



Social worker: Isabella
Armentieres Godfrey
Registration number: SW53040
Fitness to Practise
Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: Monday 02 March 2026 to Friday 06 March 2026

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 Godfrey did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Louise Culleton case presenter from Capsticks LLP.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this hearing (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Nigel Westwood	Chair
Glenys Ozanne-Turk	Social worker adjudicator
Yvonne Walsh	Lay adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Kathryn Tinsley	Hearings officer
Chiugo Eze	Hearings support officer
Helen Gower	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel was informed by Ms Culleton that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Godfrey by email and Royal Mail’s next day Special Delivery service to an address provided by the social worker (namely their registered address as it appears on the Social Work England register). Ms Godfrey submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
6. The panel had careful regard to the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final hearing dated 26 January 2026 and addressed to Ms Godfrey at her postal and email address which she provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register detailing Ms Godfrey’s registered address as it has been recorded therein without amendment since 1 August 2012 to date;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 26 January 2026 the writer sent the notice of hearing and requisite documents, including Social Work England’s statement of case, by email to Ms Godfrey at her email address referred to above, and instructed an agent to send the same documents by next day Special Delivery to Ms Godfrey at her postal address referred to above;

7. The panel noted that the Royal Mail Track and Trace Document indicated that the item was “returned to sender” on 28 January 2026. However, there is no requirement for Social Work England to prove that Ms Godfrey has received the notice, which was sent to her registered postal address as required. The information before the panel indicated that Ms Godfrey had received the notification of the hearing sent by email.
8. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
9. 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 Godfrey in accordance with Rules 14, 15, 44 and 45 of Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (“the Rules”).

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

10. The panel heard the submissions of Ms Culleton on behalf of Social Work England. Ms Culleton submitted that notice of this hearing had been duly served. She referred the panel to emails from Ms Godfrey to Social Work England dated 13 February 2026 and 25 February 2026. Within these emails Ms Godfrey stated that she will not be attending the hearing for a number of reasons. Ms Culleton submitted that although Ms Godfrey referred within her email to difficulties with her computer, she has continued to be active on social media (Twitter/X) and to respond by email to Social Work England. Ms Culleton submitted that the technical issues would not have prevented Ms Godfrey from attending the hearing, using her phone if necessary, and that members of the hearings team had offered to assist Ms Godfrey by dialling her into the hearing by phone. Ms Culleton submitted that Ms Godfrey has voluntarily absented herself. Although Ms Godfrey engaged with Social Work England in 2022 and provided written responses at that stage, in recent months she has not complied with case management directions dated 23 October 2025 which required, amongst other things, that Ms Godfrey complete a Response Form by 15 December 2025.
11. Ms Culleton referred to an email from the hearings support officer dated 26 February 2026 which advised Ms Godfrey that she may wish to apply for a postponement of the hearing. Ms Culleton submitted that no application for an adjournment had been made by Ms Godfrey and that no purpose would be served by an adjournment.
12. Ms Culleton further submitted that any disadvantage to Ms Godfrey is of her own making and that she has been given every opportunity to attend the hearing. Ms Culleton noted that Ms Godfrey refers to her age, the length of time the proceedings have been ongoing and her retirement. Ms Culleton submitted that it is in the public interest for the matter to conclude in the interests of justice.
13. 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 guidance ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’.

14. The panel considered all of the information before it, together with the submissions made by Ms Culleton on behalf of Social Work England. The panel considered Ms Godfrey’s email correspondence and was satisfied that she is aware of today’s hearing. The panel found that there were no barriers preventing Ms Godfrey from participating in the hearing if she wished to do so. Any difficulties with her computer had not prevented her sending and receiving emails and accessing the internet to post messages on Twitter/X in the days and weeks leading up to this hearing. Ms Godfrey had not taken up the option of participating in the hearing by telephone. The panel noted that Ms Godfrey alluded to a family matter upon which she is presently focussed, but it had no evidence that this matter would have prevented Ms Godfrey from participating in the hearing. Ms Godfrey has had sufficient notice of the hearing and has chosen not to prioritise it. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Godfrey had chosen voluntarily to absent herself.
15. Ms Godfrey had been informed of the option of making an application for a postponement, but had chosen not to do so. The panel had no reason to believe that a postponement would result in Ms Godfrey’s attendance at a future date.
16. The panel considered carefully the extent of prejudice to Ms Godfrey if it were to proceed in her absence. The panel noted that Ms Godfrey provided written responses to the regulatory concerns on 19 June 2022 and in her email of 13 February 2026 she asked that this panel refer to her 2022 responses, which she submitted “are as pertinent today as they were then”. Furthermore, although it is generally in the interests of Social Workers to attend hearings, in this case the panel found that there would be some benefit to Ms Godfrey if the matter were to be concluded. Ms Godfrey has stated that she has retired and that she has been unable to deregister because of the ongoing proceedings. She has also referred to the length of time the proceedings have been ongoing. Having weighed the interests of Ms Godfrey in regard to their attendance at the hearing with those of Social Work England and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing, the panel decided to proceed in Ms Godfrey’s absence.

Preliminary matters:

17. Ms Culleton made an application to amend paragraph 5 of the Allegation. She submitted that it would be appropriate to add the words “*which was offensive or discriminatory*”. The principle of adding this objective element to the allegation had been addressed at a Case Management Hearing on 13 February 2026 and agreed by that panel, but the amendment to paragraph 5 had been overlooked.
18. Ms Culleton also made an application to amend to the allegation to correct two minor typographical errors.
19. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. She advised that the panel has the discretion to make amendments to the Allegation provided that they do not unfairly

prejudice Ms Godfrey and that they are appropriate. The legal adviser reminded the panel that it also has a responsibility, in accordance with the overarching objective of protecting the public, to ensure that there is no under-charging.

20. The panel decided that it was fair and appropriate to make the amendments proposed by Ms Culleton. It noted that Ms Godfrey had the opportunity to attend the Case Management Hearing and that she had voluntarily absented herself. The proposed amendment to paragraph 5 of the allegation was of the same nature as those which were considered and agreed at the Case Management Hearing. The panel considered that the proposed amendment was necessary to ensure that there was no under-charging and that it was therefore appropriate to allow Social Work England's application to amend the allegation.
21. The panel also agreed to the minor typographical amendments as these did not prejudice Ms Godfrey and they ensured that the Allegation was clear and consistent with the evidence.

Allegations – as amended:

Whilst registered as a Social Worker:

1. Between 19 June 2021 and 24 March 2022, you retweeted on Twitter one or more of the posts identified in Schedule 1, which were offensive and/or racist;
2. Between 21 May 2025 – 16 November 2025, you retweeted on X (formerly Twitter) one or more of the posts identified in Schedule 2, which were offensive and/or racist.
3. Your conduct at Paragraph 1 and/or Paragraph 2 above was racially motivated and/ or intentionally discriminatory;
4. You retweeted a post on Twitter from @Holbornlolz, on an unknown date, which read, "You are here because your dad's not queer. Happy Father's Day.", which was offensive and/or homophobic;
5. You retweeted a post on X from @CherylamCakes dated 7 October 2025, which was offensive and/or discriminatory, which read "If you're not sickened by this then you're the problem! Not sure how much more of this depravity I can deal with! What the hell happened to the world! When did it become so deviant and at what point did humanity accept this as the norm [sad face emoji and crying face emoji]". The post then shares another X user's post showing an image of a couple (trans and/or gay) embracing with

other women and children carrying rainbow flags, with a comment asking – ‘Is this appropriate for a children’s book?’

6. Your conduct in Paragraph 4 and/or Paragraph 5 was intentionally discriminatory and/ or homophobic.

The matters described at Paragraphs 1 - 6 above amount to misconduct.

By reason of your misconduct, your fitness to practise as a social worker is impaired.

Schedule 1

- 1) A tweet from @pimpmytweeting, dated 19 June 2021, which read, “WTF??? HAVE YOU LOST YOUR MINDS?? JEEZ! (Sic)” This is above a link to a news article stating that “Larger than life’ George Floyd statue unveiled in N.J’s largest city.”
- 2) A tweet from @AngelaK34204696, dated 16 October 2021, which read, “Re David Amess: It’s a random, unpredictable and exceptional incident.” This is above images of a variety of mug shots of individuals – many of whom appear to be of black or Asian origin.
- 3) A tweet from UK Justice Forum, dated On 10 November 2021, which read, “One grateful Muslim invader on our beach at Dungeness thanking Allah for his safe arrival into the UK. Soon to get his 4-star hotel, free healthcare, benefits, mobile phone, laptop, and a cash bonus. All the expense of British taxpayers and pensioners.”
- 4) A tweet from @Bluelad676772753, dated 8 January 2022, which read, “A very dangerous pattern, just how many people could put up fight against that boat load, let alone the thousands that are now roaming the streets of Britain.” This is above a photograph of black people on a dinghy at sea, with text that reads: “No women and no children. Just Grown Ass Men. Anyone else noticing a pattern here?”.
- 5) A tweet from Nat’s Hat...Standing with Ukraine, dated 9 January 2022, which read, “#Another One in fact, 29 of the Muslim paedo rapists! WHO WILL SAVE OUR GIRLS?”.
- 6) A tweet from @AnnieCShandbag, dated 27 January 2022, which read, “Why is the UK, a tiny country, already struggling under the weight of illegal immigrants, responsible for evacuating the population of Afghanistan? A population who are not even compatible with our culture? @GBNEWS since when were we responsible for the worlds (sic) problems?”.
- 7) A tweet from @Suse_Susie, dated 19 February 2022, which read, “We have a right to know who’s in there. We have a right to feel safe in our own country.”

This is above an image of a woman wearing a niqab and text which reads: “who is behind the mask? Man? Woman? Terrorist? You don’t know, do you? This is a risk to our security and should be banned in all public places all over the UK. Share if you agree.”

- 8) A tweet from UK Justice Forum, dated 11 March 2022, which read “The jungle migrants sitting along the northern French coast waiting for the weather to settle are aggrieved that real refugee women and children from Ukraine are being allowed into the UK while they aren’t.”
- 9) A tweet from @27476b54549e462, dated 14 March 2022, which read, “Mayor Sadiq – ‘We must teach our kids in Primary Schools about Hate/Crime and Misogyny’ I’LL TELL YOU WHAT! How about you leave our kids to ‘Going on a Bear Hunt’ And focus your shit on Islam. Where Hate/Crime & Mysogyny (sic)_are well & truly...THRIVING.”
- 10) A tweet from UK Justice Forum, dated 15 March 2022, which read, “Spot the Difference? In Ukraine many women take up arms to fight for freedom alongside their menfolk. In Africa the men run off leaving all their women and children to their fate”.
- 11) A tweet from @LittleBoats2020, dated 16 March 2022, which read, “Facts! Illegals are now pouring into Dover in no’s (sic) 6x higher than last year. Sexual attacks & the harassment of kids going to & from school by Muslim men are increasing around hotels. & With 1.2k newly arrived illegals now on the terror watch list many Britons are going to die.”
- 12) A tweet from @TerryToby1, dated 16 March 2022, which read, “OMG WHAT A CROCK OF [poo emoji] STILL COMING BOAT AFTER BOAT. YOU SHOULD BE ASHAMED BORIS? OUTSIDE [HOTELS] SMOKING & ON THEIR M/PHONES. DESIGNER CLOTHES ON PESTERING & STALKING YOUNG ENGLISH GIRLS. WHILE YOUR PENSIONER’S BLOODY FREEZE. WELL DONE [clown emoji]”.
- 13) A tweet from @Warwicktweets, dated 19 March 2022, shared a post which read, “In this country in 15 or 20 years’ time the foreign man will have the whip hand over the white man. 40 years ago, he was referring to “immigrants.” Now we have mass “illegal immigrants,” totally out of control”.
- 14) A tweet from @CDMandBAR, dated 20 March 2022, shared a post which read, “Absolute rubbish, if you can’t read English signs, go back to where you came from”.
- 15) A tweet from @27476b54549e462, dated 23 March 2022, shared a post which read, “Just in case anyone’s still interested. Yesterday 400 more illegals landed on our shores via boats. That’s 2,000 so far this month. That (sic) £5m per day should soon be hitting £6m on housing this ‘Shower of Shite’”.

Schedule 2

- 1) A tweet from RadioGenoa dated 18 June 2025, stating “Mohammed was a pedophile [sic]. Islam is evil, violent, hateful, barbaric and incompatible with freedom.” (Link to video - RadioGenoa on X: ““Mohammed was a pedophile. Islam is evil, violent, hateful, barbaric and incompatible with freedom.” <https://t.co/x3QFJEQhAw>" / X)
- 2) A tweet from RadioGenoa dated 19 June 2025 showing an image of a bearded Asian/non-white man with the words “Islam is the religion of peace! If you don’t agree I will kill you!” and the comment from RadioGenoa being – “Accurate.”
- 3) A tweet from Lewis.B.Rendell Official dated 29 September 2025. The post posts a speech from Shabana Mahmood by Disclose.tv and states the following:

“Shabana Mahmood, the Pakistani-born Home Secretary, stood in Liverpool yesterday and delivered a sermon that would make any self-respecting Englishman’s blood boil.

This daughter of Mirpur, who pledges alliance to the Quran, had the temerity to lecture us – the native heirs of this storied isle – on the virtues of a “generous, open, tolerant” Britain, lest we succumb to the spectre of “ethno-nationalism”.

Not a drop of English blood in her veins, yet she claims this nation as “her country”, presuming to instruct its rightful stewards on how to surrender it further to the global tide of migration. The audacity is staggering – a foreigner, elevated by Labour’s multicultural dogma, scolding us for daring to defend our patrimony.

Her vaunted “persuasion” is nothing but a polished veneer for Labour’s open-borders orthodoxy. [2] She mouths platitudes about ‘securing borders’ and cracking down on smuggling rackets, yet her government’s first act was to torch the Rwanda plan – a proven deterrent to the small-boat invasion.

Her solution? Cosmetic reforms: English tests, clean records, and a bit of community volunteering to earn indefinite leave to remain. [7] As if these bureaucratic checkboxes will transmute unassimilable masses into loyal subjects of the Crown.

It is a risible fiction, designed to mollify the working-class Englishman while the floodgates remain ajar, admitting ever more of her co-religionists and their extended clans.

Mahmood’s invocation of “ethno nationalism” as the great Satan is a deliberate slur against the natural instincts of a people under a siege.

She casts the English desire to preserve their identity, their culture, their very existence as a pathology to be eradicated.

But this isn't some fringe malady – it's the pulse of a nation that has endured invasions, wars, and betrayals to remain England. From the Anglo-Saxon shield walls to the sacrifice at Passchendaele, our forbears didn't spill their blood so that a transient elite could hand our cities to those who neither know or love our ways.

Her 'generosity' is a euphemism for dispossession, stripping native Britons of their jobs, their communities, and their future to appease a borderless utopia that exists only in her cosmopolitan fantasies.

She warns that without her 'fair migration policies, the working class will flock to Reform's 'false promises'. False? The only deceit is her pretence that unending immigration fortifies rather than fractures this nation. It depresses wages, overwhelms public services, and erodes the social cohesion that once made England the envy of the world. Her reforms are a Trojan horse, smuggling in the same old Labour treachery: promising control while delivering capitulation.

Mahmood is not of us. Born to Pakistani parents, steeped in an alien creed, she is a guest who has climbed the greasy pole to lecture the hosts on how to dismantle their home.

England is not her birthright – it is ours, forged by our ancestors' sweat and sacrifice.

Her call for "generosity" is an insult, a demand that we subsidize our own displacement. Enough!

This is our land, our legacy, our future. Let's reclaim it from interlopers like her. #EnglandForTheEnglish".

- 4) A tweet from @mc_lwar dated 9 October 2025 – "The world has enjoyed 0 days since an Islamic wack job killed somebody on behalf of the religion of peace"
- 5) A tweet from @mikeerwydd1968 dated 10 October 2025 stating "So the mayor of Londonistan sadiq Khunt has said that no Westerners should be in charge in gaza, well how's about no Muslims should be in charge in Great Britain"
- 6) A tweet from @VividProwess dated 5 November 2025 with a photo of the twin towers and the post – "24 years after Muslim terrorists turned the skies into weapons and brought the Twin Towers crashing down, New Yorkers handed the keys of this city to a Muslim extremist? How did we get here?"

Admissions:

22. Rule 32c(i)(aa) Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the 'Rules') states:

Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved.

23. There were no admissions by Ms Godfrey and in accordance with Rule 32c(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel went on to determine the disputed facts.

Background:

24. On 28 June 2021, Social Work England received an anonymous referral from a member of the public regarding Ms Godfrey.
25. The complainant stated “Whilst looking her [Ms Godfrey] up I came across the forwarded images.. homophobic.. racist and against immigrants upon a public Twitter page on her account that is free for anyone to view.. with her picture and name”. The complainant attached three examples of these re-tweets to their complaint and directed Social Work England to look at the Ms Godfrey’s Twitter account.
26. Social Work England proceeded to review the Twitter (now rebranded as X) account identified by the complainant and considered that further posts were offensive and appeared to be racist and/or homophobic. The Twitter/X profile identified by the complainant is Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7.
27. In November 2025, prior to finalising and disclosing the case on Ms Godfrey, a review of the identified Twitter/X profile was undertaken to understand if it remained public and active. The time period of May to November 2025 was easily visible on review and within that period a number of further posts were considered to be offensive and racist/discriminatory and/or homophobic as set out in Paragraph 2 of the Allegation. It was noted that the user of Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 posts frequently, often reposting the posts of others but also posting their own material as well as engaging/interacting with others’ posts by commenting on them. The profile has Ms Godfrey’s forename and surname and indicates that the individual using this profile joined in April 2018. When reviewed by the complainant in 2022, the profile had 641 Followers and the account owner was Following 1,014 profiles. When reviewed by Ms Davies on 17-18 November the figures were 657 Followers and Following 890. The Twitter/X account remained active as at 18 November 2025.

Summary of evidence:

i) Social Work England

28. Ms Culleton drew the panel’s attention to relevant documents including the statement of case, the statement bundle, the exhibits bundle, the social worker’s response bundle, and the authorities bundle.
29. Oral evidence was given by the following witnesses:
 - (i) Ms Ferreira, a Legal Manager for Social Work England. She was a member of the Decision Making Group which considers concerns

that have been referred to triage. She reviewed the relevant Twitter/X account and took screenshots of selected content.

- (ii) Mr Taylor, an investigator for Social Work England. As part of his investigation he also took screenshots of various content from the relevant Twitter/X account.
- (iii) Ms Davies, a paralegal at Capsticks. On 17 and 18 November 2025 she reviewed the relevant Twitter/X account and took screenshots of selected material between 1 September and 17 November 2025.

ii) Social worker

30. The panel read the social worker's response bundle. This included Ms Godfrey's observations dated 19 September 2022. The panel also noted the content of Ms Godfrey's email dated 13 February 2026. In these documents Ms Godfrey acknowledged that she shared posts on X (formerly Twitter) and she set out her explanation for doing so.

Finding and reasons on facts:

31. The panel heard submissions from Ms Culleton. She adopted and expanded on the submissions set out within the statement of case. Her submissions included references to the authorities within the authorities bundle.
32. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel was reminded that the burden of proof rested throughout on Social Work England and that the applicable standard of proof was the civil standard, namely the balance of probabilities. The panel was advised that each allegation must be considered separately and that no allegation could be found proved unless, having carefully examined and weighed the evidence, the panel was satisfied that it was more likely than not that the alleged conduct had occurred.
33. The panel was advised to consider all the evidence before it. It was reminded that its findings must be based on the evidence, and not on speculation.
34. The panel was advised that whether the posts are offensive or racist or homophobic is an objective test as confirmed in the case of *PSAv GPhC v Nazim Ali* [2021] EWHC 1692 (Admin). The panel must not look at social worker's subjective intention at this stage, but rather at what the words objectively convey. When considering whether the posts are offensive or racist or homophobic the panel should consider the context and surrounding circumstances. The context includes the nature of tweets where individuals will scroll quickly gaining a fleeting impression of the content. The tweets should be assessed in isolation and taking into account their cumulative impact, in accordance with the guidance in *Stocker v Stocker* [2020] AC 593 which was confirmed

to be applicable in regulatory cases in the case of *Husain v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2025] EWHC 1170 (Admin).

35. The legal adviser also advised on the relevant provisions within the European Convention of Human Rights; Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 10 (freedom of expression). These rights are qualified and may be restricted in accordance with the law for a number of purposes, including the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.
36. In relation to Article 8 it was confirmed in the case of *Diggins v BSB* [2020] EWHC 467 (Admin) that there is no “bright line” between professional and private realms and that interference with private life is justified when it is necessary and proportional, as it was with the case of *Diggins* where the tweets were in the public domain and were racist and offensive.
37. The legal adviser also referred the panel to the detailed discussion in the case of *Husain* on the interrelationship between Article 10 and the regulation of professionals. The legal adviser advised that the heightened protection for political speech is applicable in *Ms Godfrey’s* case. This was also acknowledged by *Ms Culleton* in her submissions. Although political speech attracts higher protection it is not entirely unfettered, as confirmed in *Husain*. For example, it would not extend to gratuitous personal abuse, derogatory racist or sexist language, or grossly offensive posts.
38. In light of the guidance in *Husain* the panel was advised that where a tweet involves a political topic, “offensive” within paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Allegation should be read as incorporating a requirement that the content of the tweet must be seriously offensive, rather than merely offensive.
39. In relation to paragraphs 3 and 6 of the Allegation, which refer to *Ms Godfrey’s* intention, the panel was advised to apply the guidance in *Lambert-Simpson v HCPC* [2023] EWHC 481 (Admin). Conduct will be racially motivated when (i) the act in question ...had a purpose behind it which at least in significant part was referable to race and (ii) the act was done in a way showing hostility or a discriminatory attitude to the relevant racial group. The same approach applied to the consideration of any other form of discrimination, including homophobia. When considering whether it should draw an inference that the conduct was motivated by race or other protected characteristic, the panel should consider any explanation put forward by *Ms Godfrey* and the credibility of her explanation. In the absence of a credible explanation, the panel may infer intention from the words or content of the tweets, for example if the language used is stark.
40. In reaching its decision, the panel carefully considered all the evidence placed before it, including the responses provided by *Ms Godfrey*. The panel applied the civil standard of proof and assessed each allegation separately on its own merits.
41. In this case documentary rather than witness evidence was central to *Social Work England’s* case. Nevertheless, the panel found that all of the witnesses called by *Social*

Work England gave their evidence in a clear and helpful manner, consistent with their witness statement and the documents. While the panel noted that Mr Taylor and Ms Davies' investigations were focussed on identifying social media posts which would support the regulatory concerns, the panel accepted that this was the nature of their role and did not consider that this diminished their credibility. Each witness answered questions carefully and within the bounds of their recollection.

42. The entire Allegation depended on Social Work England proving that Ms Godfrey was responsible for the social media posts connected with the Twitter/X account Isabella Godfrey @isabelladodfre7. The panel therefore considered this issue first. The account was in Ms Godfrey's name, but this, by itself, was insufficient to prove that Ms Godfrey was responsible for the account.
43. There was evidence that the anonymous complainant had identified Ms Godfrey as the individual connected with this account, but it was unclear how the complainant had identified Ms Godfrey, and the panel therefore gave limited weight to this evidence.
44. The panel considered that the more persuasive evidence that Ms Godfrey was responsible for the Twitter/X account was the evidence of her engagement with Social Work England's investigator. This was set out within the documents and the witness evidence of Mr Taylor. Although Ms Godfrey was not directly asked whether Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 was her account, she provided responses in the investigation in which she tacitly accepted that she was responsible for the account. Her responses included a limited acknowledgment that the exhibited re-tweets emanating from Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 were inappropriate and provided an explanation for her behaviour.
45. The panel noted that within Social Work England's investigation Ms Godfrey had many opportunities over a long period of time to state that she was not responsible for the account, but that she did not do so. The panel considered that it was not credible that Ms Godfrey would accept criticism and the attribution of the social media posts to her, if she was not responsible for Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7.
46. The panel was therefore satisfied that Ms Godfrey was responsible for the relevant Twitter/X account.
47. The panel was also satisfied that the material posted by Ms Godfrey on Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 was in the public domain and that those who were aware of her status as a social worker would be able to connect the account with Ms Godfrey. The witnesses confirmed in their oral evidence that Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 could easily be accessed and that there were no privacy settings that limited their access to the social media posts. The documents before the panel included a copy of the front page of Ms Godfrey's Twitter/X account, on which a photograph of her face was visible. Although Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 did not refer to Ms Godfrey's status as a social worker and there was nothing to suggest that the account belongs to a social worker, the public and transparent status of her Twitter/X created a material risk that a person accessing Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 could make the

connection between the owner of that account and Ms Godfrey's profession as a social worker. Any client, ex-client, or colleague who had engaged with Ms Godfrey would be able to carry out a search for her Twitter/X account and connect her with the account by searching for her name and connecting her with Isabella Godfrey @isabellagodfre7 using her photograph.

48. In its deliberations the panel bore in mind that Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) protects Ms Godfrey's right to respect for her private life. Ms Godfrey's social media posts were within her private life. However, for regulated professionals, there are limitations on conduct within private life which damages or jeopardises public confidence in the profession. Where there is conduct which clearly damages public confidence, such as the racist and offensive tweets in the case of Diggins, the interference with private life is necessary and proportionate.
49. In this case, the panel determined that the interference with Ms Godfrey's private life was necessary and proportionate. For the reasons explained below the panel found that most of the social media posts within the Allegation were racist, homophobic, and/or seriously offensive. The public expression of such views is wholly inconsistent with the fundamental tenets and values of the social work profession. The social work profession requires social workers to treat everyone impartially. To command respect social workers must adopt a non-discriminatory approach and demonstrate respect for all service users. The public dissemination of racist and homophobic material is fundamentally contrary to the values of the profession and therefore public confidence in the profession is damaged by such conduct.
50. The panel also bore in mind that Article 10 ECHR protects Ms Godfrey's right to freedom of expression. Ms Godfrey's tweets related to political topics and therefore the heightened protection, as described in Husain applied to them. The panel determined that interference with Ms Godfrey's right to freedom of expression was necessary and proportionate in this case because the social media posts either involved racist or homophobic comments, or were grossly offensive.
51. The panel was satisfied, in the circumstances of this case, that the re-posting of material was not neutral and that it was an endorsement by Ms Godfrey of the content of the social media post. Although Ms Godfrey stated within her 2018 submissions that she was merely indicating her interest in the topics, the panel did not find that her explanation to be credible, as explained in the panel's decision on paragraph 3 of the Allegation.
52. The panel noted that Ms Godfrey was a long-standing and a competent user of Twitter/X, having held the account since 2018. The documents before the panel demonstrated that Ms Godfrey understood how to make comments on any re-tweeted material if she chose to do so. Within the documents there were examples of social media posts where Ms Godfrey had re-tweeted material and added her own comments. The content of the social media posts within the Allegation was contentious or provocative, and Ms Godfrey was disseminating that material to the wider audience of

her followers and other members of the public. The panel determined that the posting of such material without condemning or distancing herself from it strongly indicated her positive endorsement of that contentious/provocative content.

53. The panel noted that Social Work England’s guidance on Standard 5.6 of the Professional Standards Guidance advises social workers that “They should refrain from posting anything that may damage confidence in their work, or the work of the profession. This may include political, religious, or moral beliefs....”.
54. The panel concluded that, objectively, a reasonable person, reviewing Ms Godfrey’s Twitter/X account together with the context, would infer that she endorsed the content.
55. The panel noted that the word “racist” within paragraphs 1 and 2 of the allegation, when read together with Social Work England’s statement of case, includes discrimination against Muslims and the Islamic faith, as well as discrimination on the ground of colour, nationality, and ethnic or national origins.
56. The panel next addressed each social media post individually, while also taking into account their cumulative impact when viewed as a body of posts. For each post the panel applied the objective test, considering the content the post and without taking into account Ms Godfrey’s subjective intention.

- 1. Between 19 June 2021 and 24 March 2022, you retweeted on Twitter one or more of the posts identified in Schedule 1, which were offensive and/or racist. Found proved, with the exception of Schedule 1 – item 13.**

Schedule 1 – Item 1

A tweet from @pimpmytweeting, dated 19 June 2021, which read, “WTF??? HAVE YOU LOST YOUR MINDS?? JEEZ! (Sic)” This is above a link to a news article stating that “Larger than life’ George Floyd statue unveiled in N.J’s largest city.”

57. The panel determined that this post demonstrates hostility towards commemorating a black man, George Floyd, who was murdered by white police officers in America. George Floyd inspired the Black Lives Matter movement and commemorations, such as the statue, are to pay respects to a Black African American who lost his life in reprehensible circumstances. Given the context, it is a post referring to race and it demonstrates hostility towards Black African Americans.
58. Applying the test in *Ali*, considering what the words objectively convey, the panel was satisfied that the post is racist. The post is also seriously offensive because of its discriminatory content.

Schedule 1 – Item 2

A tweet from @AngelaK34204696, dated 16 October 2021, which read, “Re David Amess: It’s a random, unpredictable and exceptional incident.” This is above images of a variety of mug shots of individuals – many of whom appear to be of black or Asian origin.

59. Social Work England submitted as follows:

“Sir David Amess, was a British Conservative Party politician and Member of Parliament for Southend West who was fatally stabbed at a constituency surgery on 15 October 2021, by Ali Arbi Ali. Ali, a British Somali, was an Islamic State sympathiser, and was convicted of murder and the preparation of terrorist acts in April 2022. The implication of the post is that the murder of Sir David Amess, and that level of violence, is something that can be expected from, or attributed to, certain demographics – namely Muslim and/or non-white males. This is therefore significantly referable to race (non-white Males) and clearly demonstrates a discriminatory attitude towards them, therefore fulfilling both elements of the Lambert-Simpson test.

In light of the image, the comment contained in the tweet – “Re David Amess: It’s a random, unpredictable and exceptional incident” appears to be sarcasm, or seeking to be ironic, namely that the images of what appear to be police mugshots from around the country are all of a certain ‘racial profile’ or race in fact demonstrate the opposite – that Amess’ murder, and the perpetrator, was not a random, unpredictable or exceptional incident. The image and comment is thus seeking to link individuals of a certain profile or race to criminality.”

60. The panel determined that when considered in conjunction with other material posted by Ms Godfrey, which was racist, the inferences suggested by Social Work England were reasonable, and that this post links non-white males to criminality.

61. The panel was satisfied that the post is racist. The post is also seriously offensive because of its discriminatory content.

Schedule 1 – Item 3

A tweet from UK Justice Forum, dated On 10 November 2021, which read, “One grateful Muslim invader on our beach at Dungeness thanking Allah for his safe arrival into the UK. Soon to get his 4-star hotel, free healthcare, benefits, mobile phone, laptop, and a cash bonus. All [at the] the expense of British taxpayers and pensioners.”

62. This post refers directly to the individual pictured as being a Muslim and that they are described as an “invader”, implying an act of war, demonstrates hostility and a discriminatory attitude towards that relevant group (Muslims).

63. Further, the post refers to the ‘Muslim invader’ receiving a “4-star hotel, free healthcare, benefits, mobile phone, laptop, and a cash bonus” and that this would be

paid for by the British taxpayer and pensioners. The suggestion that the ‘Muslim invader’ is receiving monetary gains at the cost of British citizens indicates and is also likely to incite a negative and hostile attitude towards immigrants.

64. The post involves the making of offensive assumptions and stereotyping Muslim asylum seekers. The panel considered that the post was both racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 4

A tweet from @Bluelad676772753, dated 8 January 2022, which read, “A very dangerous pattern, just how many people could put up fight against that boat load, let alone the thousands that are now roaming the streets of Britain”. This is above a photograph of black people on a dinghy at sea, with text that reads: “No women and no children. Just Grown Ass Men. Anyone else noticing a pattern here?”.

65. The post (and image) is directly referring to the race of the people shown (namely that they are black) and the fact that they are described as “roaming the streets” (or that it wouldn’t be possible to put up a fight against them) implies that there is a risk associated with having black people on the streets in Britain and entering Britain in the first place. This association of black people with criminality is a stereotypical and discriminatory attitude towards the relevant racial group.
66. The panel determined that the post was both racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 5

A tweet from Nat’s Hat...Standing with Ukraine, dated 9 January 2022, which read, “#Another One in fact, 29 of the Muslim paedo rapists! WHO WILL SAVE OUR GIRLS?”.

67. This post associates Muslims with sexual offences. The reference to “Muslim paedo rapists” emphasises the race of the men charged for child sexual offences and shows hostility and a discriminatory attitude towards the relevant group, namely Muslim men. Furthermore, the use of “our girls” (as opposed to all women) is a further example of “othering”, emphasising the difference between us (“our girls”) and them (Muslim men).
68. The panel determined that this post uses gratuitous language, and is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 6

A tweet from @AnnieCShandbag, dated 27 January 2022, which read, “Why is the UK, a tiny country, already struggling under the weight of illegal immigrants, responsible for evacuating the population of Afghanistan? A population who

are not even compatible with our culture? @GBNEWS since when were we responsible for the worlds (sic) problems?”.

69. This post expresses negative sentiment towards Afghanistan’s citizens. It involves negative stereotyping and makes sweeping statements asserting that the population of Afghanistan is not compatible with the culture in the UK.
70. The panel found that the post was racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 7

A tweet from @Suse_Susie, dated 19 February 2022, which read, “We have a right to know who’s in there. We have a right to feel safe in our own country.” This is above an image of a woman wearing a niqab and text which reads: “who is behind the mask? Man? Woman? Terrorist? You don’t know, do you? This is a risk to our security and should be banned in all public places all over the UK. Share if you agree”

71. The post explicitly associates Muslims, and the wearing of a niqab with terrorism. The association of Muslims and terrorism, along with the implied risk to security and the suggestion that the niqab should be banned is showing hostility and a discriminatory attitude towards a particular group, namely Muslims.
72. The panel was satisfied that the post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 8

A tweet from UK Justice Forum, dated 11 March 2022, shared a post which read, “The jungle migrants sitting along the northern French coast waiting for the weather to settle are aggrieved that real refugee women and children from Ukraine are being allowed into the UK while they aren’t”.

73. The panel considered this post in the context of the other posts which it found to be racist. This post contains a photograph of an individual who appears to be a journalist with a microphone and a black man sitting outside what appears to be a tent. The term “Jungle” in this context is understood to refer to the informal, often makeshift camps, where migrants live, particularly in locations like Calais, France. The post concludes that “jungle migrants” are not “real refugees” like women and children from Ukraine. Given the context of the other posts, it is a reasonable inference that the women and children from Ukraine were perceived to be white, in comparison to the black man who was one of the “jungle migrants”. The post is hostile towards the “jungle migrants” (who are perceived to be black or non-white).
74. The panel concluded that the post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 9

A tweet from @27476b54549e462, dated 14 March 2022, which read, “Mayor Sadiq – ‘We must teach our kids in Primary Schools about Hate/Crime and Misogyny’ I’LL TELL YOU WHAT! How about you leave our kids to ‘Going on a Bear Hunt’ And focus your shit on Islam. Where Hate/Crime & Mysogyny (sic)_are well & truly...THRIVING.”

75. This post explicitly associates Muslims with criminality. The post expressly states that hate/crime and misogyny thrive in the Islamic culture. The association between Islam and criminality (and that generalisation that hate/crime and misogyny are thriving as an inherent part of Islam) demonstrates hostility and a discriminatory attitude towards Muslims.
76. The panel was satisfied that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 10

A tweet from UK Justice Forum, dated 15 March 2022 , which read, “Spot the Difference? In Ukraine many women take up arms to fight for freedom along side their menfolk. In Africa the men run off leaving all their women and children to their fate”.

77. An image under the words in this post shows white women in uniform and with guns contrasted with pictures of black men crowded into boats.
78. The comparison between white women and black men is clearly referring specifically to their race as well as to their sex. The implication that the white Ukrainian women are prepared to fight for freedom, whereas Black African men are cowards and happy to leave their families, is an expression of hostility towards Black African men.
79. The panel found that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 11

A tweet from @LittleBoats2020, dated 16 March 2022, which read, “Facts! Illegals are now pouring into Dover in no’s (sic) 6x higher than last year. Sexual attacks & the harassment of kids going to & from school by Muslim men are increasing around hotels. & With 1.2k newly arrived illegals now on the terror watch list many Britons are going to die”.

80. This post explicitly associates Muslims with criminality, referring to both sexual offences and terrorism. The post clearly refers to the men’s religion and the fact that they are Muslim men. The association of the non-UK nationals, in particular Muslims, with criminality is inflammatory and again demonstrates hostility towards Muslims and immigrants.
81. The panel was satisfied that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 12

A tweet from @TerryToby1, dated 16 March 2022, which read, “OMG WHAT A CROCK OF [poo emoji] STILL COMING BOAT AFTER BOAT. YOU SHOULD BE ASHAMED BORIS? OUTSIDE [HOTELS] SMOKING & ON THEIR M/PHONES. DESIGNER CLOTHES ON PESTERING & STALKING YOUNG ENGLISH GIRLS. WHILE YOUR PENSIONER’S BLOODY FREEZE. WELL DONE [clown emoji]”.

82. The Twitter user making the above statement had shared a post by UK Justice Forum stating “Over 300 illegal immigrants, again mostly men, brought into Dover Harbour today. After a basic check the illegals are bussed out to migrant hotels around the country where they can claim benefits and have free access to all our services. #NotRefugees #Gimmigrants”.
83. The post explicitly associates non-UK nationals with criminality. Although the post does not specifically refer to either race or ethnicity the implication is that the purpose is to refer to the fact that those discussed are non-UK nationals. The association is then that these non-UK nationals are involved with “pestering and stalking young English girls” which implies criminality. The panel was satisfied that this inference is inappropriate given the context of the other social media posts.
84. The panel was satisfied that the post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 13

A tweet from @Warwicktweets, dated 19 March 2022, shared a post which read, “In this country in 15 or 20 years’ time the foreign man will have the whip hand over the white man. 40 years ago, he was referring to “immigrants.” Now we have mass “illegal immigrants,” totally out of control”.

85. In its submissions Social Work England contended that this post has racist undertones and incites anti-immigrant views particularly in the way that it highlights immigrants as being illegal. The purpose of this post is to refer to the difference between the “white man” and the “foreign” (non-white) man. Social Work England further submitted that in addition to highlighting race, the post also incites slavery by using phrases such as having “the whip over”, and suggesting that things were now “out of control” almost implying that things were better at a time when foreigners were controlled, as slaves.
86. Social Work England also submitted that the use of the picture of Enoch Powell links the post to the racist views expressed in his Rivers of Blood speech.
87. The panel did not find that this post was racist or seriously offensive, when considered individually and when considered cumulatively in the context of the other social media posts. While the content of this tweet together with the use of the picture of Enoch Powell and the anti-immigrant sentiment would be offensive to many people, the panel was not satisfied that the threshold for interference with Article 10 and the higher

protection afforded to political speech was crossed. The panel did not consider that, applying the objective test, the post clearly incited or was connected to slavery, as the expression “whip hand” has also been used as shorthand for the exercise of political control.

Schedule 1 – Item 14

A tweet from @CDMandBAR, dated 20 March 2022, shared a post which read, “Absolute rubbish, if you can’t read English signs, go back to where you came from”.

88. The words above accompanied a BBC news report indicating that Bengali language signage had been installed at Whitechapel Station in Tower Hamlets.
89. The post specifically refers to a foreign language being used and reference to a specific community in London. The statement “Go back to where you came from” is the expression of direct hostility towards members of the Bengali community.
90. The panel found that this post was racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 1 – Item 15

A tweet from @27476b54549e462, dated 23 March 2022, shared a post which read, “Just in case anyone’s still interested. Yesterday 400 more illegals landed on our shores via boats. That’s 2,000 so far this month. That (sic) £5m per day should soon be hitting £6m on housing this ‘Shower of Shite”.

91. The panel considered that this post did not refer to race, but that it used intemperate and provocative language in describing asylum seekers entering the UK by boat as a “shower of shite”. The panel considered that this was hate speech, rather than the expression of a political view. The panel had in mind the high threshold for interference with political speech, but it considered that the interference with the Article 10 right was necessary and proportionate because of the intemperate and provocative language used in this post.

2. Between 21 May 2025 – 16 November 2025, you retweeted on Twitter one or more of the posts identified in Schedule 2, which were offensive and/or racist. Found proved in its entirety.

1. Schedule 2 - Item 1

A tweet from RadioGenoa dated 18 June 2025, stating “Mohammed was a pedophile [sic]. Islam is evil, violent, hateful, barbaric and incompatible with freedom.”. (Link to video)

92. This post is Islamophobic. It demonstrates an intolerance of, and prejudice against, Islam in general, and therefore all Muslims. It is inciting negative sentiment towards Muslims.
93. The panel was satisfied that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 2 – Item 2

A tweet from RadioGenoa dated 19 June 2025 showing an image of a bearded Asian/non-white man with the words “Islam is the religion of peace! If you don’t agree I will kill you!” and the comment from RadioGenoa being – “Accurate.”

94. This post is Islamophobic, attributing provocative words to an individual on the basis of their appearance.
95. The panel found that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 2 – Item 3

A tweet from Lewis.B.Rendell Official dated 29 September 2025. The post posts a speech from Shabana Mahmood by Disclose.tv

96. This post is racist towards Ms Mahmood and others “like her”. There are repeated references seeking to emphasise her “otherness” in respect of her origins, race and religion – in negative, offensive terms; it demonstrates prejudice and hostility towards her and her “co-religionists and their extended clans”.
97. The panel was satisfied that this post is racist and seriously offensive. It is vitriol and derogatory comments directed at an elected politician rather than the expression of a different point of view which would be protected by Article 10.

Schedule 2 – Item 4

A tweet from @mc_lwar dated 9 October 2025 – “The world has enjoyed 0 days since an Islamic wack job killed somebody on behalf of the religion of peace”

98. This post states that irrational or crazy murders by those who practise the Islamic faith are a daily event. To make such generalisations about the religion demonstrates prejudice and hostility towards Muslims.
99. The panel was satisfied that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 2- Item 5

A tweet from @mikeerwydd1968 dated 10 October 2025 stating “So the mayor of Londonistan Sadiq Khan has said that no Westerners should be in charge in Gaza, well how’s about no Muslims should be in charge in Great Britain”

100. This post is racist towards Sadiq Khan and British Muslims in that it suggests that no Muslims should be in positions of authority in England and makes an offensive play on words in respect of Mr Khan’s name and the UK’s capital city. To state such a generalisation demonstrates prejudice and hostility towards Muslims and is Islamophobic.
101. The panel was satisfied that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

Schedule 2 – Item 6

A tweet from @VividProwess dated 5 November 2025 with a photo of the twin towers and the post – “24 years after Muslim terrorists turned the skies into weapons and brought the Twin Towers crashing down, New Yorkers handed the keys of this city to a Muslim extremist? How did we get here?”

102. This post is racist in characterising the elected Mayor of New York City, Zohran Mamdani, as a Muslim extremist and in seeking to link him to the twin-towers attack and thereby to link him to Muslim terrorists. The imagery and rhetoric related to the 9/11 attacks is used to imply that Mr Mamdani is a threat to the security of New York city.
103. The panel was satisfied that this post is racist and seriously offensive.

3. Your conduct at Paragraph 1 and/or Paragraph 2 above was racially motivated and/ or intentionally discriminatory. Found proved.

104. The panel applied the test in *Lambert-Simpson v HCPC* [2023] EWHC 481 for racially motivated offensive communications. It considered whether (i) the act in question ...had a purpose behind it which at least in significant part was referable to race and (ii) the act was done in a way showing hostility or a discriminatory attitude to the relevant racial group.
105. In considering any inferences to be drawn as to Ms Godfrey’s state of mind when re-posting the material in Schedule 1 and Schedule 2, the panel considered Ms Godfrey’s explanation for her conduct as set out within her written submissions dated 19 September 2022:
- a. She says that she neither condones nor champions the comments or pictures of the tweets under any circumstances and that she is “*truly saddened and horrified*” that Social Work England or any of her colleagues

would believe she would practise with any such bias in mind. She states that she never has and never would [practise with bias].

- b. She states - *“There is no doubt that some may consider the tweets offensive, and the tweets portray the views of others. This is unfortunately the way of the world we live in”*.
- c. She states that *“The sharing of the tweets was for me in no way an endorsement of the subject matter but merely a professional interest in the tweets and that of a handful of professionals who like me have worked within immigration settings and are at various stages of undertaking the Prevent and De Radicalisation programmes, among other courses available to develop their skills and generate appropriate awareness”*.
- d. She seeks to explain the following:- *“My own interest in the tweets derive from several areas of thought/consideration and awareness nonrelated to personal bias of any kind whatsoever. Moreover, they are one of the human cost and suffering caused by that of people smugglers, illegal traffickers profiteering from people’s misery and sometimes tragedy. Unfairness in general, within and across society. Above all the safety of everyone involved regardless of who they are and where they originate from”*.
- e. She also says: *“the posts most certainly would have the potential to undermine public confidence in the profession, in the event that they were being created and produced by a Social Work professional and advertised as such”*. She goes on to state – *“Sadly, such is the apparent bias and prejudice held across most walks of society, the majority of the posts/pictures were indeed already national headlines emblazoned across our newspapers and therefore already in the public domain that no doubt created huge further division within society in general”*.
- f. She then goes on to assert *“My own twitter account is completely personal and wholly transparent”*. She states that anyone linking her to her profession would have to know her name personally and be aware of the professional practice that she is associated with, which she says is the situation with the complainant who has previously levelled different allegations against her to Social Work England.
- g. She acknowledges that she *“may have made an error in judgment accessing the cited twitter feeds”* and states *“I cannot begin to express in words how sincerely sorry I am that through my own naïve and innocent use of others twitter posts that I have inadvertently shown interest in may have offended others. This was never ever willingly intended”*.

106. In her email dated 13 February 2026 Ms Godfrey added further detail to her explanation as follows:

“I fully acknowledge that I naïvely shared posts and received posts on X formerly twitter, I did share as part of the Prevent process with a group of friends. The friends were made up of ex colleagues 5 or 6. Some were retired others still working – ironically 2 were employed via Social Work England. We would meet via Zoom and discuss/debate any issues raised healthily. At no point was their [sic] anything sinister or adverse about the group’s intentions.”

107. The panel considered that if Ms Godfrey’s interest had been only professional and legitimate, as she asserts, the offensive posts would not have been publicly disseminated without any comment on their content. Ms Godfrey describes her Twitter/X account as “transparent”. She knew that she was disseminating the posts to the entirety of her followers and that they were also available to members of the public at large. If the discussion between colleagues had taken place by Zoom as described by Ms Godfrey, this did not explain why the material was posted on Twitter/X. The panel also noted that Ms Godfrey did not provide any evidence in support of her assertions. The panel did not accept Ms Godfrey’s explanation for the posts and found it not to be credible.
108. Having rejected Ms Godfrey’s explanation, the panel considered whether the posting of the material in paragraphs 1 and 2 had a purpose which was related to race. The panel found that many of the posts explicitly refer to race, and in others a reference to race can reasonably be inferred. Some of the posts demonstrated clear hostility on the ground of race, and some might be described as inciting hatred relating to race. The language used was stark and the cumulative effect of the tweets was that of prejudicial and derogatory comments targeted at non-white groups. The panel therefore inferred that Ms Godfrey’s purpose was related to race. For the same reasons, the panel inferred that Ms Godfrey’s act of re-posting the tweets showed hostility and a discriminatory attitude towards non-white groups including Black Americans, black people described in the tweets as “immigrants”, and Muslims.
109. The panel concluded that Ms Godfrey’s conduct in paragraphs 1 and 2 was racially motivated and intentionally discrimination. It therefore found paragraph 3 of the Allegation proved.

4. You retweeted a post on Twitter from @Holbornlolz, on an unknown date, which read, “You are here because your dad’s not queer. Happy Father’s Day.”, which was offensive and/or homophobic. Found proved.

110. The post is homophobic because its implication that those who are not heterosexual, or “queer” using the language of the post, do not have children, which is factually incorrect. This is a negative comment expressing hostile sentiment to those who are “queer”.
111. The panel found that this post is homophobic and seriously offensive.

5. You retweeted a post on X from @CherylamCakes dated 7 October 2025, which was offensive and/or discriminatory, which read “If you’re not sickened by this then you’re the problem! Not sure how much more of this depravity I can deal with! What the hell happened to the world! When did it become so deviant and at what point did humanity accept this as the norm [sad face emoji and crying face emoji]”. The post then shares another X user’s post showing an image of a couple (trans and/or gay) embracing with other women and children carrying rainbow flags, with a comment asking – ‘Is this appropriate for a children’s book?’. Found proved.

112. The panel found that a post which referred to a picture of a couple (trans or gay) and asked whether that would be appropriate for a children’s book, would be protected under Article 10 ECHR and interference with freedom of expression would not be necessary or proportionate. The panel determined that while many would find such posts offensive, the topic is a legitimate one within political debate, and such content would not cross the threshold of seriousness.

113. However, this post also used derogatory and inflammatory language. The post described such a couple as “deviant”, referred to “depravity” and being “sickened by” such behaviour. By using such language the post expresses hostility towards individuals who are either gay or transgender.

114. The panel found therefore that this post is discriminatory and seriously offensive.

6. Your conduct in Paragraph 4 and/or Paragraph 5 was intentionally discriminatory and/ or homophobic. Found proved.

115. The panel noted that Ms Godfrey has not provided any explanation for the posts in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Allegation. The context of these posts is that Ms Godfrey was aware at the time she posted these tweets on X that Social Work England had investigated her conduct following a complaint made about the content of her tweets.

116. The panel considered whether the posting of the material in paragraphs 4 and 5 had a purpose which was related to homophobia or transphobia. The panel found that each of the posts demonstrated clear hostility to those in relationships that are not heterosexual and/or cisgender. The panel therefore inferred that Ms Godfrey’s purpose was related to homophobia and/or transphobia. For the same reasons, the panel inferred that Ms Godfrey’s act of re-posting the tweets showed hostility and a discriminatory attitude towards individuals who are not heterosexual and/or cisgender.

117. The panel concluded that Ms Godfrey’s conduct in paragraphs 4 and 5 was intentionally discriminatory and homophobic. It therefore found paragraph 6 of the Allegation proved.

Finding and reasons on grounds:

118. The panel heard submissions from Ms Culleton on behalf of Social Work England. She submitted that the findings of fact amounted to the statutory ground of misconduct. She referred to Social Work England's statement of case and added supplementary oral submissions in which she referred to Ms Godfrey's shocking and disgraceful conduct and its incompatibility with the nature of the work undertaken by social workers which includes work with a wide cross-section of society and different racial groups.
119. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser on the issue of misconduct.
120. The legal adviser reminded the panel that the overarching objective of Social Work England is the protection of the public. That objective involves safeguarding individual members of the public, maintaining confidence in the social work profession and promoting and upholding proper professional standards.
121. The legal adviser directed the panel that whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct is a matter for its independent evaluative judgment.
122. The panel was reminded that there is no statutory definition of misconduct. In *Roylance v General Medical Council (No 2)* [2000] 1 AC 311, misconduct was described as a word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The standard of propriety is to be judged by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required of a practitioner in the particular circumstances.
123. The legal adviser advised that not every breach of professional standards will amount to misconduct. The threshold involves a requirement of seriousness, as confirmed in the case of *Nandi v GMC* [2004] EWHC 2317. The panel must assess the seriousness, context, culpability and the overall gravity of the conduct found proved.
124. The panel carefully considered the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, the written representations made by Ms Godfrey, the relevant Professional Standards, and the legal advice it received. The panel concluded that Ms Godfrey's conduct in this case fell well below the standards expected of a registered social worker and amounted to a serious departure from proper professional practice. Notwithstanding Ms Godfrey's specialist field of work, which included working with asylum seekers and others in the Prevent Programme she deliberately and repeatedly targeted and stereotyped members of the diverse community.
125. The panel found that its findings of fact involved breaches of the following standards.
Social Work England's Professional Standards (2019), in particular:

As a social worker:

- 1.1 *I will value each person as an individual, recognising their strengths and abilities.*

1.5. I will recognise difference across diverse communities and challenge the impact of disadvantage and discrimination on people and communities.

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 work.

5.6 I will not use technology, social media or other forms of electronic communication unlawfully, unethically, or in a way that brings the profession into disrepute.

126. Having applied the facts proved to the relevant standards, the panel considered the conduct to decide whether it was sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct. The panel was satisfied that the conduct in this case was not a minor lapse. It involved repeated behaviour over a period of time, and a further repetition of similar behaviour in 2025 after Ms Godfrey was alerted to the complaint about the content of her Twitter/X feed, and was aware of Social Work England's regulatory concerns. The behaviour was a breach of a fundamental tenet of social work to treat all people with respect and dignity.
127. The panel was of the view that fellow practitioners and members of the public would consider Ms Godfrey's conduct to be deplorable. Ms Godfrey's Twitter/X account was easily discoverable and could be connected with her role as a social worker. There was a very clear connection between Ms Godfrey's role as a social worker and the conduct in her private life. As a social worker Ms Godfrey worked with diverse communities, and part of her professional responsibilities she was required to acknowledge the impact of discrimination on them. There was a fundamental lack of compatibility between Ms Godfrey's role as a social worker, and the content of her Twitter/X feed, in which she intentionally disseminated a negative discriminatory message.
128. The panel considered that there was nothing in the context or circumstances which significantly reduced the degree of Ms Godfrey's culpability. Ms Godfrey was not the author of posts, but her re-tweets without comment endorsed the content and her conduct was intentional. Ms Godfrey was a competent user of Twitter/X and she was aware that her Twitter/X account was transparent and could be accessed by members of the public.
129. The panel considered that Ms Godfrey's conduct damaged public confidence in her as a social worker and in the profession. The publication of the material caused offence to the complainant, and had the potential to cause offence to other individuals. The dissemination of discriminatory tweets also involved the potential risk of harm to service users within the groups targeted by the tweets because the support for such content has the potential to incite discriminatory conduct towards those service users.
130. The panel concluded that its findings in paragraphs 1-6 were sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct, considered both individually and cumulatively.

Finding and reasons on current impairment:

131. The panel heard submissions from Ms Culleton on behalf of Social Work England. She submitted that Ms Godfrey's fitness to practise is impaired. Ms Culleton referred the panel to the statement of case and supplemented those submissions with her oral submissions. She reminded the panel that in 2022 Ms Godfrey was aware of Social Work England's investigation into her conduct and the regulatory concerns. Ms Culleton invited the panel to conclude that as Ms Godfrey continued to post offensive and discriminatory social media posts in 2025, which she must have known would be considered to be offensive, there is a high risk of repetition. Ms Culleton informed the panel that Ms Godfrey's Twitter/X account remains active at today's date. Ms Culleton further submitted that a finding of impairment was required in the public interest to uphold public confidence in the profession.
132. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. She advised that impairment is a current and forward looking assessment and that it is a matter for the panel's professional judgment. The purpose is not to punish past wrongdoing but to assess current fitness to practise.
133. The panel was referred to Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant [2011] EWHC 927, which endorsed the approach derived from the fifth Shipman Report. The panel should consider whether the social worker has in the past acted, and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put service users at unwarranted risk of harm; to bring the profession into disrepute; to breach fundamental tenets of the profession; or to act dishonestly.
134. The panel was reminded that the assessment of impairment involves two interrelated components. The personal component concerns the registrant's current insight, remediation, and the risk of repetition. The public component concerns the need to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards.
135. The legal adviser further referred to Cohen v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 581, emphasising that in assessing the personal component the panel should consider whether the concerns are capable of remediation, whether they have been remedied and whether they are highly unlikely to be repeated. Evidence of genuine insight, reflection and remedial steps is central to that assessment. The demonstration of genuine insight does not require the social worker to admit the conduct.
136. The legal adviser reminded the panel that even if the risk of repetition were assessed as low, the panel must still consider whether a finding of impairment is required on public interest grounds in order to maintain confidence in the profession and to uphold and declare proper standards.
137. When considering the question of impairment, the panel carefully considered the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, Ms Godfrey's

written submissions, Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance', and the legal advice it received.

138. In considering whether Ms Godfrey's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel considered the matter afresh and in a forward looking manner.
139. In assessing the personal component, the panel also considered the questions identified in the case of Grant.
140. The panel noted that there is no evidence that Ms Godfrey's views, as expressed in the social media posts, impacted on her practice as a social worker. Ms Godfrey's agency employer provided a positive employment reference in 2022 in which no concerns were raised about Ms Godfrey's practice and her ability to work with people from diverse racial and religious backgrounds, sexual orientation and gender identities.
141. Notwithstanding this evidence, social workers must ensure that their conduct in their private life does not undermine public confidence in the profession. The panel determined that three of the limbs identified in the case of Grant were engaged. First, Ms Godfrey's conduct undermined public confidence in the profession. The social work profession is one which upholds the value of treating all service users with respect and dignity and understanding the needs of the diverse community and Ms Godfrey's conduct was inconsistent with the values of the profession. Second, Ms Godfrey's conduct breached fundamental tenets of the profession, as set out within the panel's decision on misconduct. Third, the panel also found that Ms Godfrey's conduct had caused and had the potential to cause harm to members of the public. The content of the social media posts caused serious offence to the complainant and had the potential to cause serious offence to other members of the public at large. The dissemination of discriminatory views also had the potential to incite or encourage a hostile attitude towards the groups that were targeted in the social media posts.
142. The panel considered whether the misconduct is remediable, whether it has been remedied, and whether it is highly unlikely to be repeated. The panel found that it would be very difficult to remedy misconduct of the nature found in this case. The panel found that Ms Godfrey's conduct was intentionally discriminatory. This is an attitudinal issue which may be particularly difficult to remediate. The misconduct was repeated after Ms Godfrey was alerted to the regulatory concerns, which supports a conclusion that the misconduct is of an enduring attitudinal nature. Ms Godfrey has been aware of the concerns since 2022, but has continued to disseminate offensive and discriminatory material and has not closed her Twitter/X account or deleted the offensive posts.
143. In considering the level of insight demonstrated by Ms Godfrey, the panel took into account her written submissions. Although there appeared to be some acknowledgement within Ms Godfrey's 2022 submissions that the content of the social media posts was offensive, Ms Godfrey also sought to justify and explain her conduct. Ms Godfrey's subsequent conduct in disseminating similar material undermined her 2022 submissions. The panel therefore gave Ms Godfrey's written submissions in 2022 little weight. The panel was not persuaded that Ms Godfrey has reflected on her

conduct, that she is genuinely remorseful for her behaviour or that she understands the impact or the seriousness of her conduct. The panel found no evidence that Ms Godfrey understands the ramifications of her conduct on public confidence in herself or the reputation of the profession. The panel concluded that Ms Godfrey has not demonstrated any insight or understanding into the facts found proved.

144. There was no evidence that Ms Godfrey has undertaken relevant training to address the concerns. In her submissions Ms Godfrey referred to training she had undertaken as part of the Prevent programme, but she did not provide the panel with details of the training and it did not appear to be relevant to the Allegation.
145. Ms Godfrey did not provide the panel with evidence relevant to the assessment of the risk of repetition, such as testimonials.
146. The panel found that it was particularly significant that Ms Godfrey had continued to post material of an offensive nature. Ms Godfrey posted the material in 2025 despite having been alerted to Social Work England's concerns in 2022 and the panel therefore concluded that she would be highly likely to repeat such behaviour in the future.
147. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Godfrey's fitness to practise is impaired on the personal component.
148. Turning to the public component, the panel considered whether a finding of impairment is required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold professional standards. The panel determined that racially motivated and intentionally discriminatory conduct breaches fundamental tenets of the profession and is of such gravity that it undermines public confidence in the profession. The panel was satisfied that an informed member of the public would be seriously concerned if a social worker who had repeatedly and deliberately posted racist, seriously offensive, discriminatory and homophobic material, were found not to be impaired. A finding of no impairment would undermine public confidence and fail to uphold proper standards.
149. The panel concluded that Ms Godfrey's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal and public components.
150. Accordingly, the panel determined that Ms Godfrey's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

151. Ms Culleton made submissions to the panel on behalf of Social Work England. Ms Culleton informed the panel that in 2011 Ms Godfrey was issued with a disciplinary letter of advice from the General Social Care Council. The regulatory concern involved one family and the concerns were of insensitive communication and an inappropriate prejudice in favour of the mother. Advice was also issued to Ms Godfrey by Social Work England's Case Examiners in 2022. This also involved a regulatory concern relating to a

single family, and the complainant was the same as the complainant in the current case. The concern included not maintaining records, not taking steps to reduce the risk of harm and communication. The Case Examiners decided that there was no realistic prospect of success in relation to the majority of the allegations, and that if proved the remainder would not amount to misconduct. Ms Godfrey was issued with advice reminding her of the importance of maintaining records and of good communication.

152. Ms Culleton submitted that this fitness to practise history was limited and not directly relevant to the current case.
153. Ms Culleton submitted that nothing short of a suspension order would be a sufficient sanction given the serious matters found proved by the panel.
154. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser, who reminded it that, in determining sanction its duty was to pursue the overarching objective of protecting the health safety and well-being of the public, maintaining public confidence in social workers and their regulator, and upholding professional standards. The purpose of sanction is protective and not punitive.
155. The legal adviser directed the panel to have regard to Social Work England's Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, together with its findings on grounds and impairment. The panel was reminded that it must apply the principle of proportionality, balancing the interest of the social worker with the public interest, and imposing the minimum sanction necessary to achieve the legitimate aims of public protection and the wider public interest.
156. The panel was advised to identify and weigh any aggravating and mitigating factors and to consider the available sanctions in ascending order of severity, providing reasons for rejecting lesser sanctions before moving on to a more restrictive one.
157. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
158. The panel did not identify any mitigating features. The panel considered whether any contextual matters reduced the seriousness of the misconduct and concluded that they did not for the reasons set out within the panel's decision on misconduct and impairment. The panel found that the expression of regret within Ms Godfrey's written submissions was not genuine, given that she continued to intentionally post discriminatory and offensive material on her Twitter/X feed after she had been made aware of Social Work England's regulatory concerns in 2022.
159. The panel identified substantial aggravating features. Ms Godfrey's conduct was repeated over a sustained period of time. Her behaviour was entrenched and there was no change in it after the concerns were drawn to her attention by Social Work England in 2022. The complaint and Social Work England's investigation should have been a catalyst for change, but it was not. Ms Godfrey took no steps to change the privacy settings on her Twitter/X account or to delete her posts or close her account.

160. A further significant aggravating feature was the absence of insight. The panel rejected Ms Godfrey's characterisation of her conduct as naïve. She was evidently a competent user of Twitter/X, and she chose to continue to use her account without privacy settings notwithstanding her knowledge of the complaint and Social Work England's investigation. The panel determined that although it was not directly relevant, Ms Godfrey's fitness to practise history also indicated her lack of insight. The advice letters in 2011 and 2022 should have alerted Ms Godfrey to the need to reflect on her conduct and Social Work England's professional standards. The fact that the complainant in the Social Work England regulatory concern was the same as in this case should have put Ms Godfrey on notice that that she needed to be particularly careful about her use of social media and communications in general.
161. In accordance with the guidance, the panel considered each available sanction in ascending order of severity.
162. The panel first considered taking no further action. It concluded that this would be wholly inappropriate given the gravity of the misconduct, the absence of insight, and the high risk of repetition. The finding of impairment alone was not sufficient to protect the public or the wider public interest.
163. The panel next considered advice or a warning order. Such outcomes do not restrict practice. Ms Godfrey's conduct was deliberate, racially motivated, and intentionally discriminatory. In such circumstances, and where there remained a current risk of repetition, the panel concluded that advice or a warning would not provide adequate public protection nor maintain public confidence.
164. The panel then considered whether a conditions of practice order could be appropriate. Conditions are generally suitable where concerns relate to remediable practice deficiencies, where insight has been demonstrated and where a social worker's practice can be closely monitored by a workplace supervisor or manager. This case concerned serious and repeated conduct in Ms Godfrey's private life. The panel could not formulate conditions which would meaningfully address Ms Godfrey's attitude and behaviour. Any restriction on Ms Godfrey's practice as a social worker would not prevent her continuing to post offensive material on her Twitter/X feed and would therefore not protect the public.
165. The panel also had insufficient confidence that Ms Godfrey would comply with a conditions of practice order and determined that conditions of practice would be unworkable and unenforceable. Ms Godfrey's engagement has been limited and within her submissions Ms Godfrey stated that she has retired.
166. The panel also considered that conditions of practice would be inappropriate and insufficient to address the wider public interest, given the gravity and nature of misconduct.
167. The panel next considered suspension. Suspension may be appropriate in cases of serious misconduct where there is evidence of insight and a realistic prospect of

remediation. In this case there was no evidence of insight, no meaningful apology, and no evidence of any remedial steps. The misconduct was attitudinal in nature. The panel carefully considered Ms Godfrey's written submissions but was not persuaded that she had learned anything or that her current behaviour would change. The panel did not identify any signs of developing insight that would suggest a suspension order could result in a pathway for Ms Godfrey to return to safe and effective unrestricted practice. There was no evidence that she is able or willing to remediate the deficiencies in her behaviour or that there will be any further development in the level of her insight. The panel therefore determined that a suspension order would be ineffective and would serve no purpose.

168. The panel also found that a suspension order would be insufficient to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold standards of conduct. A suspension order would not prevent Ms Godfrey continuing to post racist and discriminatory material on her Twitter/X feed. If the panel were to suspend Ms Godfrey she would remain a social worker, and her status as a social worker could be connected with her Twitter/X feed. The panel therefore concluded that suspension would not adequately protect the public nor maintain confidence in the profession or uphold standards of conduct for the profession.
169. The panel then considered whether a removal order was required. The panel had regard to paragraph 149 of the sanctions guidance which states that a removal order may be appropriate in cases involving: persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of their actions or consequences; and social workers who are unwilling and/or unwilling to remediate (for example, where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future).
170. The panel considered that these circumstances applied, and that this was a case where no other order would be sufficient to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession, and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England. The panel recognised that removal is the most serious sanction available and did not reach this conclusion lightly. Notwithstanding Ms Godfrey's statements that she has retired, the panel acknowledged that a Removal Order may have a detrimental impact on Ms Godfrey's reputational interests and that it is an ignominious way to end a career. The panel bore in mind the requirement that the sanction must be proportionate, but it decided that Ms Godfrey's interests were outweighed by the need to protect the public and the public interest.
171. The panel concluded that Ms Godfrey's behaviour was incompatible with continued registration and decided that a Removal Order is the appropriate and proportionate order and the only sanction in this case that would be sufficient to uphold Social Work England's statutory overarching objective.
172. The panel directed that Isabella Armentieres Godfrey be removed from the register.

Interim order:

173. In light of its findings on sanction, the panel next considered an application by Ms Culleton for an interim suspension order to cover the appeal period before the final order becomes effective.
174. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser on its power to make an interim order under paragraph 11(1)(b) of Schedule 2 to the Social Workers Regulations 2018.
175. The panel next 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 not to impose an interim order. The panel had identified a real risk of repetition if Ms Godfrey were permitted to practise without restriction. The panel therefore concluded that an interim order was necessary to ensure the protection of members of the public, to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold standards for members of the profession.
176. In determining the appropriate form of interim order, the panel decided that an interim suspension order was necessary and proportionate to address the identified risks during the appeal period. Given the panel's reasons for imposing a removal order as the substantive sanction, it considered that suspension was the only appropriate interim measure to prevent unrestricted practice.
177. The panel considered that an 18 month order was necessary and proportionate, given that it may take time for any appeal to be scheduled.
178. Accordingly, the panel concluded that an interim suspension order for 18 months is necessary for the protection of the public. When the appeal period expires this interim order will come to an end unless an appeal has been filed with the High Court. If there is no appeal, the final order of removal shall take effect when the appeal period expires.

Right of appeal:

179. 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.

180. 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.
181. 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.
182. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended).

The Professional Standards Authority:

183. 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>.