



# Social worker: Robert Eyre

## Registration number: SW24695

### Fitness to Practise

### Final Order Review hearing

Date of hearing: 25 February 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:

Conditions of practice order (expiring 8 April 2026)

Hearing outcome:

Extend and vary the conditions of practice order for a further 9 months with effect from the expiry of the current order

## Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by the case examiners, by way of accepted disposal on 9 October 2024.
2. Under paragraphs 7 and 9 of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, for a case to be concluded through accepted disposal, the social worker must consent to the proposed disposal. The case examiners' decision of 9 October 2024 records:

*“On 12 September 2024, the social worker confirmed that they had read the case examiner decision and the accepted disposal guide. The social worker signed a document confirming they accepted the key facts set out in the case examiner decision and that their fitness to practice is impaired. They confirmed that they understood the terms of the disposal of their fitness to practice case and accepted them in full”.*

3. The panel found that Mr Eyre accepted the key facts, and that their fitness to practise was at the time impaired.
4. Mr Eyre did not attend and was not represented.
5. Social Work England was represented by Ms Tania Khan, case presenter from Social Work England.
6. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

<b>Adjudicators</b>	<b>Role</b>
Sally Berlin	Chair
Tracey Newson	Social worker adjudicator

<b>Hearings team/Legal adviser</b>	<b>Role</b>
Andrew Brown	Hearings officer
Elsie Li	Hearings support officer
Diarmuid Bunting	Legal adviser

## Service of notice:

7. The panel was informed by Ms Khan that notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Eyre by email to an address provided by Mr Eyre. Ms Khan submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
8. The panel had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:

- A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 26 January 2026 and addressed to Mr Eyre at their email address which they provided to Social Work England;
- An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 26 January 2026 detailing Mr Eyre’s registered address and email address;
- A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 26 January 2026 the writer sent by email to Mr Eyre at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents.

9. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.

10. Having had regard to Rules 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the “FTP Rules 2019”) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Eyre in accordance with the Rules.

### Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

11. The panel heard the submissions of Ms Khan. Ms Khan submitted that no application for an adjournment had been made by Mr Eyre and there was no guarantee that adjourning today’s proceedings would secure their attendance. Ms Khan invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.

12. 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 Rules 32 and 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’ and the Social Work England ‘Guidelines on postponements and adjournments of fitness to practise hearings’, both of which were last updated on 16 December 2022.

13. The panel took into account correspondence between Social Work England and Mr Eyre in late November and December 2025. The panel found it was clear that Mr Eyre understood that the matter would proceed to a review hearing on 25 February 2026. Mr Eyre submitted evidence to Social Work England during early December 2025.

14. The panel found that no application for an adjournment had been made by Mr Eyre. It further found that there was no evidence that adjourning today’s proceedings would secure Mr Eyre’s attendance. The panel considered that there were public protection concerns arising from the allegations. The panel was conscious that an adjournment could result in the current order lapsing and this weighed in favour of proceeding with the review hearing.

15. The panel weighed the interests with those of Social Work England and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing.

16. The panel concluded that it was appropriate to proceed in the absence of Mr Eyre.

### Preliminary matters: Privacy

17. The panel heard (in private) an application by Ms Khan on behalf of Social Work England that any parts of the hearing in which matters relating to Mr Eyre's health were discussed be held in private.

18. The panel's considerations included the circumstances of the case before it, Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, the fact that the default position was that the principle of open justice should prevail, that professional conduct proceedings would generally be held in public and the guidance in *Miller v General Medical Council* [2013] EWHC 1934 (Admin).

19. However, this was not an application to hold the entire hearing in private, and there were substantial parts of the relevant material which did not relate to health. The panel determined that it could adequately manage the hearing by going into private session when health-related matters were discussed.

20. The panel held that some of the hearing should be held in private, but only when the health of the registered social worker was being discussed, pursuant to rule 38(a)(ii).

### Review of the current order:

21. This final order review hearing took place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

22. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 8 April 2026.

23. The panel understood that the various options before it were as follows, pursuant to Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018:

- a. Under paragraph 15(1)(a): extend the period for which the previous order is in place (provided that any extension does not exceed 3 years at a time)
- b. Under paragraph 15(1)(b): make an order that case examiners or adjudicators could have made at the time (provided that the order does not exceed 3 years at a time)

- i. This includes, under paragraph 9(2) *if the case was by way of accepted disposal*:

1. advice

2. no further action
- ii. This includes, under paragraph 13(1):
  1. ...
  2. suspension
  3. conditions of practice
  4. warning order
- c. ...
- d. Under paragraph 15(1)(d): revoke the order in place.

The allegations found likely to be proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order by way of accepted disposal were as follows:

24. In relation to the facts:

*Whilst registered as a social worker between 2018 to March 2022:*

*1. You failed to demonstrate the necessary level of knowledge, skill or judgment including in the following areas:*

- a. Managing and prioritising your caseload.*
- b. Following management instructions including requests to deal with urgent casework in a timely manner*
- c. Timely completion and/or accuracy of casework and case recordings*
- d. Communicating with service users, their family, other professionals, and/or colleagues in a timely and/or professional manner*
- e. Recognising and responding to risk in a timely manner.*

25. In relation to the statutory grounds for impairment:

*The matters outlined in regulatory concern (1) amount[s] to the statutory ground of lack of competence or capability.*

*Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct and/or lack of competence or capability.*

26. The case examiners' reasoning on why the facts of the case and the statutory grounds met the 'realistic prospect test' are contained in pages 9 to 13 and pages 15 to 17 (respectively) of the case examiners' decision dated 9 October 2024.
27. Those reasons are not recited in this record of the panel's decision, but they were considered in full.

### The case examiners on/around 9 October 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:

28. The case examiners' reasoning on why the case met the 'realistic prospect test' in relation to impairment in fitness to practice, as detailed in the case examiner decision dated 9 October 2024, was as follows:

*Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:*

- 1. The personal element, established via an assessment of the risk of repetition.*
- 2. The public element, established through consideration of whether a finding of impairment might be required to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.*

#### **Personal element**

*With regard to the concerns before the regulator, the case examiners have given thought to their guidance, and they note that they should give consideration to whether the matters before the regulator are easily remediable, and whether the social worker has demonstrated insight and/or conducted remediation to the effect that the risk of repetition is highly unlikely.*

#### **Whether the conduct can be easily remedied**

*The case examiners consider that the conduct is remediable. The social worker appears to have worked without issue for many years prior to the period of time under consideration, and as such the case examiners consider that the social worker's dip in performance could be directly related to mitigating circumstances previously outlined.*

*The social worker has not been employed in a social work role since March 2022. The social worker had been working long hours in a busy hotel kitchen from May 2022, which they submit is evidence that they can work as part of a team and where there is pressure.*

**[PRIVATE]** *The social worker accepts that they would be 'rusty' should they return to the social work profession but suggest that as an experienced social worker they 'ought to be able to complete assessments.'*

The social worker also speaks of the value of their reflective work, they keep a diary, which helps them to 'double down on reflection' or reflect on their reflections.

There is cogent evidence to suggest that the social worker has developed coping strategies **[PRIVATE]**

### Insight

The case examiners note the social worker has provided extensive submissions, in these they accept that 'they very much struggled to keep up' with their workload and this was the reason they were subject to performance management. The social worker appears to accept that they continued to work at a time when, given their personal circumstances, on reflection they should not have continued to do so.

In their final submissions the social worker says that they were in performance management because they were not keeping up with their workload, they say that they do not deny how much they struggled to keep up. The social worker says that they 'just kept going' **[PRIVATE]** they say that they carried on with their social work role to try and maintain some sense of stability in their life. The case examiners consider that the social worker demonstrates insight into how they attempted to cope at the relevant time and that with hindsight they accept that they might have acted differently.

### Risk of repetition

It is positive that the social worker shows insight into the issues of concern and has sought support **[PRIVATE]**

Whilst there is evidence to suggest that the risk of repetition may be low due to the insight shown by the social worker and their efforts to address their wellbeing, the social worker's ability to cope in a social work environment is untested and as such the case examiners conclude that the risk of repetition remains at this time.

### **Public element**

The case examiners have next considered whether the social worker's actions have the potential to undermine public confidence in the social work profession, or the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

The case examiners have considered whether the social worker's conduct harmed or caused a risk of harm to service users. The social worker has acknowledged that they were not able to manage their caseload, and the case examiners have found a realistic prospect that the social worker did not meet timescales for visiting service users and as such may have placed service users at risk of harm. The case examiner guidance is clear that the risk of harm if the behaviour of concern is repeated can be as serious as actual harm caused.

*The case examiners also consider that the social worker's conduct at the relevant time could undermine trust and confidence in the profession. Social workers must be able to manage and prioritise their caseload and interact with service users and other professionals in a timely and professional manner, as failure to do so could increase risk to vulnerable people.*

*Accordingly, the case examiners consider there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the social worker to be currently impaired.*

### The case examiners on/around 9 October 2024 determined the following with regard to sanction:

29. The case examiners' reasoning on the appropriate sanction by way of accepted disposal, as detailed in the case examiner decision dated 9 October 2024, was as follows:

*In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's sanctions guidance and reminded themselves that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker but to protect the public and the wider public interest. Furthermore, the guidance requires that decision makers select the least severe sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.*

*In determining the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case, the case examiners considered the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness. The case examiners considered taking no further action but are of the view that this would not be appropriate in this instance as it would not satisfy the wider public interest.*

*The case examiners next considered whether offering advice would be sufficient. An advice order will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings. The case examiners believe that issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they view the social worker's conduct.*

*The case examiners then considered a warning order. A warning order implies a clearer expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct than some advice. When considering a warning order, case examiners can direct that a warning order will stay on the social worker's register entry for periods of one, three or five years. According to case examiner guidance, 1 year might be appropriate for an isolated incident of relatively low seriousness where the primary objective is to send a message about the professional standards expected of social workers; 3 years might be appropriate for more serious concerns to maintain public confidence and to send a message about the professional standards expected of social workers; and 5 years might be appropriate for serious cases that have fallen only marginally short of requiring restriction of registration, to maintain confidence in the profession and where it*

*is necessary to send a clear signal about the standards expected. The case examiners guidance paragraph 108 states that:*

*A warning order is likely to be appropriate where (all of the following) are present:*

- *the fitness to practise issue is isolated or limited*
- *there is a low risk of repetition*
- *the social worker has demonstrated insight*

*Given the above, the case examiners do not think a warning order is suitable, this is because they do not consider the risk of repetition to be low, as it is currently untested. In their consideration of conditions of practice, the case examiners note that their guidance would say [para 114]:*

*Conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where (all of the following):*

- *the social worker has demonstrated insight*
- *the failure or deficiency in practice is capable of being remedied*
- *appropriate, proportionate, and workable conditions can be put in place*
- *decision makers are confident the social worker can and will comply with the conditions*
- *the social worker does not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice*

*The case examiners consider that the social worker does demonstrate insight and that the conduct under consideration is remediable. The case examiners believe that appropriate proportionate and workable conditions can be put in place.*

*The case examiners have carefully considered whether the social worker can comply with conditions, noting that they are not currently employed in a social work role. In their consideration of this, the case examiners have determined that the social worker appears to have tried to comply with performance plans put in place by the council at the time in question, cooperated with the regulator **[PRIVATE]** this gives the case examiners confidence that the social worker has the desire to comply with conditions if these are put in place.*

*The case examiners consider that conditions of practice would provide a framework where the social worker's practise is carefully monitored, so that they can demonstrate, with support that they are able to rectify the issues that have given rise to these concerns.*

*A suspension order, the next available sanction would not appear to be proportionate as guidance would suggest that it is more appropriate when conditions would not appear to be workable, and where the issues of concern are so serious that they marginally fall short of requiring removal from the*

*register. Furthermore, the social worker has been out of practice for a significant amount of time already and the case examiners would not wish to further distance them from the profession and deskill them if this is not necessary.*

*Given the above the case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker that this matter is dealt with by means of a conditions of practice order of 18 months duration. The case examiners consider that this will offer the social worker an option to return to practice, where they will be closely monitored for a period of 18 months. The case examiners consider that given the social worker's recent absence from the profession this option provides a restrictive, but supportive means by which they can continue to reflect on the issues of concern should they decide, they can accept a finding of impairment.*

### Social Work England submissions:

30. The panel heard submissions from Ms Khan and took into account Social Work England's written submissions, which stated as follows:

*Subject to any further evidence of remediation received prior to the review, Social Work England invites the reviewing panel to extend the current Conditions of Practice Order by a period of 9 months, with some variation.*

*The Social Worker has complied with the Conditions in so far as they have been in effect. The Social Worker has not undertaken any social work roles so as to demonstrate compliance with most of the Conditions. The Social Worker has submitted a reflective piece and evidence of CPD, and reflection on the same. He has also provided references from voluntary work, although these do not reflect significant transferable skills or replicate the pressures and stress that may attach to a registered role.*

#### **[PRIVATE]**

*It is submitted that a further period of conditions would allow the Social Worker a reasonable period to evidence his ability to (I) manage his workload, (II) complete urgent tasks in a timely manner, (III) recognise and respond to risk in a timely manner in practice.*

*Social Work England submit that the need for learning and reflection, and then demonstrating that in safe practice, remains. A Conditions of Practice Order continues to be the necessary and proportionate way to ensure a safe return to practice.*

*On the information available to Social Work England at the point of drafting the Notice of Hearing, they invite the panel to find that although there has been some*

*change since the last review, due to the circumstances outlined above, the Social Worker's fitness to practise remains impaired.*

*The finding of impairment in this case was on the grounds of lack of competence or capacity and it is submitted that this cannot be addressed only by reflection, CPD and references that do not reflect a role akin to social work practice.*

*If the Social Worker provides evidence of (I) managing his workload, (II) completing urgent tasks in a timely manner, (III) recognising and responding to risk in a timely manner, prior to the review, then Social Work England may review their position. Absent such evidence, it is submitted that the risk of repetition remains and the public would not be protected if there were no restrictions on the Social Worker's registration.*

*It is submitted that a period of nine months should allow the Social Worker time to secure employment in a social work role, or equivalent, and to demonstrate they are safe to practice. It will also allow time for the Social Worker to confirm their future intent as regards a return to practice. Social Work England invite the Panel to impose a further period of Conditions of Practice for nine months, but to consider removing condition 11, as this has already been complied with.*

31. In oral submissions, Ms Khan directed the panel to various documents, including Mr Eyre's reflective statement, evidence of his CPD undertaken in 2023, 2024 and 2025 and his two references, from Helen Gilbert and Father Gordon Adam.

### Social worker submissions:

32. Mr Eyre did not attend.
33. The panel proceeded on the basis that his position was that his fitness to practise was no longer impaired, based upon the evidence he had submitted, which the panel read in full and carefully considered.

### Decision and reasons on current impairment:

34. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the case examiners. However, it exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
35. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the case examiners and the submissions of Mr Eyre and Social Work

England. It also considered all the new documentation provided by Mr Eyre including his extensive reflective statement, relevant CPD and references.

36. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
37. The panel first considered whether Mr Eyre's fitness to practise remains impaired, focusing on the private element of impairment in fitness to practise.
38. The panel shared the case examiners' view that the regulatory concerns were capable of remediation. Mr Eyre appears to have worked without issue for many years prior to the period of time under consideration. As such, his dip in performance could be directly related to various mitigating circumstances.
39. Regarding insight and remediation, the panel observed that Mr Eyre had meaningfully and extensively demonstrated insight. His evidence of remediation was relevant and cogent.
40. The panel next considered whether there remained a risk of repetition of the regulatory concerns. In this regard, the panel noted that, although Mr Eyre had been working since he ceased practising as a social worker, he was not in roles which involved the same level of pressure and/or responsibility as social work. Mr Eyre's fitness to practise has not been tested in a social work setting, or an analogous role or setting (in terms of the content or complexity of the work and/or the nature of the interactions with other stakeholders).
41. The panel found that, given the nature of the regulatory concerns, there remained a risk of repetition if Mr Eyre was permitted to return to unrestricted social work practice.
42. The panel had regard to the fact that the concerns in the case carried real risks to service users, albeit it balanced this with the fact that Mr Eyre had demonstrated good insight within his impressive reflective piece and the commentary he provided in respect of his CPD.
43. Overall, the panel considered that the risk of repetition remains extant. For that reason, the panel concluded that Mr Eyre's fitness to practise remains impaired on the basis of the private element.
44. Regarding the public element of assessing fitness to practise, the panel were of the view that a fully informed and reasonable member of the public would be concerned if a social worker in Mr Eyre's circumstances was able to return to unrestricted practice.
45. Therefore, Mr Eyre's fitness to practice remains impaired on the basis of the public element.

## Decision and reasons on sanction:

46. The panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The following orders were open to the panel:
- a. revocation of the current order (with immediate effect);
  - b. no further action (in which case the current order would lapse on 8 April 2026);
  - c. advice;
  - d. warning order;
  - e. conditions of practice (not exceeding three years);
  - f. suspension (not exceeding three years).
47. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser on the issue of sanction.
48. The panel considered the submissions made by Ms Khan, on behalf of Social Work England, during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a 9-month conditions of practice order, in similar terms to the present order. It also considered Mr Eyre's evidence, as outlined above. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
49. The purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Eyre, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Mr Eyre's interests with the public interest.
50. The panel took account of both aggravating and mitigating factors.
51. It noted that there were mitigating factors including as follows:
- a. Evidence of remorse;
  - b. Evidence of remediation;
  - c. Personal mitigation;
  - d. Evidence of good character.
52. It noted the following aggravating factors:
- a. Repetition of concerns;
  - b. Risk of harm to service users.
53. After its analysis of all the evidence and information, the panel ultimately determined that an extension of 9 months to the conditions of practice order is warranted.

54. Before reaching this conclusion, the panel considered ascending sanctions, their appropriateness and proportionality in this case, as summarised below.
55. **No Further Action or Revocation of the Current Order or Advice:** These were deemed inappropriate as they would fail to address the nature and/or seriousness of the breaches and would not provide adequate public protection, given the risks identified. They would leave Mr Eyre in unrestricted practice. They would also fail to adequately protect the broader public interest considerations of protecting the profession and maintaining professional standards.
56. **Warning Order:** The panel concluded that it would not address the underlying concerns. It would be disproportionately lenient in the circumstances. A warning would not adequately protect the public. It would also fail to adequately protect the broader public interest considerations of protecting the profession and maintaining professional standards.
57. **Conditions of Practice Order:** The panel found that conditions of practice were appropriate in this case to adequately protect the public and the profession. Given the steps toward remediation that Mr Eyre has taken, the panel considered that appropriate, proportionate and workable conditions could be put in place.
58. **Suspension:** The panel considered whether a suspension would be appropriate. It determined that this was not an appropriate sanction because the public could be adequately protected by workable conditions of practice.

### Extend and vary the conditions of practice order for a further 9 months with effect from the expiry of the current order:

59. The panel considered that the current conditions of practice order should be extended for a further period of time, with a few minor amendments, for a period of 9 months.
60. The panel was satisfied that this period was appropriate because this would adequately protect the public and the wider public interest.
61. This period should also enable Mr Eyre to reflect on the panel's findings and devise a plan of action targeted towards an unrestricted return to the register, if they desire such a return.
62. This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel might be assisted by Mr Eyre attending the review hearing and it would be of assistance to that panel if Mr Eyre was able to reassure the panel (whether or not he is in attendance) that he has mitigated the risk of repetition. He may be able to do so by providing relevant evidence of:
- a. Managing and prioritising a caseload or analogous workload;

- b. Following management instructions including requests to deal with urgent casework or other work in a timely manner;
- c. Timely completion and/or accuracy of casework or other records;
- d. Communicating with service users, their family, other professionals, or others in challenging circumstances;
- e. Communicating with colleagues in a timely and/or professional manner;
- f. Recognising and responding to risk in a timely manner.

63. Based upon the matters above, the panel ordered that the current conditions of practice be amended to the following:

### Conditions of practice order

Robert EYRE

Social Work England registration number: SW24695

Decision Date: 25 February 2026

Outcome: Conditions for a period of 9 months

1. You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency, or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.
2. You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency, or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.
3.
  - a. At any time you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England's register.
  - b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England
4. You must provide reports from your reporter (per condition 3a, above, if applicable) to Social Work England every 3 months and at least 10 days prior to any review and

Social Work England will make these reports available to any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions on request.

5. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.
6. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.
7. You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.
8. You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days of the date of application [for future registration] or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect [for existing registration].
9. You must work with your reporter (per condition 3a, above, if applicable), to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:
  - Visiting service users within timescales
  - Prioritising tasks
  - Ensuring case records are completed within timescales
10. You must provide a copy of ~~your~~ any such personal development plan (per condition 9, above, if applicable) to Social Work England within 4 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.  
  
~~[PREVIOUSLY CONDITION 11 - REMOVED] You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019) and provide a written reflection 2 months after these conditions take effect if you are not employed in a social work role within this period. Your reflection should focus on the issues that gave rise to these concerns and why this was allegedly below the accepted standard of a social worker. You should outline what you should have done differently.~~
11. You must keep your professional commitments under review and limit your social work practice in accordance with your reporter's advice.
12. **[PRIVATE]**

13. a. [PRIVATE]
  - b. [PRIVATE]
  - c. [PRIVATE]
  - d. [PRIVATE]
14. You must not supervise the work of any other social worker or student social worker.
15. You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days ~~from the date these conditions take effect~~ of the date you accept any professional appointment in which you contract or arrange to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at 1 to ~~15~~ 14, above:
- a) Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.
  - b) Any locum, agency or out-of-hours service you are registered with or apply to be registered with in order to secure employment or contracts to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
  - c) Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
  - d) Any organisation, agency, or employer where you are using your social work qualification/knowledge/skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.
16. You must forward written evidence of your compliance with ~~this condition 15~~ to Social Work England within 14 days from the date ~~these conditions take effect~~ you accept any professional appointment in which you contract or arrange to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.
17. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, (1) to (16), to any person requesting information about your registration status.

## Right of appeal:

64. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:
- a. the decision of adjudicators:
    - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
    - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
    - iii. to make a final order,
  - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
65. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
66. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.
67. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

## Review of final orders:

68. Under regulation 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended):
- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
  - 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
  - 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5).
69. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

## The Professional Standards Authority

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

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