

Social worker: Stuart
Sanders

Registration number: SW103743

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review meeting

Date of meeting: 02 October 2025

meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed: Suspension order
(expiring 13 November 2025)

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

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the fourth review of a final suspension order. A conditions of practice order was originally imposed for a period of 24 months by a panel of adjudicators on 17 January 2023. At the first early review on 13 November 2023 the panel varied the original conditions and at the second early review on 4 June 2024 the panel replaced the conditions of practice order with a suspension order for the remainder of the term of the order. On the third early review on 06 January 2025, the panel extended the suspension order for a further nine months.
2. Mr Sanders 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
Jill Crawford	Chair
Christine Anne Rice	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Tom Stoker	Hearings officer
Kathryn Tinsley	Hearings support officer
Louise Cotton	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 01 September 2025 and addressed to Mr Sanders at their email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 01 September 2025 detailing Mr Sander's registered email address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 01 September 2025 the writer sent by email to Mr Sanders 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 Social Work England 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 Sanders in accordance with Rules 16, 44 and 45.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

7. The notice of final order review informed Mr Sanders 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 15 September 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 Mr Sanders had responded to the notice of final order review.
9. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides: *“Where the registered social worker does not state within the period specified by the regulator whether they intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may determine whether to make an order by means of a meeting.”*
10. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering whether it was appropriate to conduct the review in the absence of Mr Sanders. This included reference to the cases of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1 and *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’.
11. The panel considered the circumstances of Mr Sanders’ absence. There has been no recent engagement from Mr Sanders and he had not responded to the notice of hearing. There has been no recorded contact from him in relation to this matter since 02 June 2024, when he indicated by email that he no longer wished to be a social worker and requested the removal of his name from the register, though the panel noted that he had not yet applied for voluntary removal. The panel considered its overarching objective to protect the public. It considered that there is a strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of the review of the current suspension order and was mindful of the costs that an adjournment would incur to Social Work England, especially in consideration of Mr Sanders’ views expressed in June 2024, which indicated that an adjournment was unlikely to secure his attendance because he no longer wishes to practise social work. Having carefully balanced Mr Sanders’ interests and the public interest, the panel decided that it was appropriate to conduct the review in Mr Sanders’ absence. 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).

Preliminary matters:

12. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to holding the meeting in private. The panel was satisfied that, pursuant to rule 38 of the Fitness to Practice Rules 2019, parts of the meeting should be held in private. This was limited to those parts of the meeting and subsequent written decision in which there was mention of Mr Sander's private physical or mental health/medical information.

Review of the current order:

13. 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).
14. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 13 November 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:

15. *"In January 2019, Birmingham Children's Trust ("the Trust") submitted a referral to the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) in relation to concerns relating to Mr Sanders' practice. Mr Sanders was employed by the Trust as a children's social worker, whose role was to work directly with children and families to whom he was allocated. Mr Sanders had completed his supported year in employment (ASYE) in December 2016.*
16. *An audit was carried out into Mr Sanders' cases for the period February 2017 to November 2017. Following the audit of his caseload which had been undertaken in December 2017 an investigation was commenced in June 2018 which was completed in May 2019. The investigation identified 15 cases that had been allocated to Mr Sanders where there appeared to be concerns.*
17. [PRIVATE]
18. *Having carefully reviewed the evidence the panel found particular 4 proved, but only in respect of Mr Sanders failure to manage risk by reason of the scale and scope of his inadequate record keeping. The panel found that Social Work England have not discharged the burden of proof in relation to the remainder of the concerns.*

Particular 4

Failed to appropriately manage risk and escalate concerns, in respect of service users:

- a. Child A
- b. Child B and C
- c. Children D, E and F
- d. Children G, H and I
- e. Children J and K
- f. Children L, M, N
- g. Child O”

19. *The panel reviewed the evidence provided by Mr Sanders in relation to [PRIVATE]. The reports describe [PRIVATE] The panel found that [PRIVATE] was a contributory factor in Mr Sanders’ failures to complete full and timely records. The panel noted Mr Sanders’ evidence that his employer should have done more at an earlier stage to provide him with administrative and other support as a reasonable adjustment and his [PRIVATE] should have been reviewed each time he moved department or even his work base. It did not make any findings of fact because any conclusion about the results of the provision of such support would be speculative.*
20. *The panel found particular 5 proved in relation to each of the sub-particulars by the documentary evidence and AC’s evidence.*

Particular 5

Failed to keep full and accurate records and failed to ensure records were completed promptly in respect of service users:

- a. Child A
- b. Child B and C
- c. Children D, E and F
- d. Children G, H and I
- e. Children J and K
- f. Children L, M and N

Child O”

The previous final order review panel on 06 January 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

“The panel first considered whether Mr Sanders’ fitness to practise remains impaired.

Mr Sanders did not attend the review, provide documentation, or written submissions. The panel therefore concluded that there had been no change in the circumstances since the last review and there remained concerns about the lack of insight demonstrated by Mr Sanders. Consequently, there was no evidence provided to the panel that the risk of repetition has reduced.

In its review the panel noted that the final hearing panel had identified positive aspects of Mr Sanders' practice as a social worker, but full and accurate record keeping is required for safe social work practice and deficiencies in record keeping expose members of the public to the risk of harm. The requirement of full and accurate record keeping is also within Social Work England's professional standards and failure to maintain the standards undermines public confidence in the profession.

The panel therefore decided that Mr Sanders' fitness to practise remains impaired"

The previous final order review panel on 06 January 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

Take no further action/impose a warning order/revoke the current suspension order/allow the current suspension order to lapse upon its expiry

The panel decided that taking no action, allowing the current order to expire, or imposing a warning order, would be insufficient to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the profession. These options would not restrict Mr Sanders' practice and would not address the ongoing risk of repetition in relation to the record keeping deficiencies.

Replace the current order with a conditions of practice order with effect from the expiry of the current order

The panel noted that previous panels had concluded that Mr Sanders failed to comply with the original and the revised conditions of practice order. Given Mr Sanders' current lack of engagement, conditions of practice would not be practicable or workable, and would be tantamount to a suspension. This appears to be acknowledged by Mr Sanders himself in his e-mail dated 2 July 2024 when he stated that conditions of practice were impossible to comply with because he has been out of the sector for six years.

Extend the current suspension order for a further 9 months with effect from the expiry of the current order:

The panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time.

The panel's primary responsibility is to protect the public and a suspension order would provide a sufficient measure of protection for members of the public. The panel was also of the view that, at the current time, a suspension order would be sufficient to maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold standards for social workers.

In its deliberations the panel had regard to the nuanced decision of the final hearing panel, which acknowledged the impact of [PRIVATE] and its relevance in mitigation to the degree of his culpability. The panel was of the view that the impact of [PRIVATE], as described in the final hearing decision, remained relevant. The panel was not provided with all the material which was before the previous review panels, and it did not reach any conclusion on whether [PRIVATE] may have impacted on the level of his engagement with Social Work England or the degree to which he complied with the conditions of practice in providing written material.

Assessing the position at today's date and looking forward, the panel was of the view that there were steps that the panel could take as reasonable adjustments to enable Mr Sanders to submit written material to demonstrate his reflection and insight into the importance of full and accurate record keeping, and the practical steps he would take in the future to prevent a repetition of the deficiencies found proven. The panel has therefore set out recommendations that may assist a future reviewing panel for Mr Sanders and recommendations for Social Work England.

Having conducted its review, the panel was of the view that there remains a realistic prospect that Mr Sanders may re-engage with Social Work England with the benefit of the recommendations the panel has made. It also remains an option for Mr Sanders to make an application for voluntary removal from the register.

The panel had in mind the reputation of the profession, and that it is not in the public interest that the cycle of reviews continues indefinitely. However, at the current time, the panel's view was that there remained a prospect of the rehabilitation of a skilled and trained social worker to the register, and it was appropriate and proportionate for Mr Sanders to be given a further opportunity to engage with Social Work England if he wishes to do so.

The panel decided that the suspension order should be extended for a period of nine months. The panel was satisfied that this period was appropriate and proportionate. It provides sufficient time for Mr Sanders to reflect on this decision and prepare evidence for a review panel, while ensuring that there is sufficient protection for the public and upholding the public interest.

A removal order taking effect on the expiry of the current order was available to the panel as Mr Sanders' fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of the grounds as set out in regulation 25(2)(b) and he had been suspended from practice or subject to a conditions of practice final order (or a combination of both) for a continuous period of two years immediately preceding the day when the removal order would take effect.

The panel considered the option of imposing a removal order, but decided that it would be disproportionate. In reaching this decision the panel took into account that the final hearing decision related to a discrete area of Mr Sanders' practice, that the deficiencies are remediable, and that Mr Sanders did initially engage with Social Work England for approximately one year following the imposition of a final order. The panel was also of the view that its responsibilities to protect the public and the wider public interest were met by the continuation of a suspension order.

The panel therefore decided that the appropriate and proportionate order is to extend the suspension order for a further period of nine months on the expiry of the current suspension order.

This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel would expect Mr Sanders to attend the review hearing and it would be of assistance to that panel if he was able to provide evidence that he had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. This may include:

- (i) A reflective piece focussed on a social workers professional responsibilities in ensuring their skills and practice in record keeping meet professional standards. This should include a focus on public protection and maintaining public confidence in the profession. The completion of this reflection will be assisted by the panel making a reasonable adjustment and requesting the provision to Mr Sanders by Social Work England of a suitable template with headings to guide the structure of the reflection.*
- (ii) Any evidence on the development of skills in relation to full and accurate record keeping, from completing relevant Continuing Professional Development, and/or current employment, and/or voluntary work*
- (iii) Testimonials or references from current employment and/or voluntary positions*

The panel was also of the view that Mr Sanders would be assisted by having peer discussions with another qualified social worker to assist him in focussing his reflections. The panel considered that Mr Sanders himself would be able to arrange this.

This panel cannot impose obligations on Social Work England. However, it recommends that Social Work England consider whether there are any reasonable adjustments that it might make as referred to in paragraph 47(i). This may also include:

- (i) Providing Mr Sanders with a template with relevant prompts and/or questions for a reflective statement*
- (ii) Direction and/or links to relevant sources of advice/guidance"*

Social Work England submissions:

21. The panel noted the written submissions from Social Work England as outlined in the notice of hearing dated 01 September 2025:

“Social Work England invite the reviewing Panel to consider directing removal from the register on the basis that the Social Worker has not demonstrated any meaningful insight, reflection or remediation. The Social Worker’s fitness to practise remains impaired on the basis that there has been no change of circumstances since the last review of the final order.

The Social Worker has previously emailed Social Work England asking to be removed from the register. Following the review Social Work England invited him to engage with the review process but also provided him with information about voluntary removal. No response has been received from the Social Worker and no application for voluntary removal has been made.

It is submitted that the Social Worker has disengaged from the fitness to practise process. He has demonstrated a lack of engagement, lack of insight, lack of focus on professional shortcomings, and a failure to accept personal responsibility in seeking to remedy the deficiencies in his professional practice. Further, by disengaging the Social Worker has provided no evidence of reflection or remediation.

The Social Worker has been given ample opportunity to engage and comply and has failed to do so meaningfully. This will be the fourth review of the Final Order.

It is submitted that a Removal Order is now appropriate and proportionate to protect the public and in the public interest generally on the basis that:

- the Social Worker will have been subject to a Final Order for over 2 years and 7 months at the date of review;*
- the Social Worker failed to comply with the conditions of practice that he was previously subject to;*
- the Social Worker has not engaged with the regulator since June 2024;*
- the Social Worker has effectively disengaged since the first review;*
- the Social Worker has indicated that he no longer wishes to practise as a social worker, that he does not wish to remain on the register and has asked to be removed;*
- there is no evidence of any willingness to remediate;*
- the Social Worker was afforded a further opportunity to reflect and consider his position by the last reviewing Panel but has not availed himself of this opportunity.*

Social Work England therefore invite the Panel to find that his Fitness to Practise remains impaired and to impose a Removal Order, to take effect on expiry of the current order”.

Social worker submissions:

22. There were no submissions by or on behalf of Mr Sanders.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

23. 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 panels, 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'.
24. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel and previous review panels. The panel also took account of the written submissions made on behalf of Social Work England.
25. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser, which included reference to Social Work England's '*Impairment and sanctions guidance*' ("Sanctions guidance") and the sequence of decision making set out by Blake J in *Abrahaem v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 183, namely that the panel must firstly address whether the fitness to practise is impaired before considering sanctions, and that the panel must consider whether all of the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction, taking into account that there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision, or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments.
26. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the overarching objective and 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.
27. [PRIVATE].
28. The panel first considered whether Mr Sander's fitness to practise remains impaired. It kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment and asked itself whether Mr Sanders had demonstrated that he had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the previous panel.
29. The panel noted that the final hearing panel found that Mr Sanders' fitness to practise was impaired on the grounds of lack of capability or competence, relating to his record keeping. The panel noted that the final hearing panel found that Mr Sanders had limited insight and had demonstrated insufficient remediation in seeking to remedy the deficiencies in his professional practice. The panel noted that whilst the final hearing panel found that [PRIVATE], that panel was also of the view that as an autonomous professional, Mr Sanders should have been more pro-active.

30. The panel noted that by way of insight and remediation, Mr Sanders would need to show that he has found a way to mitigate his challenges in this area, that he understands the need to seek appropriate support and that he now understands his obligation to keep full and accurate records and why this is so important. The panel considered that the original panel had been very specific in directing Mr Sanders as to how he could demonstrate insight and remediate his challenges, and on the evidence presented he has not done so.
31. The panel considered the evidence and submissions that Mr Sanders had provided to previous review hearings, noting that he had provided written submissions to the final order review on 13 November 2023, which detail his views on the concerns about his reflective document provided on 07 September 2023 and detailing two CPD activities which he had undertaken. The panel noted that the reflective piece appeared academic in nature and did not reflect back on Mr Sanders' own practices. The panel noted and adopted the view of the reviewing panel on 13 November 2023 that whilst the reflective piece submitted by Mr Sanders recognises the importance of accurate record-keeping in a timely fashion and a number of risks that can be associated with the failure to do so, it did not deal with how failings in professional practice would impact on service users and colleagues and how Mr Sanders would act differently in the future if similar circumstances were to present themselves, and that the reflective piece also demonstrated that Mr Sanders was seeking to place a disproportionate level of responsibility on his former employers rather than focusing on his own professional shortcomings.
32. The panel noted that the second final order review decision refers to an email sent by Mr Sanders to Social Work England on 02 June 2024. This is the last recorded contribution from Mr Sanders to these proceedings. The panel noted that in the extract from that email, Mr Sanders asked to be removed from the Social Work England Register, setting out that he had no intention of returning to work as a social worker. The panel noted that at that time, his insight was limited, because he sets out that *"Suggesting that I should have continuously requested support is unreasonable"; "I feel I have been unfairly used as a scapegoat"; and "I no longer wish to remain on a register I have lost faith in, and I refuse to continue jumping through hoops to stay on it."*
33. The Panel noted that the last reviewing panel, in extending the order of suspension, had given Mr Sanders another chance to engage and address the deficiencies of his practice, setting out at paragraphs 47 onwards of the third final order review decision that it would be of assistance to this review panel if Mr Sanders was able to provide evidence that he had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction, and giving examples of how he could achieve this. Mr Sanders did not attend this review, nor did he provide any updated documents or written submissions. The panel therefore concluded that there was no evidence of any change in circumstances since the last review and there remained concerns about the lack of insight demonstrated by Mr Sanders. Consequently, there was no evidence provided to the panel that the risk of repetition has reduced.

34. The panel noted and adopted the views of the last review panel, that the final hearing panel had identified positive aspects of Mr Sanders' practice as a social worker, but full and accurate record keeping is required for safe social work practice and deficiencies in record keeping expose members of the public to the risk of harm. The requirement of full and accurate record keeping is also within Social Work England's professional standards and failure to maintain the standards undermines public confidence in the profession.
35. The panel therefore decided that Mr Sanders' fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons:

36. Having found Mr Sander'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.
37. The panel considered the written submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, within which they invited the panel to consider imposing a removal order. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
38. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Sanders, 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 Sander's interests with the public interest.

Take no further action, issue advice or a warning

39. The panel decided that taking no action, issuing advice or issuing a warning would not adequately address the serious nature of Mr Sanders' behaviour. Nor would they adequately protect the public as they would not restrict Mr Sanders' practice. The deficiencies identified with Mr Sanders' practice had the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences and therefore some restriction on his practice is required in order to meet the public interest.

Impose a new order, namely conditions of practice

40. The panel considered whether a conditions of practice order could be imposed. A conditions of practice order would enable Mr Sanders to resume practice as a social worker, while ensuring that there were safeguards in place to ensure that the deficiencies in his practice were addressed and monitored. As explained in Social Work

England's impairment and sanctions guidance, conditions of practice commonly apply in cases of lack of competence.

41. In this case the panel did not have sufficient confidence that Mr Sanders was capable of complying and/or would comply with conditions of practice, because he had failed to comply with all of the original conditions of practice order imposed by the final hearing panel as well as any of the revised conditions of practice order imposed by the first reviewing panel. In his last communication with Social Work England sent in an email dated 02 June 2024, he made clear that he was not willing to take further steps to seek to regain unrestricted registration.

42. The panel agreed with and adopted the reasons of the second reviewing panel, that

“Although Mr Sanders had made some attempts to comply in the first instance he had no longer done so for a considerable amount of time. Ultimately he had demonstrated a lack of compliance with the conditions of practice that he is subject to. By taking this course of action Mr Sanders has failed to uphold the standards of the profession.

Further, Mr Sanders has demonstrated that he is not willing to comply with the conditions or engage in these proceedings in any meaningful way. He has, however, informed Social Work England that he no longer intends to practise as a Social Worker and wishes to be removed from the register”.

43. The panel also agreed with and adopted the reasons of the third reviewing panel that

“The panel noted that previous panels had concluded that Mr Sanders failed to comply with the original and the revised conditions of practice order. Given Mr Sanders’ current lack of engagement, conditions of practice would not be practicable or workable, and would be tantamount to a suspension. This appears to be acknowledged by Mr Sanders himself in his e-mail dated 2 July 2024 when he stated that conditions of practice were impossible to comply with because he has been out of the sector for six years”.

44. The panel noted that Mr Sanders has not engaged in this review and has previously shown an active disinterest in engaging with Social Work England, demonstrated in his email of 02 June 2024. The panel was not satisfied that he would be willing or able to comply with conditions of practice, if any could be formulated given his stance in relation to the regulator. Alongside this, Mr Sanders has also indicated that he does not wish to return to social work practice, and he discussed applying for voluntary removal with Social Work England, though he has not done so to date. In the circumstances the panel concluded that it could not formulate any workable conditions which would sufficiently protect the public and the wider public interest.

Extend the current suspension order:

45. The panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time. The panel noted that a further suspension order would prevent Mr Sanders from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest, however, he has already been subject

to a suspension order since June 2024, and throughout this time he has not engaged with Social Work England, shown remediation or indicated that he wishes to return to practice, and the panel had already found that a risk of repetition remained.

46. The panel considered that the final hearing panel had provided what this panel consider to be clear and reasonable recommendations as to how Mr Sanders could seek to demonstrate his insight and remediation at a review, which might then demonstrate a reduced risk of repetition. Despite this, Mr Sanders appears to have disengaged with the process of seeking to address the concerns about his practice. The panel had no evidence to suggest Mr Sanders is willing and able to resolve or remediate the concerns. His failure to constructively engage with this review process appears entirely consistent with his indications that he does not want to return to social work practice.
47. The panel considered that Mr Sanders has been given a full opportunity to demonstrate that he is willing to remediate, including in the decision of the previous panel, which made recommendations in respect of how he could provide evidence of remediation and insight, and how he could seek assistance.
48. In the circumstances, the panel decided that there was little prospect that if the panel were to impose a suspension order, Mr Sanders would engage with Social Work England or provide evidence for a future review hearing. In the panel's judgment the imposition of a suspension order would serve no purpose. It is not in the public interest for the panel to impose a suspension order in circumstances where there is no realistic prospect that Mr Sanders will constructively engage with the regulator. The panel concluded that whilst a suspension order would serve to protect the public, it would not be appropriate as it would not be in the public interest to prolong these matters.

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

49. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Mr Sander's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of one or more grounds as set out in regulation 25(2), (b), (e) or (h) and he had been suspended from practice or subject to a conditions of practice final order (or a combination of both) for a continuous period of two years immediately preceding the day when the removal order would take effect.
50. 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 be appropriate because Mr Sanders' fitness to practise remains impaired, but he is not able to and/or is not willing to remediate. The panel considered that this can be seen from his lack of engagement with this review process, and his failure to date to provide evidence of further insight or remediation into his actions or the consequences they could have had.

51. The panel considered the impact of further review hearings on regulatory resources, including public funds, and considered whether it is in the public interest for matters to be resolved. The panel concluded that, given that Mr Sanders has indicated that he does not wish to return to practise as a social worker or remain on the Social Work England Register, it would be proportionate to now remove his name from the register, noting that he has been provided with opportunity to engage by the last review panel and has not done so. There was no evidence before the panel to indicate that Mr Sanders would oppose his removal from the register, to the contrary, there is a suggestion that he seeks a removal in any event.
52. The panel therefore concluded that a removal order is the appropriate and proportionate order.

Right of appeal:

53. 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.
54. 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.
55. 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.
56. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

57. 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).

58. 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

59. 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>