

Social worker: Jeanette Hanvey-Wilding

Registration number: SW48763

Fitness to Practise

Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 8 to 9 December 2025; 11 December 2025; 15 to 16 December 2025

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome:

Fitness to practise impaired, removal order

Interim order:

Interim suspension order (18 months)

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”).
2. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Adrian Harris, Counsel instructed by Capsticks LLP.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this hearing (the “panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Eileen Carr	Chair
Tracey Newson	Social worker adjudicator
Cherrylene Henry-Leach	Lay adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Hannah Granger	Hearings officer
Kathryn Tinsley	Hearings support officer
Neville Sorab	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel was informed by Mr Harris that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Hanvey-Wilding by email and special delivery to an email address and postal address, respectively, provided by the social worker as they appear on the Social Work England register. Mr Harris submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served and signed for.
6. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the Notice of Hearing dated 29 October 2025 addressed to Ms Hanvey-Wilding at her email address and postal address as they appear on the Social Work England Register;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register detailing Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s registered email address and postal address;
 - A copy of a signed Statement of Service, on behalf of Social Work England. This confirmed that on 29 October 2025 – more than 28 days before this hearing – a Notice of Hearing and related documents were sent by email and special delivery to Ms Hanvey-Wilding at her registered email address and postal address; and

- A copy of the Royal Mail Track and Trace Document indicating “signed for” delivery to Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s address at 12:21 hours on 30 October 2025.

7. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice. This included reference to Rules 14, 15, 44 and 45 of Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the “FTP Rules 2019”).
8. Having had regard to all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Hanvey-Wilding in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the FTP Rules 2019.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

9. The panel heard the submissions of Mr Harris on behalf of Social Work England. Mr Harris submitted that:
 - a. notice of this hearing had been duly served;
 - b. there is no evidence provided by Ms Hanvey-Wilding that additional time is needed to prepare for this Final Hearing;
 - c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has not applied for an adjournment. Any adjournment would not guarantee the appearance of Ms Hanvey-Wilding. There has been a long-term non-engagement and Ms Hanvey-Wilding has said that she will be disengaging with proceedings; and
 - d. given the date of the allegations, there is a public interest in this matter proceeding.
10. Mr Harris therefore invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.
11. 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 of the Rules 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’s guidance “*Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker*”.
12. The panel considered all of the information before it, together with the submissions made by Mr Harris on behalf of Social Work England. The panel noted that Ms Hanvey-Wilding had been sent notice of today’s meeting. The panel considered that:
 - a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was served with the notice of hearing in which it was set out that, in her absence, the hearing may take place;
 - b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has not requested to adjourn the meeting. Given Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s lack of communication with Social Work England since December 2023, and her indication that she no longer wishes to be a social

worker, it is unlikely that any adjournment would facilitate the attendance of Ms Hanvey-Wilding;

- c. Given the length of time passed since the allegations (over two years), it is considered that it is in Ms Hanvey-Wilding's own interests to proceed with the Final Hearing; and
- d. There is a public interest in proceeding with the Final Hearing given the length of time passed since the allegations and the attendance of witnesses.

Consequently, the panel determined to proceed in Ms Hanvey-Wilding's absence.

Allegations:

13. Ms Hanvey-Wilding faces the following allegation:

FTPS-19544

Whilst registered as a social worker:

- 1. You failed to maintain accurate records in that you inaccurately recorded the information in respect of one or more particular set out in Schedule A.*
- 2. You failed to follow management direction by contacting Child A's school on 15 June 2021 after you were instructed not to do so.*
- 3. You provided false and/or misleading information to a manager in respect of one or more particular set out in Schedule B.*
- 4. You failed to undertake statutory visits within relevant timeframes in respect of one or more particular set out in Schedule C.*
- 5. You failed to safeguard service users, in that you did not adequately assess and/or manage risk in relation to one or more particular set out in Schedule D.*
- 6. Your actions in paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 and/or 5 were dishonest.*

Schedule A – Inaccurately recorded information

	Date	Allegation
a.	29 April 2021	Telephone conversation with Person 1
b.	14 May 2021	Virtual visit at school with Child A
c.	i. 5 May 2021 and/or ii. 26 May 2021	Visit/s with Children B and C
d.	i. 22 March 2021 and/or ii. 18 May 2021	Visit/s with Child D

	Date	Allegation
e.	iii. 14 May 2021 and/or iv. 3 June 2021	Visit/s with Child F
f.	Date unknown	A health visitor's views on safeguarding concerns regarding Family P

Schedule B – False and/or misleading information provided to manager

	Date	Allegation
a.	Between approximately 14 and 18 June 2021	Information regarding the availability of phone records
b.	Approximately 16 June 2021	Information regarding contact with Child A and Person 1
c.	Between approximately 13 and 17 May 2021	Information for an assessment to be signed off by management in relation to Family P

Schedule C – Failed to undertake statutory visits

	Date	Allegation
a.	Between approximately 30 March 2021 and 15 June 2021	Child A
b.	Between approximately 22 March 2021 and 16 June 2021	Children B and C
c.	Between approximately 19 June 2020 and 2 June 2021	Child D

Schedule D – Failed to adequately assess and/or manage risk

	Date	Allegation
a.	Between approximately 3 March 2020 and 27 June 2020	Child A reporting an allegation of assault by a placement staff member

	Date	Allegation
b.	<i>Between approximately 13 and 17 May 2021</i>	<i>Gathering relevant information from one or more other professionals to inform an assessment of Family P</i>

FTPS-21481

7. Between approximately 20 July 2022 and 29 July 2022:

- a. You continued to work as a social worker, despite being subject to an Interim Suspension Order.*
- b. You failed to inform your employer you were subject to an Interim Suspension Order*

8. Your actions at paragraph 7 were dishonest.

9. You did not cooperate with Social Work England during an investigation, in that between approximately 18 August 2021 and 30 June 2023 you:

- a. Failed to respond to a request for information dated 18 August 2021;*
- b. Failed to respond to a request for information dated 30 January 2023.*

The matters outlined in 1-9 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

Admissions:

14. Mr Harris set out that it is Social Work England's submission that allegations 1-4 have been admitted by Ms Hanvey-Wilding. Ms Hanvey-Wilding submitted an initial response to Social Work England's investigation of Case FTPS-19544 on 12 October 2022 in which she indicated:
 - a. She admitted Regulatory Concern (now Allegation) 1;
 - b. She admitted Regulatory Concern (now Allegation) 2;
 - c. She admitted Regulatory Concern (now Allegation) 3.
15. Further, Mr Harris submitted that Ms Hanvey-Wilding provided an amended comments form on 20 November 2022 in which she admitted Regulatory Concern (now Allegation) 4. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's admissions are substantively the same as set out in the allegations. The allegations have been put into a schedule to make them easier to read, and allegations 2-4 have had dates added, which simply add to the specificity to the allegations. It is fair to Ms Hanvey-Wilding and the panel for Ms Hanvey-Wilding's admissions to be accepted.
16. The panel accepted the advice from the legal adviser which set out:

- a. Rule 32(c)(i)(aa) of the Rules states: “Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved.”
 - b. Where any admission is qualified, it cannot be considered to be an admission under Rule 32(c) (i)(aa) of the Rules.
17. The panel considered the following:
 - a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s admissions in the response documents are substantively the same as those allegations 1-4. Where dates have been added to the allegations, when compared to the response documents, these narrow the allegations, rather than widen them, and provide specificity to the allegations.
 - b. Even though these admissions are over three years old, there is no other information contained within the panel’s documentation which contradicts or qualifies these admissions.
18. The panel therefore found allegations 1-4 proved by way of Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s admissions from her response forms dated 12 October 2022 and 20 November 2022.
19. The panel went on to consider the remaining allegations, namely allegations 5-9.

Background:

20. Ms Hanvey-Wilding started at Hampshire Children Services (the “Council”) in November 2019. She was an agency social worker and her role was to hold a case load. Her work included assessing cases, completing visits and longer-term work such as child protection, child in need, looked-after children and court proceedings. This included completing work within statutory timescales.
21. On 9 August 2021, Social Work England received a referral from Lianne Smith regarding Ms Hanvey-Wilding.
Allegation 1, Schedule A(a)
22. At the time of these allegations, Child A was a pupil within a school that was a residential home for children with Autism Spectrum Disorder.
23. The case was closed in error by the Council on 27 October 2020, and then reopened. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was reallocated to Child A from 30 March 2021, having previously been the allocated social worker.
24. On 29 April 2021, Ms Hanvey-Wilding recorded that she had a telephone conversation with Child A’s mother (Person 1 in the allegation) at 2.19pm. She recorded notes of the conversation including details of Person 1’s opinion that Child A should not be seen and that she would telephone the school rather than see Child A.

25. Person 1 was not aware that the case had been reopened or that there was an allocated social worker for Child A. Person 1 received no contact from Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 29 April 2021, as recorded in the case notes by Ms Hanvey-Wilding.
26. On 11 June 2021, when in a telephone conversation with another social worker, Laura Hutchings, Person 1 said that she did not have a social worker. Person 1 said that she had not seen Ms Hanvey-Wilding and had understood the case was closed. Following this conversation, Person 1 sent her call log to Ms Hutchings to show there had been no calls involving Ms Hanvey-Wilding.

Allegation 1, Schedule A(b)

27. On 1 June 2021, Ms Hanvey-Wilding recorded a virtual CIN visit with Child A as having been completed on 14 May 2021 via MS Teams, during which Child A had refused to speak to her and walked out. The case note referred to Child A being present with “Ms Keely”.
28. Lynette Keady is the Deputy Home Manager for the residential school where Child A was placed. Ms Keady stated that she was not aware of a virtual visit (via Teams) taking place with Ms Hanvey-Wilding and Child A on 14 May 2021.
29. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s case notes made on Child A’s file include a telephone call on 6 May 2021 to Ms Keady, whom she described as being “*Key worker and dep home manager*”, where they discussed a potential forthcoming visit.
30. Ms Hanvey-Wilding made a case file entry dated 14 May 2021, labelled as “CIN [(“Child in Need”)] Visit”, where she wrote that she “*spoke to Ms Keely [sic] at [Child A’s school], who is [Child A’s] key worker. Ms Keely has been trying to encourage [Child A] to speak wit [sic.] me via Teams. I am told that you agreed to speak to me and then today decided not to. You were in the room with Ms Keely but decided that you did not want to speak to me and walked out.*” It appears, therefore, that Ms Hanvey-Wilding is referring to her communication with Ms Keady from 6 May 2021 when filling in the entry in the notes dated 14 May 2021.

Allegation 1, Schedule A(c)

31. The case of Children B and C was allocated to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 22 March 2021. As this was a child protection investigation under section 47 of the Children Act 1989, the children must be visited within the first twenty-four hours and then every five working days after that until a child protection investigation is stepped down or a case progresses to child protection conference. On 30 March 2021, the case was then stepped down to CIN, requiring three-weekly visits.
32. Administrative staff from the Council called Children B and C’s mother on 17 June 2021. Although there were no concerns from the mother, she said that since 20 March 2021, they had seen Ms Hanvey-Wilding three times, and that there had been a gap in visiting of roughly six to seven weeks.

33. The Council's case recording system showed Ms Hanvey-Wilding had recorded four visits in total: 22 March 2021, 14 April 2021, 5 May 2021 and 26 May 2021.
34. On the 18 June 2021, Ms Hutchings spoke to Children B and C's mother by telephone to clarify the dates of the visits. The mother advised that visits were completed on three dates only (either the 20 or 21 March 2021 prior to allocation of Ms Hanvey-Wilding, 22 March 2021 and 14 April 2021). Ms Hanvey-Wilding had recorded two further home visits on the 5 May 2021 and 26 May 2021 and noted that the mother was present, but the mother said that there had been no contact by any means until mid-June 2021.

Allegation 1, Schedule A(d)

35. The case of Child D was allocated to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 19 June 2020 following the mother of Child D struggling to manage Child D and his sister's needs. Both children had additional needs and there were discussions about Child D going into care. This history would have been available to Ms Hanvey-Wilding. This was a CIN case, requiring three-weekly visits after the assessment was signed off.
36. Child D's case notes from 19 June 2020 to 24 June 2021 show that Ms Hanvey-Wilding recorded visits were completed on 2 November 2020, 2 March 2021, 22 March 2021, 18 May 2021 and 2 June 2021. The frequency of these visits was not in accordance with the three-weekly frequency.
37. Between 18 and 22 June 2021, there was an email exchange between Child D's mother and Ms Smith, in which the Child D's mother complained that she had not received appropriate support from Ms Hanvey-Wilding. Ms Smith identified the four recorded visits, to which Mother responded:

"Contact between [Ms Hanvey-Wilding] and [Child D] I meant face to face. He has not seen [Ms Hanvey-Wilding] since placement the date she recorded in Feb. That date in March is untrue as we had moved house beginning of March and [Ms Hanvey-Wilding] has not been to our new house. Even our CIN plans had been to the wrong address as the address was not updated! FaceTime call in June happened but that was because [Child D] popped on to speak with [the] therapist during the CIN meeting coincidentally not planned. Looking at my call records the 18.5 no call happened and I can not remember one?! I will triple check this but I really don't think it did..."

38. On 22 June 2021, Child D's mother confirmed that the two alleged visits, on 18 May 2021 and 22 March 2021, did not take place. She had checked her calls, texts and email; the visits/Facetime calls did not happen. Child D's mother confirmed that Ms Hanvey-Wilding had not visited their new home after they moved in late February-early March.

Allegation 1, Schedule A(e)

39. The case of Child F was allocated to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 24 February 2021, taking over from another social worker who provided a summary including the case goals and the family plan. This was a CIN case, requiring three-weekly visits.
40. The case notes recorded visits which included 14 May 2021 and 3 June 2021.
41. On 17 September 2021, Child F's Mother sent an email stating that Ms Hanvey-Wilding had *"never visited [Child F] in his home in Winchester"*. When confirmation of this was sought from Child F's mother by email from Ms Smith, Child F's mother replied on 17 September 2021, *"Regarding [Ms Hanvey-Wilding], we never had face to face contact with her except during the CIN meetings that you will be aware of. She phoned me but never came here to my home. She was meant to visit [Child F] in Winchester but never turned up."*

Allegation 1, Schedule A(f)

42. Family P's case was allocated to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 24 February 2021, following domestic abuse allegations. A Child and Family assessment was required into the impact upon the children.
43. Working Together to Safeguard Children Guidance provides that effective sharing of information between practitioners and local organisations/agencies is *"essential"* in completing a Child and Family assessment, high-quality assessments are holistic in approach, are multi-agency and multi-disciplinary, and should *"draw together relevant information gathered from the child and their family and from relevant practitioners including teachers and school staff, early years workers, health practitioners, the police and adult social care"*. This should mean that no cases are inappropriately closed and that children are safeguarded.
44. Amanda Stonehouse is a specialist community public health visitor. Her role is to work alongside social workers in a joined approach and identify the health and wellbeing for the children and parents as appropriate, with a prime concern to highlight the voice of the child.
45. Ms Stonehouse became the allocated health visitor for Family P on 19 January 2021. She attempted to contact Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 17 March 2021 and left a message asking for an update. On 11 May 2021, she left a message on Ms Hanvey-Wilding's answer phone asking for an update on the family.
46. On 17 May 2021 Ms Stonehouse visited the Family P and made clinical notes where she identified *"many risks"*. In particular, she had concerns about the youngest child, who was very shy and had limited speech, plus concerns about the smell and mould in the home, the father visiting daily, after work and on weekends. Ms Stonehouse was unclear whether there was further abuse in the home and noted that there would need to be continued assessment.
47. Ms Stonehouse undertook a further visit on 28 June 2021. The family informed her that the case had been closed by Ms Hanvey-Wilding. Ms Stonehouse describes herself as

being shocked by the decision to close the case, given the level of risk presented. The “Plan” section of her notes records that she would contact Ms Harvey-Wilding to discuss case closure without contacting her.

48. On 29 June 2021, Ms Stonehouse rang the duty social work team number and left a message on the voicemail to contact her as she continued to have concerns with the family and that she had not been contacted by Ms Harvey-Wilding. Ms Stonehouse expected to be consulted by social workers on her cases as she would be involved in any assessment being conducted. Had she been consulted for the Child and Family assessment, she would have said that Family P’s case should stay open.
49. Ms Harvey-Wilding had in fact recorded in the Child and Family assessment signed and dated 13 May 2021, and signed off by Ms Hutchings on 17 May 2021, that Ms Stonehouse had reported that she has no safeguarding concerns, but there was no corresponding case note recorded on the file in respect of any discussion with the health visiting team. The case was closed on 28 May 2021, based on this assessment.

Allegation 2

50. On 14 June 2021, Ms Smith spoke to Ms Harvey-Wilding on her return from annual leave about the concerns raised by Person 1 (that Ms Harvey-Wilding did not visit Child A and did not inform Person 1 that the case had been reopened). Ms Harvey-Wilding said that Person 1 had been unwell and must be confused. Ms Harvey-Wilding also said that she had seen Child A virtually on 14 May 2021, but only for a couple of seconds as he refused to speak to her. Ms Harvey-Wilding offered to call Person 1 and the school to clarify this, but Ms Smith told her not to make contact because Ms Hutchings would be dealing with it.
51. On 15 June 2021, Ms Hutchings visited the school and spoke to Ms Keady, who was the Deputy Home Manager, who advised that Ms Harvey-Wilding had not visited the school and had not seen Child A face to face or virtually since the case had been reopened.
52. On 15 June 2021, Ms Keady received an email from Ms Harvey-Wilding at 10.49 hours asking her to call, and later answered a telephone call from a receptionist at the school, who said Ms Harvey-Wilding was on the telephone asking to speak to Ms Keady. Ms Keady had previously spoken to Ms Harvey-Wilding by telephone and knew who she was. Ms Keady told the receptionist she did not feel comfortable about taking the call and felt it best not to do so. The receptionist said she would tell Ms Harvey-Wilding that Ms Keady was unavailable. Ms Keady forwarded a copy of the email from Ms Harvey-Wilding and a note of the content of the telephone call to Ms Hutchings on 18 June 2021.

Allegation 3, Schedule B(a)

53. All social workers within the team were provided with a work phone. On 14 June 2021, Ms Smith asked Ms Harvey-Wilding to find her call logs from the call to Child A’s mother on 29 April 2021 and virtual CIN visit on 14 May 2021.

54. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not provide the requested call logs to Ms Smith.
55. On 16 June 2021, Ms Smith spoke to Ms Hanvey-Wilding who repeated her account that the telephone call to Person 1 on 29 April 2021 and visit to Child A on 14 May 2021 had happened. This telephone conversation was summarised in an email to Ms Hanvey-Wilding and set out that:
- a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding said she was struggling to access her phone records from her personal phone and was seeking support from Apple;
 - b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding could not remember whether the call was by Teams, her personal phone or her work mobile phone; and
 - c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's work mobile was broken so she could not retrieve the list.
56. On 18 June 2021, Ms Smith received a text message from Ms Hanvey-Wilding to say that she would not be coming into work and she explained that Apple's advice was to wipe her phone and install again, which had wiped most of her phone. She then said that she had asked Vodafone for an itemised bill and that she was not sure when this would arrive. At the time, the Council did not provide Apple phones, suggesting that it was her personal phone she was using. Ms Smith also recalls Ms Hanvey-Wilding telling her that her work phone was not working properly/consistently, and telling Ms Hanvey-Wilding to contact IT.
57. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not subsequently provide a copy of her telephone phone records.

Allegation 3, Schedule B(b)

58. As set out in paragraph 55 above, on 16 June 2021, Ms Smith spoke to Ms Hanvey-Wilding who repeated her account that the telephone call to Person 1 on 29 April 2021 and visit to Child A on 14 May 2021 had happened.
59. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 27-30 above, the telephone call to Person 1 on 29 April 2021 and visit to Child A on 14 May 2021 did not happen.

Allegation 3, Schedule B(c)

60. As set out in paragraphs 42-49 above, Ms Hanvey-Wilding falsely asserted in a written assessment that the views of the Health Visitor were that there were "*no safeguarding concerns*". Ms Hanvey-Wilding signed and dated the form on 13 May 2021. The assessment had to be authorised by a team manager and, in this instance, Ms Hutchings completed that part of the form, who signed-off the assessment on 17 May 2021 having read it in detail and considered its content. In her comments, Ms Hutchings remarked "*It is positive that the children's school, pre-school and allocated health visitor have not raised any further safeguarding concerns.*" Ms Hutchings relied upon the professional updates that appears positive and later observed when approving the

assessment to close the case that if there were a further safeguarding concern to be raised then a child abuse investigation could follow.

61. The information in the assessment was misleading as it gave the specific impression that the Health Visitor, Ms Stonehouse, was not raising further concerns, whereas the truth was that Ms Stonehouse's opinion had not been sought by Ms Hanvey-Wilding and if it had (especially for the purposes of an assessment that could lead to the case being closed to social services), she would have given a negative opinion including further concerns.

Allegation 4, Schedule C(a)

62. Child A was a CIN case and the statutory visits need to be made 5 working days after allocation and then three-weekly, therefore every 15 working days.
63. Child A's case notes show only one recording by Ms Hanvey-Wilding of an alleged CIN visit on 14 May 2021. For the reasons set out at paragraphs 27-30 above, this visit did not take place. A CIN visit did not take place within 5 days of allocation.

Allegation 4, Schedule C(b)

64. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 31-34 above, Ms Hanvey-Wilding only visited Child B and Child C's family on three occasions and not within statutory timeframes.

Allegation 4, Schedule C(c)

65. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 35-38 above, Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to undertake statutory visits to Child D.

FTPS-21481

66. An Interim Suspension Order was imposed upon Ms Hanvey-Wilding's registration on 19 July 2022. At the time, Ms Hanvey-Wilding was employed as Safeguarding Assessment Social Worker within Portsmouth Children's Services. She worked there between 5 July 2022 and 29 July 2022, having given a week's notice on 21 July 2022.
67. On 15 November 2022, Social Work England's Case Review Team received information from Portsmouth County Council stating that they had been unaware that Ms Hanvey-Wilding was subject to an Interim Suspension Order. This was referred to Triage who opened this as a new referral.

Evidence:

68. The panel received evidence from the following witnesses:
 - a. Child A's mother referred to as Person 1;
 - b. Ms Lynette Keady, Deputy Home Manager at Southland School;

- c. Ms Laura Hutchings, social worker and Assistant Team Manager at the Council;
- d. Ms Amanda Stonehouse, Health Visitor in the New Forrest West Health Visiting Team;
- e. Ms Lianne Smith, social worker and Team Manager at Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Children Services;
- f. Mr Mark Hower, District Manager at Hampshire County Council;
- g. Ms Chloe Connolly, Paralegal at Capsticks LLP;
- h. Ms Rosie Powell, Team Manager at the Council (at the time of the allegations);
- i. Ms Julie Harman, Team Lead in Family Support at Portsmouth City Council;
- j. Mr Roger Warren (deceased), Service Leader in the Family Support and Safeguarding Central Team 1 and Lead for Children with Disabilities at Portsmouth City Council; and
- k. Lead Investigator at Social Work England.

69. Most of these witnesses exhibited evidence relevant to the case. From these witnesses, the following evidence was pertinent to the contested allegations.

70. Person 1 provided the following pertinent evidence:

- a. On 1 March 2020, there was an incident at the residential placement involving her son, Child A. She received a distressed phone call from him saying he had been assaulted by a member of staff and a child. She was panicked and because it was late evening, she phoned the social services emergency line.
- b. She then went to Child A, who was in hospital. When in hospital, she was taken to one side by a senior nurse and they confirmed that no one was coming from the Council and that they were trying to organise an emergency meeting with the Council.
- c. On 3 March 2020, she emailed pictures of Child A's injuries to Ms Harvey-Wilding informing her that he was grabbed by the jaw and shoved back into a wall by a member of staff at the residential placement. Ms Harvey-Wilding was fully aware of the facts of the incident.
- d. She also spoke to Ms Harvey-Wilding, but she is not sure of the date and she confirmed to me that the incident had been raised at the highest level and the police were involved. She sent her an email on 24 March 2020 confirming this and asked for an update. She thinks she received a brief text from Ms Harvey-Wilding but she does not have evidence of this.

- e. She heard nothing further in regards of this investigation other than on 26 June 2020 when Ms Hanvey-Wilding sent her a letter from the Keys group, which is the company that owns the residence. It was a generic letter to say that matter was resolved.

71. Ms Lianne Smith provided the following pertinent evidence:

- a. On 16 June 2021 Child A's mother forwarded the email and pictures of Child A's bruising/injuries she sent to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 3 March 2020. She explained to Ms Hutchings that she believes this was done by a member of staff at a residential placement and this was not looked into by Ms Hanvey-Wilding adequately.
- b. She asked Ms Hanvey-Wilding about this on 16 June 2021 and she said that her team manager at the time, Ms Powell, had seen these pictures. She advised that the Local Designated Safeguarding Officer ("LADO") looked at the allegation which led to a full investigation taking place. The supervision notes on the computer system suggest an assault by a peer, not a staff member.
- c. Upon review of the case notes, there is no record of the email being received, nor any action taken by Ms Hanvey-Wilding. There is also no record of the team manager being made aware of these concerns or being shown the pictures. This investigation was stepped down as it was in relation to another child and the allegation that an adult in the school was involved was not looked into.
- d. If there was a concern which was raised in relation to an assault by a professional, this should be a section 47 child protection investigation following a strategy discussion, a referral should also be made to the Local Designated Safeguarding Officer and an allegation against a professional meeting held to consider the risks and safety planning or actions which need to be completed by the multi-agency professionals. Ms Hanvey-Wilding had a duty to raise this information to her manager to trigger these responses and also completing the relevant referrals to the LADO. A child protection investigation is under the threshold of a child being at risk or having suffered significant harm as defined in the Children Act 1989.
- e. On 16 June 2021, she emailed her team manager at the time, Ms Powell, about the incident that had occurred in March 2020 with the pictures of the injuries to Child A and she confirmed she had never seen these.
- f. She then conducted a LADO referral to determine whether this had been appropriately investigated and to make sure this was investigated appropriately for Child A. The role of the LADO is to consider any concerns in relation to adults working with children and to complete an investigation into these concerns and what safety measures should be implemented at that

time. Particularly in relation to allegations or disclosures against these members of staff, she asked for support from Hampshire's LADO, this would normally be investigated by the LADO in the area where the concerns took place.

- g. She received an email from Mark Blackwell, LADO on 7 July 2021, with an update confirming that the threshold had been met for the concerns to be investigated. Mark Blackwell supported by contacting the appropriate LADO. It did not appear from these enquiries that this was investigated by the LADO at the time.
- h. The Family P case was allocated to the social worker on 24 February 2021. This case was already open and Ms Hanvey-Wilding took over from another social worker as the mother felt the previous social worker had too much of a resemblance to her abusive relative. There was domestic abuse by the father and he had been allowed to return to the family home for child care reasons, so an assessment needed to be done to look at the impact this had on the children. For the completion of a child and family assessment, any professionals working with the family need to be consulted so that a holistic and clear assessment can be done, and the family receive the right level of support from the beginning. This should mean that no cases are closed when they should stay open in order to safeguard the child or children.
- i. On 30 June 2021, a voicemail was forwarded to her from Ms Stonehouse, a Health visitor, which had been left on the duty line. She was raising concerns that this case had been closed without consulting with the health visiting team. She also advised that the schools had not been spoken to during the course of the assessment process either. Ms Stonehouse advised at the time of the assessment that she would have had concerns in respect of domestic abuse.
- j. She tried to contact Ms Stonehouse to have a discussion, but there was no response. Ms Hutchings spoke to the school who confirmed that they were consulted on two occasions during the period of the time the case was open.
- k. Ms Hanvey-Wilding recorded in the child and family assessment that Ms Stonehouse had reported that she has no safeguarding concerns, however there is no case note recorded in respect of any discussion with the health visiting team. The case was closed on the 28 May 2021 based on this assessment.
- l. There are concerns that she recorded information against the health visitor's name which had not been shared, and this information could have led to a different conclusion or recommendation for this family.
- m. In addition, it had a possible impact on the reputation of the health visitor who was named in this assessment.

- n. In terms of Ms Hanvey-Wilding's work phone records, she recalls that the Council requested access to Ms Hanvey-Wilding's phone records. However, this process was stopped when she advised she had sought advice from Apple, as the Council did not use Apple phones, and that her work phone was broken.
- o. She advised Ms Hanvey-Wilding to contact IT to get her phone issue sorted. However, Ms Smith does not believe this was an issue that would have prevented Ms Hanvey-Wilding from using the work phone.

72. Ms Rosie Powell provided the following pertinent evidence:

- a. Her email dated 16 June 2021 sent to Ms Smith was a response to an email that Ms Smith sent to her, which asked if she had seen photographs of Child A, and the email chain was preceded by an email from Person 1, who described the photographs. She responded to Ms Smith to state that she had definitely not seen the photographs.
- b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not inform her at any time that she had received photographs of injuries to Child A.
- c. If Ms Hanvey-Wilding had shared the photographs with her at the relevant time, she would have gone directly to her line manager at the time. She would have then referred this for a Strategy Discussion and likely sought a different placement for Child A.

73. Mr Roger Warren provided the following pertinent evidence:

- a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was employed in Portsmouth City Council Children's Services as a locum Safeguarding Assessment Social Worker from 5 July 2021 until 29 July 2022. The role was in the Tier 4 Child Protection and Support Team/Family Support and Safeguarding Team, whereby the social worker was responsible for assessing risk in relation to children and their parents. Ms Hanvey-Wilding would complete initial assessments and would be expected to hold and manage CIN cases and present cases at Child Protection conferences. Ms Hanvey-Wilding would have been expected to complete reports and request multi-agency information from the police, GPs, hospital and other relevant parties. The role also involved delivering short term interventions for children and/or parents.

74. Ms Julie Harman provided the following pertinent evidence:

- a. She was Ms Hanvey-Wilding's line manager from 5 July 2021 to 29 July 2022.
- b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding had mentioned during supervisions for a month or so (prior to her resignation) that she was caring for her husband's mother who was unwell and had dementia. She recalls her talking about this saying that it was stressful and she would often have to go and look after her after work.

- c. On 21 July 2022, Ms Hanvey-Wilding advised me that she needed to give a week's notice as [PRIVATE].
- d. As Ms Hanvey-Wilding was a locum, she only had to provide one week's notice. She recalls Ms Hanvey-Wilding apologising for only providing a week. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not provide any written resignation.

75. In her response dated 17 November 2022, Ms Hanvey-Wilding stated:

- a. In relation to allegation 5: *"The child in question was in a residential placement, where he was safeguarded. I had previous knowledge of this child and was aware that he was safe within his placement."*
- b. In relation to allegation 6: *"My intention was never to be dishonest, but to protect myself from the indulgence of work and lack of compassion and awareness from management team. I am aware that my actions have come across as dishonest and this was never my intention. I have never done this before ever in my career, and at the time I stated was very stressed. I can only apologise profusely."*
- c. *"I felt bullied into taking this case. I had already explained to the assistant team manager and team manager that I was struggling with, the case load as well and did not want to take this child case. This does not explain my actions but only to give you a feeling of how I was feeling at the time."*

76. In her response dated 17 November 2022 and 12 December 2022, Ms Hanvey-Wilding stated:

"I cannot tell you how much I have let myself, my family and profession down. I did not attend the first hearing as I feel ashamed and can only tell you what was happening for me at the time."

This was during lockdown, so I (we) had been working fulltime at home. When this case was allocated to me, the manager was on leave so a newly appointed assistant team manager allocated this case to me. I told her at the time I could not take this as I was inundated with visits/cases/court reports etc. However, the response I felt at the time was "tuff" and no consideration that I was under extreme pressure from timescales, large caseload and overloaded.

[PRIVATE]. Due to the overwhelming caseload, I felt I could not take much time off. I was also supporting my youngest son who was in university at the time. As a locum, if I did not work, I did not get paid.

I am not giving this as an excuse but a way of you understanding were my mind, emotions and life were at the time. I know that I have made mistakes and take full responsibility for this.

Since I was told by Social Work England that I was suspended on the 20th July 2022, I have not worked as a social worker. I have signed up for counselling as I am aware that my judgments were impeded by my emotional state at the time and will continue to attend therapy until I have worked through all my personal issues.

I am willing to attend any courses that is suggested to me as a means of further training and learning. However, I can genuinely say that I have learnt from my suspension and apart from this mistake I have always had positive feedback from colleagues.

I love being a social worker and it has been my life for the last twenty years. I feel that although I had made a judgment errors, I really want to continue this role. I understand that the panel may have reservations about my fitness to practice. However, I know I have the skills, knowledge and character to continue to work in a safe and effective manner without any restrictions. However, I would attend any training or restrictions that the panel would see fit.”

77. On 28 December 2023, Ms Hanvey-Wilding emailed Social Work England setting out: “*I am aware of this case as being going on now for a long time. I would like it to be known to the court tomorrow that I do not wish to register every again as a social worker and that my name can be taken off the register. I can only apologise for wasting everyone’s time.*”

Finding and reasons on facts:

78. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser.

Allegation 5 – You failed to safeguard service users, in that you did not adequately assess and/or manage risk in relation to one or more particular set out in Schedule D:

Schedule D(a):

79. The panel refers to paragraphs 22-23 above.
80. On 3 March 2020, Person 1 sent an email to Ms Hanvey-Wilding enclosing photographs of injuries he had sustained during an incident on 1 March 2020. Person 1’s email referred to these injuries being caused by a member of staff from the school.
81. Person 1 provided evidence that:
- a. she then had a conversation with Ms Hanvey-Wilding, during which Ms Hanvey-Wilding assured her the matter had been raised “*at the highest level*” and with the police.

- b. Despite sending a follow-up email to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 12 March 2020, she heard nothing from Ms Hanvey-Wilding in respect of any investigation, apart from receiving a generic and incomplete letter via Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 26 June 2020 which indicated that the investigation was “concluded”.
- 82. Ms Smith provided evidence that she spoke to Ms Hanvey-Wilding about this on 16 June 2021, who said that her team manager at the time, Rosie Powell, had seen the photographs, that the LADO looked at the allegation and there followed a full investigation. Ms Hanvey-Wilding said the supervision notes on the computer system suggested an assault by a peer, not a member of staff. Ms Smith asked if Ms Powell had seen these photographs and gave Child A’s name. Ms Powell replied by email confirming she had not seen them, with the words “No definitely not!” Ms Powell provided evidence that Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not inform her at any time that she had received photographs of injuries to Child A.
- 83. The case notes from 2-3 March 2020 about the incident do not refer a member of staff allegedly being involved. The case notes do not:
 - a. reference Ms Hanvey-Wilding assessing the information received from Person 1 or assessing the risks it raised;
 - b. identify any correspondence with Person 1 about this incident;
 - c. reference Ms Powell being made aware of the concerns or having seen the photographs;
 - d. reference that the case had been investigated by the LADO; or
 - e. reference the apparent investigation closure letter sent by Ms Hanvey-Wilding to Person 1.
- 84. If a concern had been raised in relation to an assault by a professional, there should have been a section 47 child protection investigation, a referral to the LADO and an “*allegation against a professional*” meeting held to consider risks, safety planning and any actions to be completed by multi-agency professionals. Ms Hanvey-Wilding had a duty to raise this information to her manager to trigger these responses and also completing the relevant referrals to the LADO. A child protection investigation is under the threshold of a child being at risk or having suffered significant harm as defined in the Children Act 1989.
- 85. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was required to both assess the risks presented, and to manage those risks. There is no evidence before the panel that she did either.
- 86. Consequently, on the balance of probabilities, the panel finds that Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to safeguard Child A. Between approximately 3 March 2020 and 27 June 2020, she failed to act upon an allegation that Child A has been assaulted by a placement member of staff.

Found Proved

Schedule D(b):

87. Given Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s admissions referred to in paragraphs 42-49 and 60-61 above, the panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to carry out an essential task in preparing the assessment, namely speak to all other relevant professionals. This was a failure to properly assess the risks presented. Any failure to properly obtain information relevant to the assessment of risk would lead to a consequent failure to manage that risk.
88. Consequently, on the balance of probabilities, the panel finds that Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to safeguard Family P. Between approximately 13 and 17 May 2020, she failed to gather relevant information from one or more other professionals to inform an assessment of Family P.

Found Proved

Allegation 6 – Your actions in paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 and/or 5 were dishonest:

89. The panel used the test of dishonesty set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Limited t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67:

“When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual’s knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.”

Allegation 1

90. The panel considered Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s actions to be dishonest on a balance of probabilities given:
- a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s records were not an absence of information, but the recording of events which did not take place. In particular:
 - i. On 29 April 2021, Ms Hanvey-Wilding recorded that she had a telephone conversation with Person 1 at 2.19pm. It has been admitted by Ms Hanvey-Wilding that this did not happen.

- ii. On 1 June 2021, Ms Harvey-Wilding recorded a virtual CIN visit with Child A as having been completed on 14 May 2021 via MS Teams, during which Child A had refused to speak to her and walked out. It has been admitted by Ms Harvey-Wilding that this did not happen, albeit a similar meeting appeared to have taken place on 6 May 2021.
 - iii. The Council's case recording system showed Ms Harvey-Wilding recorded visits to Children B and C on 5 May 2021 and 26 May 2021. It has been admitted by Ms Harvey-Wilding that this did not happen.
 - iv. Child D's case notes show that Ms Harvey-Wilding recorded complete visits on 22 March 2021 and 18 May 2021. It has been admitted by Ms Harvey-Wilding that this did not happen.
 - v. The case notes recorded visits for Child F on 14 May 2021 and 3 June 2021. It has been admitted by Ms Harvey-Wilding that this did not happen.
- b. The active recording of steps demonstrates thought that went into writing the records, which she would have known would be misleading and false. Ordinary decent people would consider that a professional deliberately acting as set out above, was acting to their own advantage and acting dishonestly in each instance.

Allegation 2

91. Allegation 2 concerns Ms Harvey-Wilding not following management instructions. The panel does not consider that a person can be dishonest by failing to follow management instructions. Consequently, the panel determined that Ms Harvey-Wilding cannot be dishonest for her actions in allegation 2.

Allegation 3

92. The panel considered Ms Harvey-Wilding's actions to be dishonest on a balance of probabilities given:
- a. On 14 June 2021, Ms Smith asked Ms Harvey-Wilding to find her call logs from the call to Child A's mother on 29 April 2021 and virtual CIN visit on 14 May 2021. Ms Harvey-Wilding did not provide the requested call logs to Ms Smith. Ms Harvey-Wilding then attempted to explain her reasoning for not providing phone records, namely:
 - i. Ms Harvey-Wilding's work mobile was broken so she could not retrieve the list. However, there is no evidence before the panel that the phone was broken or sent for repairs through the workplace.

- ii. Ms Hanvey-Wilding said she was struggling to access her phone records from her personal phone and was seeking support from Apple. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not need her phone for such records as these could be retrieved from an itemised phone bill.
- iii. Ms Hanvey-Wilding could not remember whether the call was by Teams, her personal phone or her work mobile phone. In any of these scenarios, logs would be available outside the devices (itemised phone bills or Teams logs).

The panel considers Ms Hanvey-Wilding to be evasive of Ms Smith's request for her phone records on the basis that she did not engage in any such calls, and providing the logs would have undermined her claims to having made the calls to Child A's mother.

- b. On 16 June 2021, Ms Smith spoke to Ms Hanvey-Wilding who repeated her account that the telephone call to Person 1 on 29 April 2021 and visit to Child A on 14 May 2021 had happened. The panel considers this to be a continuation of the dishonesty set out in paragraph 90(a)(i) and (ii) above. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was attempting to conceal her previous dishonesty (that the visits to Child A on 29 April 2021 and 14 May 2021 happened) with further dishonesty to Ms Smith.
- c. Having not spoken to the Health Visitor about Family P, the panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding knew that writing that there were no concerns from others would be understood by her manager as meaning she had confirmed that position before writing it, and that her assertion was both false and relevant to the decision that her manager would make.
- d. Ordinary decent people would consider that a professional deliberately acting as set out above, was acting to their own advantage and acting dishonestly in each instance.

Allegation 5

- 93. The panel considered Ms Hanvey-Wilding's actions to be dishonest on a balance of probabilities given:
 - a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding received information from Child A's mother alleging an assault against school staff. Ms Hanvey-Wilding then sent a letter to Child A's mother, approximately three months later, falsely asserting that the matter had been investigated, when it had not. The panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding did so in order to demonstrate that action had been taken, when it had not. It appears to the panel that Ms Hanvey-Wilding said that the matter had been concluded, when no action had been taken, in order to cover that no investigation had taken place.

- b. Having not spoken to the Health Visitor about Family P, the panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding knew that writing that there were no concerns from others would be understood by her manager as meaning she had confirmed that position before writing it, and that her assertion was both false and relevant to the decision that her manager would make.
 - c. Ordinary decent people would consider that a professional deliberately acting as set out above, was acting to their own advantage and acting dishonestly in each instance.
94. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's actions demonstrate a pattern of recording information which she knew would be false and misleading.

Found Proved

Allegation 7(a) – Between approximately 20 July 2022 and 29 July 2022, you continued to work as a social worker, despite being subject to an Interim Suspension Order:

95. An interim suspension order was imposed upon Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 19 July 2022. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was notified of the interim suspension order by email the following day (20 July 2024 at 11:45) by Social Work England's Hearings Team.
96. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's initial comments, on 12 December 2022, accepted that she was told of the Interim Suspension Order on 20 July 2022, although she denied working since that date.
97. Roger Warren and Julie Harman provided evidence that Ms Hanvey-Wilding was employed by Portsmouth in Children's Services as a locum Safeguarding Assessment social worker from 5 July 2021 until 29 July 2022. Ms Harman provided evidence that she supervised Ms Hanvey-Wilding during that time.
98. Ms Harman provided evidence that on 21 July 2022, Ms Hanvey-Wilding told her that she needed to give a week's notice and [PRIVATE]. This was recorded in a supervision note seen by the panel. Because she was employed as a locum only a week's notice was required, but no written resignation was needed. Ms Harman provided evidence that she was not made aware of the interim suspension order at the time. She became aware after another team member told her that Social Work England's website showed that Ms Hanvey-Wilding was suspended.
99. The panel put weight on the supervision note of 21 July 2022 which provided evidence that Ms Hanvey-Wilding gave notice of 1 week from that date. This meant that Ms Hanvey-Wilding worked as a social worker despite being subject to an interim suspension order.
100. Consequently, on the balance of probabilities, the panel finds that Ms Hanvey-Wilding continued to work as a social worker, despite being subject to an interim suspension order.

Found Proved

Allegation 7(b) – Between approximately 20 July 2022 and 29 July 2022, you failed to inform your employer you were subject to an Interim Suspension Order:

101. As set out in paragraph 97 above, Ms Harman provided evidence that on 21 July 2022, Ms Hanvey-Wilding told her that she needed to give a week's notice and [PRIVATE]. This was recorded in a supervision note seen by the panel. Ms Harman provided evidence that she was not made aware of the interim suspension order at the time. She became aware after another team member told her that Social Work England's website showed that Ms Hanvey-Wilding was suspended.
102. Ms Harman exhibited a number of pieces of work completed by Ms Hanvey-Wilding during the period 21 July 2022 to 28 July 2022.
103. The panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to inform her employer that, between approximately 20 July 2022 and 29 July 2022, she was subject to an interim suspension order as there is evidence that she was working during that period and Ms Harman provided evidence that Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to inform her that she was subject to an interim suspension order. If Ms Harman was notified, Ms Hanvey-Wilding would not have continued to work at Portsmouth in Children's Services as a locum Safeguarding Assessment Social Worker.
104. Consequently, on the balance of probabilities, the panel finds that Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to inform her employer that, between approximately 20 July 2022 and 29 July 2022, she was subject to an interim suspension order.

Found Proved

Allegation 8 – Your actions at paragraph 7 were dishonest:

105. The panel considered Ms Hanvey-Wilding's actions at allegation 7 to be dishonest on a balance of probabilities given:
 - a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was informed of the interim suspension order on 20 July 2022, as she has accepted in her initial comments dated 12 December 2022.
 - b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding had an incentive to protect her reputation by giving one week's notice and providing a narrative that [PRIVATE], rather than inform Portsmouth in Children's Services that she was subject to an interim suspension order.
 - c. Ordinary decent people would consider that a professional deliberately acting as set out above, was acting to their own advantage and acting dishonestly.

Found Proved

Allegation 9(a) – You did not cooperate with Social Work England during an investigation, in that you failed to respond to a request for information dated 18 August 2021:

106. Following receipt of concerns arising from Hampshire Council, Social Work England wrote to Ms Hanvey-Wilding informing her of the nature of the concerns. The panel has seen an email dated 18 August 2021 from the allocated investigator at the time to Ms Hanvey-Wilding enclosing a letter that included the following:

“What you need to do

Details of your current and previous employers

Social Work England’s legislation requires social workers to provide some information to us within a very tight time frame. You need to provide the following information to us within 7 days of receipt of this letter.

- a. Details of your current and past employers (including contact names & email address(es) and if/any relevant agency details) where you have provided services as a social worker, or in relation to social work.*
- b. Details of anyone with whom you have or had an arrangement to provide services as a social worker, or in relation to social work.*
- c. Details of any regulatory body that you are registered with, including your registration number.*

Please be aware that providing this information is a legal requirement. Rule 8(b) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019, requires you to provide the above information by 1 September 2021. Our Rules also require us to let you know that if we do not receive the above information from you without good reason by 8 September 2021, this could result in your suspension or removal from the register and/or a criminal investigation. Please see our website if you wish to view a copy of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019”

Ms Hanvey-Wilding was also invited to provide her initial response to the concerns referred for investigation.

107. The panel has seen a letter dated 7 March 2022 written by the allocated investigator, which is noted as being sent by post to Ms Hanvey-Wilding asking that she respond and enclosing a copy of the 18 August 2021 letter.
108. The panel has seen an email sent by the allocated investigator to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 20 September 2022 (to the same email address as previously used), providing the Case Investigation Report in FTPS-19544. A response was received from Ms Hanvey-Wilding using that email address on 12 October 2022. Ms Hanvey-Wilding provided an amended observations form on 20 November 2022. In those response forms, Ms Hanvey-Wilding mentioned that *“since I was told by Social Work England that I was suspended on the*

20th July 2022, I have not worked as a social worker”, although she did not (and had not previously) refer to the information required of her.

109. As the panel has not seen any response by Ms Hanvey-Wilding to the request for information dated 18 August 2021, on a balance of probabilities, it finds this allegation proved.

Found Proved

Allegation 9(b) – You did not cooperate with Social Work England during an investigation, in that you failed to respond to a request for information dated 30 January 2023:

110. On 30 January 2023 the allocated Social Work England Investigator notified Ms Hanvey-Wilding about the concerns raised in respect of FTPS-21481, within a letter which was sent to Ms Hanvey-Wilding by email. The panel has seen this email. The email was again sent to the email address registered on the Social Work England Back End Register for Ms Hanvey-Wilding. This letter again informed Ms Hanvey-Wilding that she was required to provide certain information to Social Work England within 7 days of receipt of the letter.
111. As Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not respond to this request, the panel has seen an email sent on 28 February 2023 from a Triage Investigations Officer at Social Work England to Ms Hanvey-Wilding asking her to respond.
112. The panel has seen the note of a telephone call that the new allocated investigator made to Ms Hanvey-Wilding on 19 May 2023. The call was made to the telephone number held on Social Work England’s back end register for Ms Hanvey-Wilding, but there was no answer, so he left a voice message asking her to call back by 26 May 2023. No response was received to this voice message.
113. The panel has also seen that on 19 May 2023, the new allocated investigator sent a letter to Ms Hanvey-Wilding by post to her registered postal address. The letter informed Ms Hanvey-Wilding that attempts had been made to contact her since 30 January 2023 and asked that she urgently contact Social Work England by 26 May 2023.
114. The panel has also seen that on 30 May 2023, the new allocated investigator sent a copy of the Case Investigation Report to Ms Hanvey-Wilding by email. The Report included a concern that Ms Hanvey-Wilding had failed to cooperate with this investigation by failing to provide the information required and seeking any comments by 27 June 2023. As no response was received, the panel has seen that on 29 June 2023, the new allocated investigator sent a reminder email re-sending the 30 May 2023 correspondence. No response was received.
115. As the panel has not seen any response by Ms Hanvey-Wilding to the request for information dated 30 January 2023, on a balance of probabilities, it finds this allegation proved.

Found Proved

Submissions on grounds:

116. Concerning misconduct, on behalf of Social Work England, Mr Harris set out that the failures can be properly characterised as misconduct. He outlined the Social Work England 2019 Professional Standards (the “Standards”) that Social Work England considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding had breached. He submitted:

- a. The proven misconduct would put Ms Hanvey-Wilding in breach of professional standards in place at the time, in particular:

2.1 I will be honest, reliable and fair

3.8 Clarify where the accountability lies for delegated work and fulfil that responsibility when it lies with me.

3.9 Make sure that relevant colleagues and agencies are informed about identified risks and the outcomes and implications of assessments and decisions I make

5.1 I will not abuse, neglect, discriminate, exploit or harm anyone, or condone this by others

5.2 I will not behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work

5.3 I will not falsify records or condone this by others

6.1 Report allegations of harm and challenge and report exploitation and any dangerous, abusive or discriminatory behaviour or practice

6.7 Cooperate with any investigations by my employer, Social Work England, or another agency, into my fitness to practise or the fitness to practise of others.

- b. The misconduct in question is serious (both individually and collectively) and calls into question Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s attitude towards fundamental tenets of social work.
- c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding acted in a dishonest manner over a significant period. Dishonesty rests at the highest end of misconduct.
- d. The first set of failings are as a result of the actions of a social worker that fell far below expectations.

- e. The first set of allegations (relating to practise) are seriously aggravated by the second set of allegations (relating to regulation); Ms Hanvey-Wilding knowingly worked during her interim suspension and she did not inform her employer of the interim suspension. Furthermore, she did not engage with her regulator; if she had, it may have resulted in further enquiries as to when and where she had worked.
- f. The second set of allegations undermine how Ms Hanvey-Wilding should have engaged with Social Work England. This undermines public protection. Every day that she worked whilst suspended was another day when she could have been open and honest.
- g. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's proven allegations demonstrate an ongoing pattern of behaviour.
- h. Ms Hanvey-Wilding departed from fundamental social work standards.

117. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not provide any submissions in relation to whether the proven facts amount to misconduct, other than those set out in paragraph 76 above.

Finding and reasons on grounds:

118. The panel accepted the legal advice and applied the following definition of "misconduct":

"...some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a practitioner in the particular circumstances. The misconduct is qualified in two respects. First, it is qualified by the word 'professional' which links the misconduct to the profession. Secondly, the misconduct is qualified by the word 'serious'. It is not any professional misconduct which will qualify. The professional misconduct must be serious."

119. The panel also took into account the observation of Collins J in *Nandi v GMC [2004] EWHC 2317 (Admin)* that: *"The adjective 'serious' must be given its proper weight and in other contexts there has been reference to conduct which would be regarded as deplorable by fellow practitioners."*

120. The panel considered that by committing the proven misconduct, Ms Hanvey-Wilding fell short of what would be proper in the circumstances. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's proven misconduct amounts to serious professional misconduct. In particular:

- a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to carry out a number of the basic and fundamental requirements of a social worker. She:
 - i. failed to keep accurate records;

- ii. failed to follow management direction;
 - iii. provided false and/or misleading information;
 - iv. failed to complete assessments and/or reviews, either adequately or at all;
 - v. failed to take appropriate action to safeguard service users; and
 - vi. was dishonest in her actions.
- b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s misconduct was serious and placed service users at risk of harm.
 - c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s misconduct demonstrated a pattern of behaviour.
 - d. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was dishonest, both in her practise and about her practise, having practised when suspended and not informing her employer about her suspension. In doing so, she undermined public confidence in the integrity of Social Work England’s register. Further, the dishonesty in her practise continued over a prolonged period of time, putting service users at risk of harm.
 - e. Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to cooperate with her regulator, blocking any further investigations which may have been necessary to protect the public.
 - f. The misconduct also puts Ms Hanvey-Wilding in breach of the Social Work England Professional standards set out at paragraph 116 above.
121. Further, such actions damage public confidence in the profession, as it would convey a degree of opprobrium to the ordinary intelligent citizen (*Shaw v General Osteopathic Council [2015] EWHC 2721 (Admin)*).

Submissions on impairment:

122. On behalf of Social Work England, Mr Harris submitted that Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s fitness to practise is currently impaired on the basis that:
- a. The allegations demonstrate a risk of harm to members of the public were they to be repeated. There is no evidence of insight and no demonstration of steps to remediate, as Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s position is that she does not intend to return to social work. Therefore, it appears that remediation is unlikely.
 - b. Whilst Ms Hanvey-Wilding has made some admissions and has stated that she has, “*let myself, my family and profession down*”, she has demonstrated limited insight.

- c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has attributed the alleged dishonest actions to being “stressed” but not explained this any further. Ms Hanvey-Wilding blames external factors for her misconduct.
 - d. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has not produced any reflection upon the alleged actions or their impact. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s misconduct demonstrates attitudinal failings.
 - e. The allegations were not isolated, but a repeated pattern of behaviour, over a lengthy period.
 - f. Her misconduct was not admitted, but discovered.
 - g. Her misconduct was for her own personal gain.
 - h. A finding of impairment on public protection grounds should be made given the risk of repetition and of consequent harm.
 - i. A finding of impairment should be made on wider public interest grounds (to maintain public confidence in the profession and promote and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.
123. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not provide any submissions in relation to whether she is currently impaired, other than those set out in paragraph 76 above.

Finding and reasons on current impairment:

124. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser that when considering impairment, the panel should consider whether Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s fitness to practise is currently impaired in relation to the misconduct. The panel was asked by the legal adviser to consider:
- a. whether Ms Hanvey-Wilding has acted in the past and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm;
 - b. whether Ms Hanvey-Wilding has in the past and/or is liable in the future to bring the social work profession into disrepute;
 - c. whether Ms Hanvey-Wilding has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the social work profession; and
 - d. whether Ms Hanvey-Wilding has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.
125. When considering the question of impairment, the panel took into account Social Work England’s “*Impairment and Sanctions Guidance*”.
126. At the outset, the panel considered Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s insight and remediation.

127. The panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding has shown some insight given her reflection that, *“I cannot tell you how much I have let myself, my family and profession down.”* She also made some early admissions.
128. However, the panel considered Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s insight to be very limited, given:
- a. Her reflection is limited. Her reflection seeks to blame external factors for her actions, such as having *“overwhelming caseload”* and her judgement being *“impeded by [her] emotional state”*. Furthermore, she seeks to minimise the impact of the misconduct, calling them *“judgement errors”*.
 - b. There is limited insight from Ms Hanvey-Wilding on the effect of her actions on service users. Consequently, the panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding has not fully appreciated the gravity of the proven misconduct.
 - c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s proven misconduct appears to be attitudinal in nature.

129. The panel considered that there is no evidence before it that Ms Hanvey-Wilding has remediated her practice.

Whether Ms Hanvey-Wilding has acted in the past and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm

130. Ms Hanvey-Wilding’s (in)actions in the proven misconduct demonstrates that she has acted in the past so as to put service users at unwarranted risk of harm. Ms Hanvey-Wilding:
- a. failed to keep accurate records;
 - b. failed to follow management direction;
 - c. provided false and/or misleading information;
 - d. failed to complete assessments and/or reviews, either adequately or at all;
 - e. failed to take appropriate action to safeguard service users; and
 - f. was dishonest in her actions.

The panel concluded that this demonstrates a pattern of misconduct which put service users at risk of harm.

131. Furthermore, Ms Hanvey-Wilding practised when suspended. In doing so, she undermined the authority of Social Work England and the integrity of the register, which placed service users at unwarranted risk of harm.
132. Given the very limited insight and lack of remediation from Ms Hanvey-Wilding as set out in paragraphs 127-129 above, the panel considered that Ms Hanvey-Wilding is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm.

Whether Ms Hanvey-Wilding has in the past and/or is liable in the future to bring the social work profession into disrepute

133. As a result of the (in)actions set out in paragraph 130 above, the panel considered that Ms Harvey-Wilding has in the past brought the social work profession into disrepute.
134. Given the very limited insight and lack of remediation from Ms Harvey-Wilding as set out in paragraphs 127-129 above, the panel considered that Ms Harvey-Wilding is liable in the future to bring the social work profession into disrepute.

Whether Ms Harvey-Wilding has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the social work profession

135. As a result of the (in)actions set out in paragraph 130 above, the panel considered that Ms Harvey-Wilding has breached fundamental tenets of the social work profession, namely the requirement to be honest, and to safeguard service users.
136. Given the very limited insight and lack of remediation from Ms Harvey-Wilding as set out in paragraphs 127-129 above, the panel considered that Ms Harvey-Wilding is liable in the future to breach a fundamental tenet of the social work profession.

Whether Ms Harvey-Wilding has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future

137. Given the proven allegations of 6 and 8, the panel considered that Ms Harvey-Wilding has in the past acted dishonestly.
138. Given the very limited insight and lack of remediation from Ms Harvey-Wilding as set out in paragraphs 127-129 above, the panel considered that Ms Harvey-Wilding is liable in the future to act dishonestly.

Panel's conclusion on impairment

139. In light of the above, the panel considered Ms Harvey-Wilding's fitness to practise to be currently impaired on the personal element.
140. Further, members of the public would be concerned to learn about Ms Harvey-Wilding's misconduct, stemming from the proven misconduct. Ms Harvey-Wilding has shown very limited insight and a lack of remediation, as set out in paragraphs 127-129 above, with the consequent risk that she may repeat the actions that resulted in the finding of misconduct. Consequently, the panel considered Ms Harvey-Wilding's fitness to practise to be impaired on the wider public interest element, namely maintaining public confidence in social workers in England and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers in England.

Submissions on sanction:

141. On behalf of Social Work England, Mr Harris submitted:
- a. Mitigating factors for Ms Harvey-Wilding are:

- i. Ms Hanvey-Wilding provided early admissions to some of the allegations. However, this was not to any of the dishonesty allegations.
 - ii. Ms Hanvey-Wilding had personal mitigation, including [PRIVATE]. However, these assertions were made without evidence, so limited weight can be given to them.
 - iii. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has no previous fitness to practise history.
- b. Aggravating factors for Ms Hanvey-Wilding are:
 - i. Although there was insight and remorse, it was very limited and did not cover any personal responsibility for the proven misconduct.
 - ii. The proven misconduct was repetitious and spanned a long period.
 - iii. There has been no evidence of Ms Hanvey-Wilding remediating her practice.
 - iv. The proven misconduct placed service users at risk of harm.
- c. Taking no action, giving advice or a warning is not appropriate in the circumstances given:
 - i. The seriousness of the allegations;
 - ii. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's very limited insight;
 - iii. There is no evidence of remediation from Ms Hanvey-Wilding; and
 - iv. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's proven misconduct put service users at unwarranted risk of harm.
- d. Conditions of practice would be insufficient to manage the risk posed by Ms Hanvey-Wilding given the serious and wide-ranging concerns set out in the proven misconduct, including dishonesty, where conditions are almost always insufficient.
- e. A suspension is not appropriate in the circumstances as:
 - i. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has not shown that she is willing or able to remediate her practice and resolve her failings; and
 - ii. A suspension is unsuitable where a social worker has not demonstrated any insight or remediation. There is no realistic prospect of Ms Hanvey-Wilding remediating her practice.
- f. Mr Harris further submitted that removal is the only appropriate and proportionate outcome given:
 - i. the serious and widespread concerns; and

- ii. the proven dishonesty was persistent and concealed.

142. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not provide any submissions in relation to sanction, other than those set out in paragraph 76 above.

Decision on sanction:

143. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser that it must pursue the overarching objective when exercising its functions. The purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive although a sanction imposed may have a punitive effect. The panel considered the least restrictive sanction first and then moved up the sanctions ladder as appropriate. The panel had regard to the Sanctions Guidance.

144. The panel considered the following factors to be mitigating:

- a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding provided early admissions to some of the allegations. However, this was not to any of the dishonesty allegations.
- b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding provided some personal mitigation, including [PRIVATE]. However, these assertions were made without evidence, so limited weight can be given to them.
- c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has no previous fitness to practise history.

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

- a. Although there was some insight and remorse, it was very limited and did not cover any personal responsibility for the proven misconduct. Ms Hanvey-Wilding failed to consider the result of the proven misconduct upon service users, colleagues and the social work profession.
- b. The misconduct was wide-ranging and repetitious, involving a number of service users.
- c. There was no evidence of Ms Hanvey-Wilding undertaking any remediation.
- d. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's proven misconduct gave rise to the risk of harm to service users.

146. The panel finds that taking no action or issuing advice or a warning would not be sufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour, given:

- a. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's misconduct put service users at unwarranted risk of harm;
- b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's very limited insight, very limited remorse, and lack of remediation;
- c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding brought the social work profession into disrepute;

- d. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's dishonest conduct; and
- e. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's misconduct breached a fundamental tenet of social work.

147. The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be proportionate and appropriate in the circumstances. The panel considered that a conditions of practice order would not be proportionate and appropriate to protect the public or be in the wider public interest given:

- a. The serious and wide-ranging concerns set out in the proven misconduct, which included persistent and widespread dishonesty;
- b. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's very limited insight, in particular to understand what went wrong and an-depth evaluation of why;
- c. Ms Hanvey-Wilding has not engaged in social work practice since July 2022, or with Social Work England since December 2023. Even if any conditions could be formulated, any supervision required would have to be so restrictive as to be tantamount to suspension;
- d. Ms Hanvey-Wilding continued to practice whilst subject to an interim suspension order, which would call into question her willingness to comply with conditions of practice; and
- e. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not follow instructions from her superiors at the time, which would call into question the effectiveness of conditions of practice.

148. The panel next considered whether it was appropriate to impose a suspension order. The panel had regard to the paragraphs 137 and 138 of the Sanctions Guidance:

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

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

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

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

149. The panel did not consider a suspension order to be appropriate given:

- a. The seriousness of the concerns, which were widespread and took place over a prolonged period. Ms Hanvey-Wilding's proven misconduct

demonstrates a serious breach of professional standards. In particular, the dishonesty was at the serious end of the spectrum given:

- i. The dishonesty indicated a pattern of behaviour;
 - ii. Ms Hanvey-Wilding did not admit to the dishonesty allegations;
 - iii. Ms Hanvey-Wilding tried to conceal her dishonesty; and
 - iv. The dishonesty was for Ms Hanvey-Wilding's personal gain, in that she continued to work whilst being suspended from practice.
- b. There is limited evidence to suggest that Ms Hanvey-Wilding is willing or able to remediate her practice or resolve her failings, given her silence on the matter for approximately two years and her email to Social Work England dated 28 December 2023 setting out: *"I am aware of this case as being going on now for a long time. I would like it to be known to the court tomorrow that I do not wish to register every again as a social worker and that my name can be taken off the register. I can only apologise for wasting everyone's time."*
- c. Although Ms Hanvey-Wilding has demonstrated some very limited insight and remorse, it was over two years ago and failed to consider the result of the proven misconduct upon service users, colleagues and the social work profession. The panel has little confidence that Ms Hanvey-Wilding will gain any further insight or engage with Social Work England during any suspension period.
- d. Ms Hanvey-Wilding undermined public confidence in the integrity of Social Work England register by working when suspended.

150. The panel considered the Guidance in respect of a removal order. In particular, the panel took into account paragraph 149 of the Guidance which sets out:

"A removal order may be appropriate in cases involving (any of the following):

- *dishonesty, especially where persistent and/or concealed*
- *persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of their actions or consequences*
- *Social workers who are unwilling and/or unable to remediate (for example, where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future)"*

151. In the particular circumstances of this case, the panel considered that a removal order is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose. Further, the panel considered a removal order to be appropriate given that a removal order would protect the public, maintain confidence in the social work profession and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.

Interim order:

152. In light of its findings on sanction, the panel next considered an application by Mr Harris for an interim suspension order for eighteen months to cover the appeal period before the final order becomes effective. Mr Harris submitted that an interim suspension order would be consistent with the panel's previous findings and, in particular, the finding that Ms Hanvey-Wilding still poses a risk to service users. Ms Hanvey-Wilding was not present to comment on the application.
153. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser and considered whether to impose an interim order. It was mindful of its earlier findings and decided that it would be wholly incompatible with those earlier findings and the imposition of a removal order to conclude that an interim suspension order was not necessary for the protection of the public during the appeal period.
154. Accordingly, the panel concluded that an interim suspension order is necessary for the protection of the public. It determined that it is appropriate that the Interim Suspension Order be imposed for a period of 18 months to cover the appeal period. When the appeal period expires, this interim order will come to an end unless an appeal has been filed with the High Court.

Right of appeal:

155. Under Paragraph 16(1)(a) of Schedule 2 of the regulations, the social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:
 - 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.
156. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of the regulations 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.
157. Under Regulation 9(4) of the regulations this order may not be recorded until the expiry of the period within which an appeal against the order could be made, or where an appeal against the order has been made, before the appeal is withdrawn or otherwise finally disposed of.

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

Review of final orders:

159. Under Paragraph 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of the regulations:

- 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), and a final order does not have effect until after the expiry of that period

160. Under Rule 16(aa) of the rules 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:

161. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a final 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>.