



Social worker: Jennifer Leveridge Registration number: SW82639 Fitness to Practise Final Order Review Meeting

Date of Meeting: 30 April 2026

Meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Conditions of practice order (expiring 13 June 2026)

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

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a panel of adjudicators on 2 May 2024. At the first review on 3 November 2025 the interim order was extended for a period of 6 months.
2. Ms Leveridge did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Capsticks LLP and their written submissions are set out within the notice of hearing letter.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Bryan Hume	Chair
Joanna Bowes	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Andrew Brown	Hearings officer
Liam Dixon	Hearings support officer
Ruksana Kosser	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel of adjudicators (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 30 March 2026 and addressed to Ms Leveridge’s email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 30 March 2026 detailing Ms Leveridge’s registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 30 March 2026 the writer sent by email to Ms Leveridge at the email address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents. The documents were also sent by registered post to Ms Leveridge’s home address.
6. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
7. Having had regard to the Social Work England Fitness to practise rules 2019 (as amended) (the Rules) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Leveridge in accordance with Rules 16, 44 and 45.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

8. The notice of final order review informed Ms Leveridge that the review would take place as a meeting. The notice stated:

“If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on 14 April 2026. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England’s submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide.”

9. The panel noted the comments made by Ms Leveridge in her correspondence received on 10 February 2026 and 24 April 2026 in which she stated that she would not be attending the review but would be providing written submissions.

10. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides:

“Where the registered social worker does not state within the period specified by the regulator whether they intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may determine whether to make an order by means of a meeting.”

11. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering this application. This included reference to Rule 43 of the Rules and the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5*; *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s guidance ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’.

12. The panel concluded that Ms Leveridge had chosen not to attend. Having weighed the interests of Ms Leveridge in regard to her attendance at the hearing with those of Social Work England and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing, the panel determined to proceed, as she was content for the review to proceed in her absence and she had provided written submissions.

13. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c).

Review of the current order:

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

15. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 13 June 2026.

16. The panel noted all the documentation presented in support of the final order review hearing, namely the hearing bundle (106 pages) and the service and supplementary bundles (12 pages and 10 pages). The panel also considered the written submission by Ms Leveridge.

The allegations found proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

Whilst registered as a social worker between around March and December 2019:

1) You failed to provide adequate supervision and/or oversight to Person A in that:

a. You did not carry out regular formal supervision as required by the Trafford Supervision Policy; and/or

b. You failed to:

i. ensure that Person A arranged a sufficient number of core group meetings between around March and October 2019 in relation to Child 1; and/or

ii. take any adequate action in response to the number of no access visits attempted to Child 1 and/or their family between March and October 2019; and/or

iii. between around March and November 2019 ensure that a Section 47 of the Children Act 1989 enquiry was initiated in respect of Child 1 when it was indicated to do so; and/or

iv. in around April 2019 ensure an adequate assessment was carried out in relation to Child 2 being returned from care to home; and/or

v. between around 28 May and 11 June 2019 ensure that a strategy meeting took place within a timely fashion in respect of Child 2; and/or

vi. on or around 17 June 2019 ensure a Section 47 of the Children Act 1989 enquiry was initiated in respect of Child 2 when it was indicated to do so; and/or

vii. between around July 2019 and October 2019 ensure that Child 3's care plan was updated; and/or

viii. ensure that an adequate assessment was carried out into the suitability of Child 3 being placed at their paternal grandfather's home from around 17 September 2019; and/or

ix. take any adequate action in response to the number of no access visits attempted to Child 4 and/or their family between around March and October 2019; and/or

x. between around 17 June 2019 and 30 October ensure a Section 47 enquiry of the Children Act 1989 enquiry was completed in respect of Child 2 when it was indicated to do so.

2) Between 29 August 2019 and around December 2019 you failed to provide adequate supervision and/or oversight of Person B in that you did not carry out formal supervision every month as required by the Trafford Supervision Policy.

The final hearing panel on 2 May 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:

“The panel first considered whether Ms Leveridge’ fitness to practise was currently impaired in terms of the need to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public. For that purpose, the panel considered, firstly, whether Ms Leveridge’ misconduct had caused any harm to the public or given rise to a risk of such harm being caused and, secondly, the likelihood of her misconduct being repeated.

With regard to the first of those matters, the panel noted that there was no evidence that Ms Leveridge’s misconduct had led to any actual harm to service users. However, the panel considered that Ms Leveridge’ misconduct had nevertheless exposed the service users concerned to a risk of harm. This was for the reasons given by the panel in paragraph 72 above, namely, “Lack of supervision can result, not only in drift and delay on cases but in service users being placed at risk of harm, or suffering actual harm, as a result of the manager not becoming aware of issues soon enough or not giving timely directions”. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Leveridge’ misconduct had posed a risk to the health, safety or well-being of the public.

The panel then considered whether there was a risk of Ms Leveridge’ misconduct being repeated. In doing so, the panel considered Ms Leveridge’s past history and her conduct since the events to which the Allegations relate and the extent to which she had developed insight into, and remedied, her misconduct.

With regard to Ms Leveridge’ past history and conduct since 2019:

Ms Leveridge had no criminal convictions or any previous regulatory findings against her; and

as she did not appear to have worked as a social worker since her contract with the Council was terminated in 2020, there was no evidence of her misconduct having been repeated.

With regard to Ms Leveridge's insight into her misconduct, the panel was satisfied that Ms Leveridge had developed abundant insight into her misconduct and its causes and into what she should do to avoid its being repeated in the future. In arriving at that conclusion, the panel relied, in particular, on Ms Leveridge's extensive and detailed written submissions and reflective pieces, which the panel thought provided a considered reflection on past events. In them she offered a practical plan of action for moving forward and managing the stress which she had previously experienced in the workplace and rebuilding her confidence as a practitioner. The panel also took account of Ms Leveridge's admission of the Allegations; her high level of engagement with the fitness to practice process; her expressions of remorse for her misconduct and her recognition of its potential effects on service users, colleagues, the social work profession and her employer; and her stated commitment to social work.

With regard to remediation, the panel considered that, given its nature and apparent causes, Ms Leveridge's misconduct was remediable with appropriate training and supervised practice as a manager and supervisor. However, the panel did not consider that there was sufficient evidence before it to support a conclusion that the failings in her practice which had led to the panel's finding of misconduct had been remedied. In particular, apart from the absence of any evidence of the training which she had undertaken, as Mr Leveridge had not returned to social work since leaving her post at the Council in 2020, the panel had no evidence of her performance in a social worker role over a sustained period of time. In the circumstances, although Ms Leveridge had put forward a plan for remedying the failings in her practice and addressing their causes, she had yet to demonstrate that that plan worked in practice. Indeed, Ms Leveridge had herself acknowledged this situation in her letter of 2 October 2023, when she stated that, as she had not been working as a social worker, she was "... unsure how I can provide the evidence which Social Work England submits is missing in order for the Panel to be satisfied that there is no real risk of future repetition ...".

Given the lack of any evidence of remediation, and given that Ms Leveridge's misconduct had persisted over a period of several months, the panel concluded that, notwithstanding her insight into her misconduct, there was a material risk of that misconduct being repeated, should she return to social work as a manager or in some other pressurised role.

Given the panel's conclusions regarding the risk which Ms Leveridge's misconduct posed to the health, safety and well-being of service users and the risk of that misconduct being repeated, the panel found that Ms Leveridge's

fitness to practise was currently impaired in terms of the need to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public.

With regard to the public component of impairment:

Given that Ms Leveridge's misconduct occurred in a safeguarding context and given her lack of remediation and the possible consequences for service users of her inadequate oversight and supervision (as outlined in paragraph 72 above), the panel considered that informed and reasonable members of the public who were aware of the circumstances of the present case would be very concerned, if they were to learn that she was free to return practice without restriction. The panel therefore found that Ms Leveridge's fitness to practise was currently impaired in that such a finding was required in order to maintain public confidence in social workers in England.

Similarly, given the nature and context of Ms Leveridge's misconduct, its possible consequences for service users and her lack of remediation, the panel considered that professional standards for social workers would be compromised, if Ms Leveridge were free to return to practice without restriction. The panel therefore found that Ms Leveridge's fitness to practise is currently impaired in that such a finding was required in order to maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England."

The final hearing panel on 2 May 2024 determined the following with regard to sanction:

"With regard to a conditions of practice order, the panel considered that the present case satisfied all of the criteria in paragraph 114 of the Guidance (which sets out the circumstances in which such an order may be appropriate).

Specifically:

The panel had, at the impairment stage, found that Ms Leveridge had developed and demonstrated a high level of insight.

Likewise, it had already determined that the failings in her practice which had led to its findings of misconduct and impairment were capable of being remedied.

Having reviewed the draft conditions suggested by Social Work England and considered the matter generally, the panel was satisfied that appropriate, proportionate and workable conditions could be put in place, which would be sufficient to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public and to maintain public confidence and proper professional standards.

Given Ms Leveridge's high level of insight and engagement with the fitness to practise process, and given that, in her submissions, she had expressed her willingness to work within conditions, the panel was confident the social worker could and would comply with any conditions which it might impose.

The panel was satisfied that Ms Leveridge would not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice given the insight which she had developed into her misconduct and her engagement with the fitness to practice process and provided that the conditions of practice required appropriate supervision and reporting.

Given the above conclusions, the panel considered that, in line with paragraph 141 of the Guidance, it would be in the public interest for Ms Leveridge, as a trained, skilled and experienced social worker, to return to practice, especially as she had indicated her willingness to work under conditions of practice. The panel therefore considered that, in the circumstances of the present case, a suspension order would be counter-productive and disproportionate and that a conditions of practice order was the appropriate and proportionate final order.

In terms of the conditions themselves, the panel was satisfied with those proposed by Social Work England but with the following changes:

Whilst the panel agreed that it was essential that Ms Leveridge should be subject to regular supervision and reporting, it considered that, to make them more workable, the conditions should allow the supervisor to be the same person as the reporter and provide for reports to be provided at four-monthly intervals rather than quarterly.

As Ms Leveridge had not worked as a social worker for four years, the panel considered that the personal development plan which she was to produce in conjunction with her supervisor should be of a more general nature, although, given the panel's findings, it should include her supervision of other members of staff or social work students.

As Ms Leveridge had already provided two reflective pieces as well as the reflections in her written submissions, and as these covered the issue of supervision, the panel did not consider that a further reflective piece was required.

As the issues of Ms Leveridge's continuing professional development and her supervision of others would be covered in her personal development plan and discussed and monitored in her meetings with her supervisor, the panel did not consider that it was necessary for the conditions to include specific requirements for those matters.

The panel considered that not including specific requirements regarding reflective pieces, continuing professional development and auditing of compliance with supervision policy would make the conditions more workable without reducing their effectiveness.

The panel also considered that including in the conditions a prohibition on Ms Leveridge working in a supervisory role would be disproportionately onerous for

Ms Leveridge for the reasons given by Mr Corrie and set out in paragraph 102 above.

In terms of duration, the panel considered that a conditions of practice order of 18 months duration would afford Ms Leveridge sufficient time make a secure return to social work and demonstrate that she has remedied the failings in her practice which led to the panel's finding of misconduct. At the same time, it would not be so long as to be unduly onerous.

FINAL ORDER: *that, for a period of 18 months, Ms Leveridge should comply with the following conditions of practice:*

- 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. At any time you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England:*
 - a. You must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by your employer and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England's register.*
 - b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.*
- 4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 4 months 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. At any time you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England:

a. You must place yourself and remain under the supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by your employer and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register and may be the same person as your reporter.

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

10. You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 4 months and at least 7 days prior to any review and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.

11. You must work with your workplace supervisor to formulate a personal development plan, which should include your compliance with the formal process of supervising other members of staff or social work students.

12. You must provide a written copy of these conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect (or at the time of the application, where you apply to any prospective employer or any locum, agency or out of hours service) to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at (1) to (11) 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;

c. any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary;

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.

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

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

Things which may assist the review panel

The panel considered that the panel which reviews the final conditions of practice order would be assisted by Ms Leveridge providing:

- evidence of any training which she has undertaken, in particular in the areas of her practice to which the panel's findings of misconduct relate, both since leaving her employment at the Council and since this hearing; and
- references and testimonials as to Ms Leveridge's character and abilities and about her efforts to address the failings in her practice which were identified in this hearing.

In line with the Guidance, in any references and testimonials which Ms Leveridge may provide, the authors should:

- state how they know Ms Leveridge and how long they have known her; and
- confirm their knowledge and awareness of the present fitness to practice proceedings against Ms Leveridge and the findings and outcome of this hearing.”

Social Work England submissions:

17. The panel noted the written submissions from Social Work England as outlined in the notice of hearing dated 30 March 2026:

“Social Work England invites the Panel to consider whether the fitness to practise of the Social Worker remains impaired. The Social Worker has not worked as a social worker since May 2020. She has worked in a voluntary capacity with a charity since August 2020 and has a positive and supportive reference from a senior member of staff in the organisation.

The Panel at the final hearing noted the progress the Social Worker had made and highlighted the insight they had seen from her. The Social Worker has since provided reflective pieces on 6 August 2025 and 10 February 2026 which, it is submitted, evidence further progress.

Pursuant to the recommendations of the previous review panel the Social Worker has not provided any updated references. She has, however, provided a certificate in respect of training undertaken in February 2026 focused on safeguarding children.

The Social Worker has engaged appropriately with the fitness to practise process throughout and continues to do so.

It is submitted that the Social Worker evidences some remediation, reflection and insight. It is a matter for the Panel as to whether they consider that the remediation, reflection and insight is such that they can find that the Social Worker's fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

In the event that the Panel concludes that the Social Worker is safe to return to unrestricted practice, Social Work England will invite the Panel to revoke the order with immediate effect.

In the event that the Panel determines that the Social Worker has not demonstrated sufficient remediation, reflection and insight Social Work England will invite the Panel to continue the Conditions of Practice Order for a further 6 months. The Panel may wish to make further recommendations as to what a future Panel would be assisted by”.

Social worker's written submissions:

18. Ms Leveridge acknowledged that the panel would have been assisted by her attendance at the hearing to answer any questions. However, she submitted that she would find it very difficult, hence why she had sought throughout this process to be as open and full as possible in her written submissions. Ms Leveridge stated that she intended no discourtesy in this regard and trusted that her written submissions would be sufficient.
19. Ms Leveridge in her written submissions confirmed that she had not obtained paid or unpaid employment as a social worker. Ms Leveridge stated that she fully acknowledged the finding of facts of the final hearing and has continued to comply with “what your services have identified as risk factors”. This included acknowledging the professional misconduct and the potential consequences this could have had on the individual child, their family, the community and the consequences towards the profession.
20. Ms Leveridge explained the impact it has had upon her family and her own wellbeing. Ms Leveridge stated that the ramifications of misconduct were huge, never go away and therefore she continues to reflect and work out different strategies and management tools around anxiety and wellbeing. Ms Leveridge acknowledged that she has to live with the fact that her actions potentially left children, who were identified as vulnerable, and who were placed in her care and responsibility, even more vulnerable.
21. Ms Leveridge concluded her submissions by stating that she continues to reflect by reading relevant material on child protection to enhance her understanding around misconduct and how the position that she held as a social work manager should be scrutinised by the ‘governing body’ in line with public interest. Ms Leveridge accepted that there is no excuse in where she finds herself and fully understands the panel's decision making. Ms Leveridge confirmed that she has recently undertaken training in child protection for which a certificate was provided. She directed the panel to the reference and testimonials provided for the previous review.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

22. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decisions of the previous panels. 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'.
23. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel, Social Work England's submissions, and documentation provided by Ms Leveridge, namely evidence of training, references and a reflective piece.
24. 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.
25. The panel reminded itself of its powers under Paragraph 15 of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018.
26. The panel also reminded itself of the importance of a review hearing, and it followed the sequence of decision making set out by Blake J in *Abrahaem v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 183*:
 - Address whether fitness to practise is impaired before considering the appropriate sanction.
 - Whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction.
 - In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision, or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments.
27. The panel had regard to the over-arching objective of protecting the public which involves the pursuit of the following objectives:
 - To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public.
 - To promote and maintain public confidence in the profession.
 - To promote and maintain proper professional standards of conduct for members of the profession.

28. The panel first considered whether Ms Leveridge's fitness to practise remains impaired. It kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment, and the panel considered whether Ms Leveridge had demonstrated that she had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the previous panels.
29. The panel acknowledged Ms Leveridge's participation and engagement throughout these proceedings. The panel also noted Ms Leveridge's compliance with the conditions of practice order to date, including a reading of Social Work England's Professional Standards 2019 and providing a written reflection focusing on how her conduct was below the accepted standard of a social worker and what she should have done differently. These were submitted on 06 August 2025 and 10 February 2026.
30. The purpose of the conditions of practice order was to allow Ms Leveridge to demonstrate compliance with the conditions, show reflection, insight and remediation. The panel concluded that overall, there had been compliance. Although, Ms Leveridge had not worked in a social work role since 2020 and therefore it had not been possible for Ms Leveridge to put this into practice and demonstrate how she would perform and do things differently if faced with a similar situation. However, the panel acknowledged that Ms Leveridge had been in a voluntary role, which appeared to have some similarities to the social work role, including work with vulnerable individuals. The panel therefore felt it was likely that Ms Leveridge would have been able to develop and continue using relevant skills.
31. The panel read the written reflections that Ms Leveridge submitted on 10 February 2026 and found her reflection to be very thoughtful and extremely remorseful. In her reflective piece, Ms Leveridge took full responsibility for her actions, acknowledged she was under pressure but did not seek to blame others. The panel's view was that Ms Leveridge had fully recognised the concerns and showed in-depth reflection and understanding and demonstrated what she had learnt or what she would do differently. Furthermore, Ms Leveridge had continued to keep up to date with her ongoing professional training and registration in order to continue developing her social work-related skills. The references provided were clearly in support of her. The panel were satisfied that Ms Leveridge's insight was complete.
32. The panel was satisfied that Ms Leveridge had discharged the persuasive burden upon her that she had sufficiently addressed all the outstanding concerns. The panel considered that the risk of repetition remained extremely low as Ms Leveridge's failings had been sufficiently remediated and therefore the risk to the public no longer remained.
33. Considering the continuing evidence of remediation, insight and reflection the panel concluded that a failure to find Ms Leveridge impaired would not undermine public confidence in the profession and the regulator. Nor would it undermine the maintaining of professional standards since Ms Leveridge's recent submissions and the reference and testimonies provided demonstrate that she adheres to these.

34. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Leveridge’s fitness to practise no longer remains impaired, having regard to both the personal and the public interest and revoke the order with immediate effect.

The Professional Standards Authority

35. 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>