



Social worker: Selina Hare

Registration number: SW7769

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review hearing

Date of hearing: 13 January 2026

hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
conditions of practice order (expiring 24 February 2026)

Hearing outcome:
No current impairment: allow the current conditions of practice order to lapse upon its expiry

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final conditions of practice order under paragraph 15(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the **regulations**”) originally imposed after agreed disposal for a period of 12 months by case examiners on behalf of Social Work England on 20 February 2025.
2. Ms Hare did not attend and was not represented but provided written submissions.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Narayani Panesar-Stringer, case presenter.
4. The panel of adjudicators (“the **panel**”) and the other people present at the hearing are set out in the table below.

Adjudicators	Role
Bryan Hume	Chair
Jill Wells	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Hannah McKendrick	Hearings officer
Paige Swallow	Hearings support officer
Helen Potts	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) was informed by Ms Panesar-Stringer that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Hare by email to an address provided by her (namely her registered address as it appears on the Social Work England Register). Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
6. The panel had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register (the “**Register**”) as of 11 December 2025 showing the email and registered postal address for Ms Hare which is held by Social Work England.
 - A copy of the notice of review (the “**Notice**”) dated 11 December 2025 and addressed to Ms Hare at the email address held by Social Work England. The Notice sets out the outcome which Social Work England is seeking, namely the variation and continuation of the existing conditions of practice order for a further period of 12 months. The Notice informs Ms Hare of the opportunity to attend and be represented at this review, or to make written submissions. The Notice specifies the date of this review and the date by which Ms Hare should

confirm her attendance or make written submissions, such date being 30 December 2025.

- A copy of a covering email dated 11 December 2025, which was sent by an employee of Capsticks LLP and addressed to Ms Hare at her email address as it appears on the Register. The covering email referred to today's final order review, and its attachments included a copy of the Notice and related documents.
- A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 11 December 2025 the writer sent the Notice and related documents by email to Ms Hare at the email address for her which is set out in the Register.

7. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice. This included reference to rules 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules (the "**FTP Rules**")

8. Having had regard to Rules 16, 44 and 45 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 Ms Hare in accordance with the Rules in that:

- The Notice was served on Ms Hare by one of the mandatory means of service in rule 44(a) of the FTP Rules, namely, by being sent to an email address for Ms Hare which she had provided to Social Work England.
- The Notice contained the information required by paragraph 16 of the FTP Rules.
- Service of the Notice was proved by a statement of service in accordance with rule 44(b) of the FTP Rules.
- As, pursuant to rule 45, a notice served by email is to be treated as being served on the day on which it is sent, Ms Hare has been given more than 28 days' notice of this review, and more than 7 days within which to provide her written representations or to inform Social Work England that she intends to attend and/or be represented at today's hearing.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

9. The panel next considered whether to proceed in the absence of Ms Hare. It heard the submissions of Ms Panesar-Stringer on behalf of Social Work England.

10. Ms Panesar-Stringer invited the panel to proceed in Ms Hare's absence. She submitted that Notice had been duly served and that Ms Hare had been made aware of the hearing but had chosen not to attend. She referred the panel to an email from Ms Hare in which she states that she has chosen not to attend the hearing, but provided written submissions. No application for an adjournment has been made by Ms Hare and as

such there is no guarantee that adjourning today's proceedings would secure her attendance on a future date. Ms Panesar-Stringer further submitted that this was a mandatory review which needed to take place before the expiry of the existing order and that there were public protection concerns which need to be determined. She therefore invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.

11. The panel reminded itself that this is a mandatory review of a final order previously imposed on Ms Hare's registration. It 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 guidance '*Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker*'.
12. The panel took into account that Ms Hare has provided an unambiguous statement indicating that she has chosen not to attend. It concluded that no purpose would be served by an adjournment. The panel noted that it had the benefit of written submissions from her. Having weighed the interests of Ms Hare with those of Social Work England and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing, the panel determined that it would be fair to proceed in the absence of Ms Hare.

Preliminary matters:

[Private]

The panel reminded itself that the starting point is that under Rule 37 is that these proceedings shall be held in public. Social Work England's overarching objective is the protection of the public and it follows that there is a public interest in the proceedings being conducted in public. However, Rule 38 (a) (ii) states that a hearing, or part of a hearing, shall be held in private where the proceedings are considering the physical or mental health of the registered social worker. The panel determined that those parts of the hearing which relate to Ms Hare's health would be held in private and that a public and private determination would be produced.

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 conditions of practice order which was imposed on 20 February 2025 for a period of 12 months and which is due to expire on 24 February 2026.
15. The conditions of practice which are currently in place are as follows:

“1. You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.

2. You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency, or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.

3a. At any time you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England’s register.

b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.

4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 3 months and at least 14 days prior to any review.

5. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.

6. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.

7. You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.

8. You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days of the date of application [for future registration] or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect [for existing registration].

9. You must work with your reporter to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:

- An understanding of professional boundaries in social work and the importance of maintaining professional boundaries.*

- The impact on service users of not maintaining professional*

boundaries, focussing on children and young people and how this can increase risk.

- *An understanding of why policy and procedures are in place and the importance of being familiar with and adhering to policy and procedures.*

10. *You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 4 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.*

11. *You must read Social Work England's Professional Standards (2019) and provide a written reflection 4 months after these conditions take effect, focusing on how your conduct in respect of professional boundaries was below the accepted standard of a social worker, outlining what you should have done differently, and how you will ensure that there is no future repetition.*

12. *You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at 1 to 11, above:*

- *Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.*
- *Any locum, agency or out-of-hours service you are registered with or apply to be registered with in order to secure employment or contracts to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).*
- *Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).*
- *Any organisation, agency, or employer where you are using your social work qualification/ knowledge/ skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.*

You must forward written evidence of your compliance with this condition to Social Work England within 14 days from the date these conditions take effect.

13. *You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 12, to any person requesting information about your registration status.”*

The concerns which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

16. As recorded in a final decision dated 20 February 2025, case examiners appointed by Social Work England determined that there was a realistic prospect that adjudicators would determine that Ms Hare's fitness to practise was impaired on the ground of misconduct on the basis of the following the regulatory concern:

"Regulatory Concern 1

Whilst registered as a social worker you did not maintain professional boundaries with a young person known to you in a professional capacity."

17. The case examiners determined that it was not in the public interest to refer the case to a final hearing and proposed to dispose of the case by making a final order of conditions of practice for 12 months in respect of Ms Hare.

18. Ms Hare accepted the facts set out by the case examiners in their written decision; she accepted that her fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct; and she consented to the disposal proposed by Social Work England.

19. The case was returned to the case examiners who accepted Ms Hare's response. The case examiners remained satisfied that an accepted disposal by way of a conditions of practice order for 12 months was a fair and proportionate disposal and that this was the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

20. The background to the regulatory concern is that, while working in a social work role, Ms Hare held management responsibility for Child A from when the case was allocated within her team in October 2022 until the case was transferred to a new team on 15 February 2023.

21. Child A was described as vulnerable and at risk of exploitation; furthermore, it was said that Child A found it difficult to engage with professionals. Child A entered local authority care in December 2022 due to a breakdown in relationships with their family.

22. Ms Hare's former employer has stated that, after completing a handover to the new team, Ms Hare would have had no professional reason to have maintained any contact with Child A.

23. The case examiners found, on the evidence before them, that Ms Hare had:

- Remained in contact with Child A after 15 February 2023 without management knowledge or formal approval.
- Contacted Child A using her personal mobile phone both during, and outside of, work hours after 15 February 2023.

- Attended meetings relating to Child A without having professional reason to do so and without management knowledge.
- Provided finance, reclaimed from local authority petty cash to Child A for items including taxis and phone credit, without management approval or oversight.
- Not recorded her interactions with Child A on the employer's computer data base.

24. The case examiners were satisfied that these actions amounted to not maintaining professional boundaries with Child A and that there was a reasonable prospect that the regulatory concern would be found proven by adjudicators.

The case examiners on 20 February 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

25. The case examiners were satisfied that there was a realistic prospect that adjudicators would determine that Ms Hare's actions were sufficiently serious as to amount to misconduct.

26. The case examiners considered that the evidence suggested that Ms Hare had breached paragraphs 1.7, 2.3, 2.7 and 5.2 of *Social Work England Professional Standards (2019)*.

27. The case examiners highlighted that guidance on professional standards reminded social workers that:

“Social workers should maintain clear and professional relationships with people. As social work is fundamentally about people and relationships, it is important that social workers are alert to relationships becoming inappropriate. With the authority, knowledge and influence a social worker has in the professional relationship, there is almost always an imbalance of power. This is important to acknowledge alongside personal values, views and motivations to ensure that they do not influence the relationship”

28. The case examiners noted that the evidence suggested that the Ms Hare did not maintain professional boundaries over a period of several months, and in doing so, impacted Child A's relationship with their allocated social worker and therefore left Child A potentially at an increased vulnerability.

29. The case examiners concluded that the alleged conduct was serious and, if proven, likely to suggest a significant departure from the professional standards detailed above.

30. The case examiners went on to consider whether Ms Hare's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of her misconduct. They concluded that there was a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding her fitness to practise impaired on both the personal element (established via an assessment of the risk of repetition) and the public element (established through consideration of whether a finding of impairment might be required to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in the maintenance of proper standards for social workers).

31. With regard to the personal element, the case examiners considered that while the misconduct was remediable, it had not yet been remedied. Although Ms Hare had accepted the regulatory concern in full, she had not provided any significant level of insight, apologies or remediation and had sought to blame her employer for a lack of support and monitoring. As a result of this, the case examiners concluded that Ms Hare had not demonstrated an understanding of the risk her alleged conduct posed; she had not demonstrated any tangible remediation that would allay the concern that she would behave differently if she found herself in a similar situation in the future; and the risk of repetition was high.

32. With regard to the public element, the case examiners were of the view that a member of the public would be concerned about an allegation that a social worker did not maintain professional boundaries. The case examiners considered that the allegation related to fundamental tenets of social work including making and maintaining effective professional relationships and safeguarding. The case examiners stated that adjudicators might consider there to be a potential risk of harm to the wider public in terms of their ability to trust and have confidence in a social worker who is alleged to have acted in this manner. They stated that an allegation of not maintaining professional boundaries and impacting negatively on a child's vulnerability is serious and a failure to find impairment might undermine public confidence in the profession and fail to maintain the professional standards expected of social workers.

The case examiners on 20 February 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

33. The case examiners considered that a conditions of practice order was the appropriate and proportionate sanction. Their reasons were as follows:

"Whilst the social worker has not demonstrated full insight, the case examiners note that they have shown some reflection into the circumstances of the case, and that this could offer an opportunity to develop further insight and remediation. The case examiners are of the view that workable conditions can be formulated that would support the social worker to develop the requisite insight and remediate their practice.

Having concluded that a conditions of practice order is the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners went on to consider the length of time for the order. The case examiners consider that 12 months would allow the social worker sufficient time to demonstrate strengthened practice within a full appraisal cycle. They consider that any

longer period, given that some insight and reflection has already been demonstrated, would be unnecessary and punitive.

The case examiners went on to test the suitability of the conditions of practice order by considering the next most severe sanctions, a suspension order and a removal order. Having considered their guidance, the case examiners did not consider these orders to be proportionate.

Although, the concerns are serious, the case examiners consider that the public can be protected with an appropriate conditions of practice order.”

Social Work England submissions:

34. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that Social Work England’s position is that Ms Hare’s fitness to practise remains impaired and that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is to continue the conditions of practice order for a further period of 12 months both for the public protection and in the wider public interest.
35. Ms Panesar-Stringer reminded the panel that Ms Hare carries the persuasive burden of satisfying it that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired. She invited the panel to find that Ms Hare’s fitness to practise remains currently impaired on both the personal and public component.
36. She referred to panel to the case of *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581. She reminded the panel that the original concerns about Ms Hare’s conduct were sufficiently serious to result in a 12-month conditions of practice order by way of accepted disposal. She submitted that that outcome reflected both the seriousness of the concerns and the view that the risk was capable of being managed and remediated through structured oversight of Ms Hare’s practice.
37. Ms Panesar-Stringer acknowledged that, since the imposition of the final order, Ms Hare has demonstrated insight into her misconduct and has been developing the skills to ensure that it is not repeated. She said that Ms Hare has complied with the conditions of practice order to the extent she has been able, while not working as a social worker. Ms Hare has complied with Condition 11 by submitting a reflective statement on 24 June 2025 in which she had explored the professional decisions she had made leading to her breach of professional standards. She had also kept Social Work England updated as to the fact that she is not working as a social worker .
38. Ms Panesar-Stringer reminded the panel that, in addition to her reflective statement in June 2025, Ms Hare had provided written submissions and further reflections on 28 December 2025 and 12 January 2026.

39. Ms Panesar-Stringer noted that in her written submissions of 28 December 2025 Ms Hare had referred to [PRIVATE]. Ms Panesar-Stringer highlighted that Ms Hare had also written that she has reflected deeply on her behaviour including working on professional boundaries.

40. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that Ms Hare has not provided Social Work England with evidence of the steps she says she has taken and that her reflections have not been tested in practice. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that Social Work England's position is that conditions of practice remain appropriate until such time as it is established that Ms Hare can maintain appropriate professional boundaries in a registered social work or similar role. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that independent evidence should be provided, such as an employer report, which confirms that Ms Hare can maintain appropriate professional boundaries under pressure.

41. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that, while it was recognised that Ms Hare had taken steps to remediate her misconduct, Social Work England considers that, at this stage the risk of repetition of that misconduct remains. Ms Panesar-Stringer noted that Ms Hare has not stated that she will never return to practice and, as a result Social Work England's position is that her fitness to practise remains currently impaired on the personal component.

42. Ms Panesar-Stringer went on to address the panel on the public component and invited the panel to find that Ms Hare's fitness to practise also remains currently impaired on the public component. She referred the panel to the breaches of professional standards identified by the case examiners and submitted that the public would be concerned if a social worker were permitted to return to unrestricted practice in circumstances where the original concern was significant, where the social worker had not worked in a social work or equivalent role to test the conditions in practice, and where the only evidence of remediation consisted of written reflection.

43. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that Ms Hare's insight needs to be tested in practice. She submitted that the regulatory process exists not only to support rehabilitation but also to maintain confidence in the profession. She submitted that to allow Ms Hare to return to unrestricted practice in the absence of clear and up-to-date evidence of safe professional practise would risk undermining that confidence. Ms Panesar-Stringer invited the panel to find, therefore, that Ms Hare's fitness to practise remains impaired on the public component.

44. Ms Panesar-Stringer invited the panel to continue the conditions of practice order for a further 12 months, save for the removal of Condition 11 which has been met. Ms Panesar-Stringer referred the panel to Social Work England's *Guidance on impairment and sanctions* and reminded the panel of the guidance that, when considering the appropriate sanction, it should consider the least restrictive sanction first and work its

way up in levels of seriousness. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that Social Work England's position is that current impairment arises not from any ongoing misconduct by Ms Hare but from the fact that her insight and remediation have not yet been put into practice. The risk of repetition identified by the case examiners has, therefore, not yet been shown to have resolved. She submitted that a conditions of practice order would allow Ms Hare to return to practice in a structured, supported and supervised way while ensuring that any risks to service users are appropriately managed.

45. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that a conditions of practice order would also allow Ms Hare to explore professional boundaries whilst also providing her with the opportunity to test this in practice.
46. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that this approach remains proportionate in circumstances where Ms Hare has engaged with the regulatory process and has provided reflective material indicating her willingness to improve. Ms Hare submitted that the risks posed by Ms Hare are capable of being managed through supervision, oversight and structured conditions and there is a realistic prospect that, following a period of practice under conditions, Ms Hare will be able to demonstrate safe and effective practice with sufficient remediation.
47. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that a lesser sanction would be insufficient to protect the public or to maintain confidence in the profession. She submitted that the continuation of the conditions of practice order for a further 12 months remains necessary, appropriate and proportionate to address current impairment and to protect both the public and the wider public interest.
48. In conclusion, Ms Panesar-Stringer invited the panel to vary the conditions of practice order by removing Condition 11, and to continue the order for a further 12-month period.

Social worker' submissions:

49. Ms Hare provided written submissions, dated 28 December 2025, for the purposes of the review hearing, as follows:

“Over the past year, I have gained a much clearer understanding of the personal and clinical factors that contributed to my boundary concerns.. At the time of the incident, [PRIVATE]
I now recognise that I became over-involved and over-invested in the case at the time interpreting emotional overextension as commitment. Through [PRIVATE] reflection, I understand that this was actually a sign of deteriorating boundaries [PRIVATE].

I have reflected deeply on how [PRIVATE] at that time influenced my behaviour. I understand the importance of professional distance and of maintaining clear and consistent boundaries to protect the people we work with, colleagues, and myself.

This insight is something I have developed steadily and consistently through formal reflection, [PRIVATE], and personal learning.

I have fully complied with all conditions that could be completed given that I am not currently working in social work.

I have:

- *Maintained consistent communication with Social Work England*
- *Confirmed that I am not working in a social work role at present*
- *Completed the reflective statement required under Condition 11*
- *Undertaken [PRIVATE] and structured reflection on boundaries*
- *[PRIVATE] health safely]*

Any employment-based conditions cannot be completed until such a time as I return to social work practice. This has been acknowledged in SWE's own submissions.

I have engaged fully, openly, and responsibly throughout this process. I respectfully submit that extending the Conditions of Practice Order for a further 12 months is not a proportionate or necessary response at this stage.

The purpose of a Conditions of Practice Order is to protect the public, uphold public confidence, and address any impairment of fitness to practise.

Given that I am not in practice and have made significant progress in understanding and managing the issues that contributed to my original conduct, I do not believe continued conditions serve a meaningful protective purpose.

Furthermore: I have complied fully with what was possible. I have demonstrated ongoing insight, stability, and responsibility. There has been no repetition of any concerning behaviour. The reflective condition has now been completed.

An extension would place ongoing restrictions on my registration without clear justification, particularly when the conditions cannot realistically be fulfilled unless I return to social work employment.

In light of the above, I respectfully invite the panel to consider whether revocation of the existing Conditions of Practice Order is now the proportionate and fair outcome.

However, if the panel considers that some regulatory marking is still required, I ask that a warning order rather than extended Conditions be considered as a more suitable.

I have reflected deeply on this process and on the events that led to it. I take responsibility for my past actions and have invested significant effort into understanding the factors that contributed to them. I have [PRIVATE] developed insight, and put safeguards in place that were not available to me at the time of the incident.

I remain committed to personal growth, transparency, and maintaining safe professional boundaries in all aspects of my life”.

50. In further written submissions dated 12 January 2025, Ms Hare acknowledged Social Work England's concerns regarding public protection and the perceived risk of repetition. She wrote that she recognised the seriousness of the concerns and the importance of maintaining robust professional boundaries in social work practice. She made further submissions about her health. She also invited the panel to consider her wider employment history as follows:

“I respectfully submit that there is evidence my professional boundaries have been maintained in practice. Following my six-month period of employment at Wigan, I worked for approximately one year at Oldham in a registered social work role and no professional boundary concerns were raised during that period. I understand Social Work England contacted Oldham directly, and I would ask that this is taken into account as independent evidence relevant to whether the concerns have been tested in practice....

I would also ask that my wider employment history is considered. I was employed by Calderdale for approximately fourteen years and had a strong professional reputation. I recognise this is largely self-reported at present and has not been fully evidenced through independent documentation within these proceedings. Nonetheless, I respectfully submit that this long period of practice without boundary-related concerns provides relevant context when considering overall risk.

In light of the above, if the Panel is minded to extend the order, I ask that consideration is given to whether a shorter extension (for example, six months rather than twelve) would be proportionate and sufficient in the circumstances.”

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

51. 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 case examiners. 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'.

52. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the case examiners and the additional documentation provided which included Ms Hare's reflective statement of June 2025. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Panesar-Stringer on behalf of Social Work England and those made in writing by Ms Hare, as set out above.
53. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession.
54. The panel first considered whether Ms Hare's fitness to practise remains impaired. The panel reminded itself that the case examiners had found that Ms Hare's fitness to practise was impaired on the personal component on the basis that she had "*not sufficiently demonstrated an understanding of the risk their alleged conduct posed. Further, whilst stating the conduct would not be repeated, the social worker has not demonstrated tangible remediation, such as would reassure the case examiners that the social worker's alleged conduct would not be repeated if the social worker found themselves in a similar situation in future.*"
55. The panel carefully considered whether there was any evidence before it that Ms Hare has developed her understanding of the risk posed by her conduct and taken steps to remedy it.
56. The panel acknowledged Ms Hare's participation and engagement throughout these proceedings. The panel also noted her compliance with the conditions of practice order, to the extent to which she has been able while not currently in a social work role. It noted that she has kept Social Work England informed of her employment status as required by Condition 1 and has provided a detailed written reflective piece as required by Condition 11 of the agreed conditions of practice order.
57. The panel observed that many of the existing conditions of practice are notification requirements and that the only condition which Ms Hare has been unable to fulfil by reason of not being in social work practice is Condition 9 which requires her to have a workplace reported and to work with her reporter to formulate a personal development plan specifically designed to address identified shortfalls in her practice.
58. The panel carefully considered the written reflective piece provided by Ms Hare to Social Work England on 24 June 2025. In this reflection Ms Hare explored the decisions she made.
59. The panel noted that, in her reflective piece, Ms Hare accepted that her conduct fell below the standards expected of a registered social worker. She accepted she breached Standards 1,2,3,4,5, and 6 and she explained how, in her understanding she, breached each standard. She explored the decisions she made, what she should have

done differently and how she will ensure that the concerns are not repeated in the future. She provided a detailed summary of the incident that led to these concerns.

60. In relation in what she should have done differently, the panel noted the following statements by Ms Hare:

- *I should have spoken with management immediately, especially once I knew the case was being transferred.*
- *I should never have used my personal phone, even with good intentions.*
- *I needed to recognise my own emotional over-investment and step back sooner.*
- *I should have used supervision as a space to explore my uncertainty, discomfort, and the boundaries I was struggling with.*
- *I should have followed financial procedures and requested funding through the correct channels.*
- *I should have respected the handover process and supported the new social worker to take the lead.*
- *I needed to be more aware of the power imbalance between myself, as a team manager, and the social worker receiving the case—and how that could feel silencing.'*

61. In relation in how she will prevent repetition, Ms Hare stated the following:

'At the time of writing this, I am not practising as a social worker. I made the decision to step away in order to understand how and why I made the choices I did and why I didn't speak up when I knew I was out of my depth. I'm currently [PRIVATE] exploring my relationship to boundaries, emotional responsibility, and why I found it so difficult to ask for help at the time.....If I do return to practice in future, there are clear changes I would make:

- *I would use supervision properly, not just to give updates, but to reflect when things feel emotionally charged or unclear.*
- *I would establish clear, professional boundaries from day one—making sure I am not contactable outside of hours, and never using personal equipment.*
- *I would bring emotional concerns to supervision, even if they feel uncomfortable.*
- *I would ensure that records are up to date, clear, and accessible for all professionals involved.*

- *I would respect the need to step back, even if the young person prefers continuity.*

Being liked is not the same as being safe or appropriate. I've also been reflecting on professional identity and how to maintain it in complex cases. I've kept a learning journal to track how I might handle things differently in future, and I no longer see this experience purely as failure—but as a red flag that needed attention. I'm doing that work now, with greater self-awareness and humility.'

62. She concluded by saying:

'I have taken the time to critically and sincerely reflect on my conduct, the boundary crossings that occurred, and the impact of not seeking help or using supervision when I most needed it. While my intentions were to protect, I now see clearly how those actions caused more risk, not less. Stepping away from practice has given me the space to look at what happened without defensiveness, and with a deeper understanding of the pressures I was under—and the ways my thinking was shaped by emotional overwhelm, a strong sense of responsibility, and unprocessed stress. Through therapy and honest reflection, I've come to see where things went wrong both in my actions and my decision-making. I take full responsibility for what occurred and for the consequences that followed. If I return to practice in the future, it will be with clearer boundaries, a renewed relationship to supervision, and a greater awareness of how to manage my own responses in complex, high-stakes situations.'

63. The panel was satisfied that Ms Hare has demonstrated good insight into her misconduct. She has accepted full responsibility for her misconduct. She has clearly identified how her conduct breached professional standards and what she could and should have done differently on the occasion that led to the regulatory concern on both a professional and a person level. It noted that she has maintained a log of her learning journey and [PRIVATE]. It accepted her written submission of December 2025 that she has:

- *Maintained consistent communication with Social Work England*
- *Confirmed that I am not working in a social work role at present*
- *Completed the reflective statement required under Condition 11*
- *Undertaken [PRIVATE] structured reflection on boundaries*
- *[PRIVATE]*

64. The panel was of the view that Ms Hare's insight, including her understanding of how she will prevent repetition, significantly reduces the risk of Ms Hare repeating this behaviour.

65. The panel carefully considered whether, in the absence of a period of social work practice under conditions of practice, it could safely conclude that Ms Hare was no longer at unwarranted risk of repeating the misconduct. It carefully considered Condition 9 of the existing conditions of practice which would require Ms Hare to work with a reporter on a personal development plan. The panel concluded that through the reflection she has undertaken and the work that she has done, including work with a health professional, she has already done the work contemplated by Condition 9 which states:

9. You must work with your reporter to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:

- *An understanding of professional boundaries in social work and the importance of maintaining professional boundaries.*
- *The impact on service users of not maintaining professional boundaries, focussing on children and young people and how this can increase risk.*
- *An understanding of why policy and procedures are in place and the importance of being familiar with and adhering to policy and procedures.*

66. The panel was further of the view that it could properly take into account Ms Hare's social work practice both before and since the events giving rise to the regulatory concern when assessing whether now, with the benefit of insight, she was likely to repeat her conduct. The panel took into account that following these events, Ms Hare had worked for approximately one year at Oldham in a registered social work role and no concerns were raised during that period. Ms Hare stated that during this employment she had reflected on her actions with her manager at Oldham during supervision. Ms Panesar-Stringer confirmed her understanding that Social Work England had contacted Oldham directly in the course of its investigation. Further Ms Hare was employed at Calderdale for 14 yrs with no concerns considered.

67. The panel considered that Ms Hare had, in effect, already been tested while at Oldham and that a further period of testing to consolidate her learning and put it into practice was not required.

68. The panel reminded itself that the case examiners had considered that Ms Hare had not developed full insight or completed remediation at the time of the agreed accepted disposal. However with the new reflections and written submissions, the panel concluded that Ms Hare has now gained insight and remediated the misconduct. Ms

Hare has chosen to step away from social work for a period of time to work on her health and carefully reflect on what occurred at the material time which she believes would strengthen her social work practice in the future. The panel concluded that the risk of repetition is low and that Ms Hare's fitness to practise is not currently impaired on the personal element.

69. The panel carefully considered whether a finding of current impairment was required on the public element. The panel sought legal advice as to whether it had the power to give a warning in circumstances where it had determined that Ms Hare's fitness to practise is no longer impaired but was advised that it did not. Notwithstanding this, the panel concluded that the public element had been satisfied by the case examiners original order and that, in circumstances where the panel has found that Mr Hare's fitness to practise is no longer impaired on the personal element, there is no requirement for a finding of impairment on the public element. Ms Hare has made a strong commitment to uphold the standards and reputation of the profession should she return to social work in the future.

70. The panel has, therefore, concluded that Ms Hare's fitness to practise is no longer impaired and has determined to allow the existing conditions of practice order to lapse.

The Professional Standards Authority

71. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a review decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners>