions or otherwise, if he demonstrates sufficient insight and if the review panel is satisfied that his return to practise with or without a restriction would no longer pose a risk to the public and that allowing him to practise maintains public confidence in the profession. The next reviewing panel would benefit from Mr Odoginyon's resumed engagement with Social Work England:
- Attendance at future hearings and engagement with the process
 - A reflective piece highlighting his past failings and the impact they had on the safety of service users, his colleagues, and on public trust and confidence in the profession.
 - Mr Odoginyon may also wish to provide the reviewing panel with a history of his employment and training since the ending of his ASYE contract. That might include:
 - i. reflections on that work or training
 - ii. how that has addressed and developed his competence and capability

- iii. explaining why he would not again be responsible for failings in practice related to a lack of competence or capability should he return to social work practice unrestricted.

Right of appeal:

69. 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:

- the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order,
- the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.

70. 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.

71. 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.

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

Review of final orders:

73. 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).

74. 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

75. 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>