

Social worker: Jacqueline  
Edmonds  
Registration number: SW109773  
Fitness to Practise  
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of hearing: 15 January 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:  
Conditions of practice order (expiring 26 February 2026)

Hearing outcome:  
Revoke the conditions of practice order with immediate effect

## Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final conditions of practice order originally imposed on 27 August 2024 for a period of 18 months by way of an accepted disposal between Ms Edmonds and Social Work England. At an early review of the order, on 16 December 2024, the conditions of practice order was varied and continued by a panel of adjudicators.
2. Ms Edmonds did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Narayani Panesar-Stringer, case presenter.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review ( “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Karen McArthur	Chair
Jacqui Smith	Social worker adjudicator

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

## Service of notice:

5. The panel was informed by Ms Panesar-Stringer that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Edmonds by email to an address provided by her (namely her registered address as it appears on the Social Work England Register) and that this had been done more than 28 calendar days in advance of today’s hearing. 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 and supplementary bundle, as follows:
  - An extract from the Social Work England Register (the “Register”) as of 11 December 2025 showing the email address for Ms Edmonds which is held by Social Work England.
  - A copy of the notice of review (the “Notice”) dated 11 December 2025 and addressed to Ms Edmonds at the email address held by Social Work England. The Notice sets out the outcome which Social Work England is seeking, namely that if the panel considers there is sufficient evidence of insight and remediation, it should revoke the existing order; and if it considers that a risk of repetition remains, it should extend the existing conditions of practice order for a

further period of 8 months. The Notice informs Ms Edmonds 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 Edmonds 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 Edmonds 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 Edmonds 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 Edmonds in accordance with the Rules in that:
- The Notice was served on Ms Edmonds 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 Edmonds 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 Edmonds 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 Edmonds. 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 Edmonds' absence. She submitted that the Notice had been duly served and that Ms Edmonds had been made aware of the hearing but had chosen not to attend. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that no application for an adjournment had been made by Ms Edmonds and that there was no good reason for today's proceedings to be adjourned. 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 Edmonds' 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 was satisfied that Ms Edmonds knew or had the means of knowing when and where today's hearing was to take place. She has not requested an adjournment of the hearing and the panel concluded that no purpose would be served by an adjournment. The panel was satisfied that she had deliberately and voluntarily absented herself from today's proceedings. Having weighed the interests of Ms Edmonds 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 Edmonds.

### Preliminary matters:

13. Ms Panesar-Stringer made an application for parts of the hearing to be held in private under Rules 37 and 38 of Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) ("the FtP Rules"). She said that, in the course of her submissions, she would be making reference to Ms Edmonds' health and that she would indicate when she was about to do so to allow the hearing to go into private session.
14. The panel reminded itself that the starting point is that under Rule 37 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 Edmonds' health would be held in private and that a public and private determination would be produced.

## Review of the current order:

15. 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).
16. The purpose of this review is to review the current conditions of practice order which was imposed on 27 August 2024 and varied and continued on 16 December 2024. The order is currently due to expire on 26 February 2026.
17. The conditions of practice which are currently in place are as follows:

*Condition 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.*

*Condition 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.*

*Condition 3.*

*a) 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.*

*Condition 4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 6 months and at least 14 days prior to any review.*

*Condition 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.*

*Condition 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.*

*Condition 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.*

*Condition 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].*

*Condition 9. [PRIVATE]*

*Condition 10. [PRIVATE]*

*Condition 11. [PRIVATE].*

*Condition 12. You must provide, by 1 May 2025, a reflective piece detailing your understanding of the impact of your behaviour that led to the caution on public confidence in social workers and the reputation of the profession.*

*Condition 13. 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 12, 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 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.*

*Condition 14. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the following conditions to any person requesting information about your registration status: 1 to 8, 12 and 13.*

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

18. Ms Edmonds has been employed by Wigan Council (“the Council”) since 21 November 2016. She referred herself to Social Work England on 17 October 2022 following her acceptance of a conditional police caution on 30 August 2022 for two offences of common assault and an offence of entering an aircraft whilst drunk.

19. It was alleged that Ms Edmonds entered an aircraft whilst drunk at Manchester airport and when efforts were made to remove her, she lashed out and struck a member of the air crew. It was further alleged that she assaulted a custody officer at the police station.
20. In police interview she stated that she had little recollection of events. She was apologetic. Thereafter, however, she denied the allegations within submissions to Social Work England.
21. The regulatory concerns that were subject to the final order, are as follows:

*“Whilst registered as a social worker:*

1. *On the 30 August 2022 you accepted a conditional police caution for:*

- a. An offence of entering an aircraft drunk*
- b. Two offences of common assault.*

2. *[PRIVATE].*

*The matters outlined in regulatory concern 1 amount to the statutory ground of conviction or caution.*

*[PRIVATE].*

*Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your conviction or caution and/or [PRIVATE].”*

### Case Examiners determinations on 27 August 2024:

22. The case examiners concluded that there was a realistic prospect of Regulatory Concerns 1 and 2 being found proven by the adjudicators. They further found that there was a realistic prospect of Regulatory Concern 1 being found to amount to the statutory ground of conviction or caution in the UK for a criminal offence, and that there was a realistic prospect of Regulatory Concern 2 being found to amount to the statutory ground of adverse physical or mental health. The case examiners determined that in respect of both regulatory concerns, there was a realistic prospect of the adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise was currently impaired. The case examiners did not consider it in the public interest for the matter to be referred to a final hearing and determined that the case could be concluded by way of an accepted disposal.
23. In reaching its decision on impairment, the case examiners found that Ms Edmonds' behaviour, which had resulted in the regulatory concerns, could be remediated by demonstrating reflection and insight and by taking steps to address the underlying issues. They noted that, whilst Ms Edmonds had accepted responsibility to the police, she had denied the allegations to Social Work England. [PRIVATE]. The case examiners therefore concluded:

*“...there is little evidence of insight and proper, meaningful reflection. The social worker’s submissions appear supercritical, lack consistency and are not supported by verifiable evidence. [PRIVATE]. Given the absence of full insight and remediation, the case examiners are of the view that the risk of repetition is high”.*

24. The case examiners further considered that well-informed members of the public would be concerned if a finding of impairment were not made.

25. In considering appropriate sanction, the Case Examiners decided that the most appropriate sanction would be:

*“...a conditions of practice order and decided this would provide a supportive framework within which the social worker could continue to practice. A conditions of practice order would provide oversight and monitoring, thus reducing the risk to the public. As the social worker is currently employed and appears to have a supportive employer, a conditions of practice order would seem to be workable and proportionate and would enable the social worker to work towards evidencing remediation.”*

26. An 18-month order was considered appropriate as it would allow Ms Edmonds sufficient opportunity to develop full insight and to demonstrate remediation, as well as [PRIVATE].

27. Ms Edmonds responded to the proposed disposal, which included the proposed conditions of practice, on 20 August 2024. In that response she stated:

*“I have read the case examiner decision and the accepted disposal guide. I admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that my fitness to practise is impaired. I understand the terms of the proposed disposal of my fitness to practise case and accept them in full”.*

28. The accepted disposal of an 18-month conditions of practice order was confirmed on 27 August 2024.

### **Determinations of the previous final order review panel on 16 December 2024:**

29. An early review of the original conditions of practice order was held on 16 December 2024 as a result of new evidence having become available after the making of the original order. The new evidence was that Ms Edmonds, having agreed to the conditions of practice order, now said that she was unwilling or unable to comply with some of the conditions.

30. [PRIVATE].

31. At the early review hearing, Social Work England invited the panel to replace the conditions of practice order with a suspension order on the basis that a more restrictive



sanction was now required due to Ms Edmonds' lack of insight, remediation, or reflection.

32. Ms Edmonds gave oral evidence at the early review hearing. She said that:

- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].

33. Ms Edmonds said that she did not accept that her fitness to practise remained impaired. She accepted that the caution she had received could impact upon public confidence in the social work profession and that her fitness to practise may have been impaired at that time due to [PRIVATE]. She expressed remorse. [PRIVATE].

34. Ms Edmonds stated that given the lapse of time, and the fact that the incident was isolated, it could not properly be said that there was a risk of repetition. She said that she had practised in social work since that incident without regulatory concerns save for the one complaint in October 2024. She had started to undertake AMHP practice educator work and emergency duty work.

35. She stated that, when the conditions were imposed, she did not understand that they were conditions. She believed that she was set up to fail and felt “entrapped” by them.

36. The early review panel also heard from Mark Shorrocks, principal social worker and mental health lead at the Council. He was previously Ms Edmonds' line manager and knew her practice well, having worked with her for 5-6 years and being her direct line manager for up to four years. He stated that he had never had any concerns about her practice and [PRIVATE]. He said that she was dedicated, committed and knowledgeable, particularly in relation to legislation. She was a core member of the small hospital social work team and the AMHP service.

37. The early review panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

*“The burden is upon Ms Edmonds to provide evidence and information to show development of insight and remediation and she has not done so sufficiently. She has been inconsistent as to whether she accepts the wrongdoing that she previously admitted to the police, when accepting the caution, and to Social Work England, when accepting the Case Examiners' decision. Her argument that she did not understand what she was agreeing to when she accepted the conditions is surprising given that she is an educated professional who, in her*

*work as a social worker, will be adept at reading and understanding documents and the consequences of her actions. The panel noted that thereafter she has been provided support by Social Work England, as evidenced by the substantial communication between herself and the case review officer. She has continued to engage with her regulator throughout.*

*The early review is necessary because Ms Edmonds has expressed that she had not been able to comply with all of the conditions of practice order, despite having agreed to that disposal. [PRIVATE]. She has stated that the conditions breach her human rights and has expressed limited understanding of how her actions have impacted upon the reputation of the social work profession or [PRIVATE]. However, the panel did note that in her oral evidence she expressed a willingness to adhere with conditions and an understanding that the circumstances of the caution will have undermined public confidence in the social work profession.*

*Further, in light of the lack of evidence of developing insight and remediation, together with Ms Edmonds' lack of willingness to adequately comply with the conditions, the panel concluded that members of the public would be concerned if her fitness to practise was not found to be impaired and that such a finding would undermine public confidence in the profession. Such a finding would similarly fail to uphold professional standards.*

*In reaching those decisions, the panel reminded itself that Mr Shorrocks, who knows Ms Edmonds' practise and who is extremely supportive of her skills as a social worker, agrees that her fitness to practise remains impaired until she addresses the issues outlined by the Case Examiners."*

38. Having found Ms Edmonds' fitness to practise was impaired, the early review panel then considered what sanction to impose. Having considered the less serious sanctions, it went on to consider whether conditions of practice would be appropriate and proportionate. It determined that the existing conditions of practice order should remain in place but that it should be varied to take account of the difficulties which Ms Edmonds had experienced [PRIVATE]. [PRIVATE].

39. In reaching its decision on sanction, the early review panel stated:

*Whilst there has been a failure by Ms Edmonds to demonstrate developed insight, she has expressed a degree of regret and remorse and acknowledged that the caution was such that would have undermined public trust in the social work profession. The panel has identified the potential in Ms Edmonds to develop the level of insight and to reflect upon the regulatory concerns.*

*Further, and materially, the panel noted that Ms Edmonds has no history of regulatory concerns, either before or after the police caution. Her practice has been praised by Mr Shorrocks who has no concerns about her ability as a social*

*worker. Since the index incident, she has progressed in her career which includes working as an AMHP practice educator. She has demonstrated a commitment towards her social work practice which is consistent with Mr Shorrock’s evidence that she is a “dedicated, committed and knowledgeable” social worker. The panel found his evidence to be particularly balanced and helpful.*

*For those reasons, the panel was satisfied that conditions of practice would be appropriate and proportionate to protect the public and wider public interest, whilst also ensuring that Ms Edmonds can continue to service the public and utilise her skills and benefit for the good of service users.*

*The panel concluded that the suspension order sought by Social Work England would be disproportionate in these circumstances where:*

- i. [PRIVATE];*
- ii. [PRIVATE];*
- iii. [PRIVATE];*
- iv. [PRIVATE]*
- v. [PRIVATE].*
- vi. [PRIVATE].*

40. The conditions of practice imposed by the early review panel are set out earlier within this decision and are due to expire on 26 February 2026.

41. The early review panel reminded Ms Edmonds that on a future review, the burden would be on her to show that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired and that, if she failed to comply with the conditions, it was *“highly unlikely that her fitness to practise will be considered to be anything other than impaired”*.

### **Social Work England submissions:**

42. Within the notice of hearing dated 11 December 2025, Social Work England set out its written submissions for the current review and provided information about matters since the date of the previous review hearing. Following receipt of further information from Ms Edmonds after serving the notice of hearing, Social Work England considered its position and provided the following updated written submissions for today’s hearing, which were sent to Ms Edmonds by email on 7 January 2026:

*“At the time of sending the notice of hearing to the Social Worker [PRIVATE] and employer reports were outstanding. Two reports from the employer and a letter from [PRIVATE] have now been received. Since the early review the Social Worker has remained in employment with Wigan Council and has engaged with the amended conditions. She has complied with the [PRIVATE] arranged by*

*Social Work England, has submitted the required reflective piece (albeit slightly outside the original timescale), and has notified Social Work England of a subsequent service-user complaint in October 2025.*

[PRIVATE].

*[PRIVATE]. The recent reports from the employer do suggest that the Social Worker has had some issues with her conduct at work regarding interaction with other professionals, but there is limited further information regarding this at present. There is an ongoing internal disciplinary investigation relating to this that commenced on 24 November 2025. [PRIVATE].*

*Social Work England were not made aware of this disciplinary investigation until notified by the Social Worker's employer on 15 December 2025. The Social Worker should, in accordance with condition 5, have notified her Case Review Officer by 1 December 2025. No explanation has yet been received for the failure to notify, although it is noted that [PRIVATE].*

*Social Work England invite the Panel to review all the new information and to consider if the Social Worker has fully remediated the conduct for which her fitness to practise was initially found to be impaired. If satisfied that conditions are no longer required to manage the risk to the public as a result of [PRIVATE] and there is no risk of further criminal offending, they are invited to consider revoking the Order. A finding of current impairment should only be made if the conduct under review has not been fully remediated.*

*Any concerns regarding wider health or professional conduct are not matters for consideration at the Final Order Review. If the outcome of the current disciplinary investigation results in further concerns that require regulatory intervention, the employer will be invited to refer those matters to Social Work England's triage team.*

*The Panel should only extend or vary the Order if satisfied there remains a risk of repetition of the original conduct or [PRIVATE].*

43. In oral submissions, Ms Panesar-Stringer outlined the background to today's hearing. She invited the panel to review all the new information and to determine whether Ms Edmonds has fully remediated the conduct leading to the previous finding that her fitness to practise was impaired. She reminded the panel that, at a review hearing, Ms Edmonds carries the persuasive burden of satisfying the panel that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.
44. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that, if the panel is satisfied that the conditions of practice order is no longer required to manage the risk to the public due to Ms Edmond's [PRIVATE] and if there is no longer a risk of further criminal offending, it should consider revoking the existing order. She submitted that a finding of current

impairment should only be made if there remains a risk of repetition of the criminal conduct or an unmanaged health concern.

45. Ms Panesar-Stringer referred to panel to the case of *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581.

She said that the panel should consider whether Ms Edmonds' conduct is easily remediable, whether it has been remediated and whether it is highly unlikely to be repeated.

46. Ms Panesar-Stringer addressed the panel on the personal component of impairment.

She submitted that [PRIVATE] and the behavioural consequences flowing from it, was inherently remediable. She said that this position was reflected in the original sanction where the case examiners expressly concluded that the concerns were capable of being addressed through insight, engagement and treatment. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that it was important for the panel to remember that the regulatory concerns, although serious, arose in the narrow context of [PRIVATE] outside the workplace.

47. Ms Panesar-Stringer noted that Social Work England had received a letter from

[PRIVATE] dated 19 November 2025, as required under the conditions of practice order. Two reports from her employer have also been received. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that, since the last review of the order:

- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].

48. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that the position was now quite different to when the matter was considered by the cases examiners and the previous review panel. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that Ms Edmonds had previously denied [PRIVATE].

49. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that while there is evidence that Ms Edmonds has [PRIVATE].

50. Ms Panesar-Stringer reminded the panel that there had, however, been breaches by Ms Edmonds of Condition 5 and Condition 6 of her conditions of practice:

- Condition 5 requires Ms Edmonds to inform Social Work England within seven days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against her.

Ms Edmonds' employer had reported that she is currently subject to an internal disciplinary investigation which commenced on the 24 November 2025 which Ms Edmonds had not reported.

- Condition 6 requires Ms Edmonds to inform Social Work England within seven days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against her. Her employer stated that a complaint had been made on 21 October 2025. Ms Edmonds did not report the complaint to Social Work England.

51. Ms Panesar-Stringer told the panel that Ms Edmonds has provided no response as to why she did not inform Social Work England about these matters in line with her conditions of practice order. She said that Social Work England had received evidence that morning from Ms Crompton, the advanced practitioner in Ms Edmonds team managing the complaint, to the effect that it had been dealt with informally and that no further action was required. A learning point for the wider adult social care team and health trust had been identified from the complaint in relation to information sharing.

52. Ms Panesar-Stringer went on to address the panel on the public component of impairment and whether a current finding of impairment is required to maintain confidence in the profession and to uphold proper standards of conduct. She submitted that a well-informed member of the public would expect that restrictions on a social worker's practice would end when any concerns had been remedied. She submitted that any concerns about Ms Edmonds' wider health or professional conduct were not matters for consideration by this panel. If the outcome of the current disciplinary investigation concerning Ms Edmonds results in further concerns that require regulatory intervention, the employer will be invited to refer those matters to Social Work England's triage team for further investigation.

53. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted in closing that the panel should only extend or vary the existing order if it is satisfied that there remains a risk of repetition of the original conduct or if satisfied that there is an [PRIVATE]. If the panel did not find current impairment, it should revoke the existing order.

54. Ms Panesar-Stringer said that if the panel finds current impairment, it should have regard to Social Work England's 'Guidance on impairment and sanction' and consider the available sanctions in ascending order starting with the least restrictive sanction. She submitted that if current impairment were found, it must be impairment related to the original basis for the order which is that Ms Edmonds has an [PRIVATE] leading to criminal conduct. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that, in those circumstances, a conditions of practice order would be the least restrictive and proportionate sanction. It would allow continued monitoring without removing Ms Edmonds from practice and would be consistent with the original regulatory objective of supporting safe remediation. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that there was unlikely to be a basis for a

more restrictive sanction as there was no evidence of repetition of the original conduct leading to the caution.

55. Ms Panesar-Stringer submitted that the panel must consider based on the original facts and grounds of impairment whether Ms Edmonds' fitness to practise remains impaired such that ongoing restrictions on her practice are required. She said that if the panel is satisfied today that conditions of practice are no longer required to manage the risk to public as a result of alcohol misuse and there is no risk of further criminal offending it is invited to consider revoking the order.

### Social worker submissions:

56. Ms Edmonds did not attend the hearing to make oral submissions; nor did she provide written submissions for the purposes of today's hearing.

### Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

57. 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 decisions of the case examiners and the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' and its 'Guidance on health concerns'.

58. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the case examiners and the previous review panel, and the new documentation provided for this hearing, which included but was not limited to:

- Correspondence and telephone attendance notes of calls between Ms Edmonds and Social Work England since the date of the last review hearing;
- Correspondence between Ms Edmonds' employer and Social Work England since the date of the last review hearing;
- Reports from Ms Edmonds workplace supervisor, the most recent being dated 31 December 2025;
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].
- A written reflective piece by Ms Edmonds submitted on 17 May 2025.

59. The panel took account of the submissions made by Ms Panesar-Stringer on behalf of Social Work England.



60. Ms Edmonds did not provide written submissions for the purposes of this review. However, the panel had careful regard to submissions she has made at earlier stages of this review. It also took into account the submission made by her workplace reporter in their report of 31 December 2025, that:

*“In my opinion, Jacqueline is generally fit to practice as her practice is noted as good. She was practising on a limited basis due to the internal disciplinary investigation and current mental health.*

*Jacqueline has demonstrated some insight in relation to the issues leading to the fitness to practice case. Jacqueline has complied with all the conditions relating to the fitness to practice concern. [PRIVATE]. I would recommend that these conditions are ended at the review in January 2026.”*

61. The panel reminded itself that at the time of the previous review of the order in December 2024, Ms Edmonds’ workplace supervisor had agreed that her fitness to practise would remain impaired until she addressed the issues outlined by the case examiners in their original decision.
62. 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.
63. The legal adviser reminded the panel that the decision on impairment was a matter for the panel’s judgement alone. There is no burden or standard of proof, although in practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the social worker at a review hearing to demonstrate that they are now fit to resume unrestricted practice.
64. The legal adviser advised that having an adverse health condition does not necessarily mean that a social worker’s fitness to practise is impaired by reason of it. The key question for the panel was whether Ms Edmonds presents a risk to public safety.
65. The panel was advised that, in identifying whether there is a risk, the panel should look at the nature of her health condition including whether the condition is a continuing or episodic condition, or one that, although currently in remission, may relapse.
66. The panel was advised that it could properly conclude that she posed no risk to public safety if it is satisfied that:
- she has full insight into her health condition
  - she is engaging and complying with recommended treatment programmes
  - she has strategies to manage her condition



- and she is limiting her practising appropriately or stopping practising completely when unwell.

67. The legal adviser reminded the panel that it must have in mind Social Work England's statutory overarching objective to protect the public, when exercising its function at every stage of proceedings. The Panel must consider not only the need to protect and promote the health, safety and wellbeing of the public, but it must also determine whether the need to promote and maintain public confidence in social workers and to promote and maintain proper professional standards for social workers would be undermined if a finding of current impairment were not made.

68. The panel first considered the evidence about Ms Edmonds' health condition. It was of the view that the conduct which had led to her acceptance of a conditional police caution was [PRIVATE]. The panel took into account Ms Edmonds' evidence, as set out in her written reflection provided for this review, that the incident [PRIVATE]. [PRIVATE].

69. [PRIVATE].

70. The panel was satisfied that, at the time of the events which led to the police caution, there was sufficient evidence to support the case examiners' conclusion that she had an unmanaged health condition.

71. [PRIVATE].

72. [PRIVATE].

73. The panel considered that Ms Edmonds' insight has developed significantly since the time of the previous review. She has taken clear steps to manage her health effectively and to develop alternative coping strategies to [PRIVATE]. She has complied with [PRIVATE] arranged by Social Work England in circumstances where she was previously unwilling to do so. She is engaging with her GP and [PRIVATE]. [PRIVATE]. She has been able to do this while practising as a social worker, albeit that she has had [PRIVATE]. The panel further noted that she has the support of her employer.

74. There has been no evidence of further criminal conduct, [PRIVATE]. The panel concluded that the risks associated with Ms Edmonds' health condition, including [PRIVATE], are now sufficiently low that a finding of impairment on the personal element of the test is not required.

75. The panel noted the information which had been provided about a complaint about Ms Edmonds' practice in October 2025, which has been informally resolved, and the ongoing disciplinary hearing being conducted by her employer. It reminded itself that these are not matters which were relevant to its consideration as to whether Ms Edmonds' fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her caution or adverse health condition. It was troubled that Ms Edmonds had not seen fit to disclose the

matters to Social Work England, as required under Conditions 5 and 6 of the conditions of practice order, but did not consider that this otherwise changed its view that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired on the personal element.

76. The panel went on to consider whether the need to promote and maintain public confidence in social workers and to promote and maintain proper professional standards for social workers would be undermined if a finding of current impairment were not made. The panel reminded itself of Ms Panesar-Stringer's submission that if the panel were satisfied that there is no longer personal impairment, then the public element would be satisfied in that the public could have confidence in the profession on the basis that Ms Edmonds had remedied the concerns related to her health and no longer presented a risk. The regulator would, therefore, be seen to be upholding proper professional standards and maintaining public confidence in the profession. The panel agreed with that submission and determined that a finding of impairment on the public element is not required.
77. Accordingly, the panel finds that Ms Edmonds fitness to practise is not currently impaired, having regard to both the personal and public elements of impairment.

### Decision and reasons:

78. Having found that Ms Edmonds's fitness to practise is no longer impaired, the panel determined to take no further action in relation to her registration. The panel next considered whether to revoke the existing order with immediate effect or whether to allow it to lapse on its expiry on 26 February 2026. Consistent with its finding that Ms Edmonds' fitness to practise is no longer impaired, the panel determined to revoke the current conditions of practice order with immediate effect.

### The Professional Standards Authority

79. 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>.