

Social worker: Allan Hall  
Registration number: SW26089  
Fitness to Practise  
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of Hearing: 27 May 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:  
Suspension order (expiring 8 July 2026)

Hearing outcome:  
Extend the current suspension order for a further 6 months

## Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the third review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a panel of adjudicators on 12 June 2024. At the first review on 29 May 2025 the suspension order was extended for six months. At the second review on 25 November 2025 the suspension order was extended again for 6 months.
2. Mr Hall attended and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Mr Fred Batstone, case presenter from Capsticks LLP.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Timothy Skelton	Chair
Karen (Corrie) Biddle	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Poppy Muffett	Hearings officer
Raegan Kirkland	Hearings support officer
Ruksana Kosser	Legal adviser

## Review of the current order:

5. 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).
6. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 08 July 2026. The order subject to review is a suspension order.
7. The panel noted all the documentation presented in support of the final order review hearing, namely the hearing bundle (457 pages) and the service and supplementary bundles (15 pages).

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

*(5) Whilst working as a registered social worker and Operational Lead for your team for Coventry City Council December 2017 – April 2019 you failed to make and/or record decisions in a timely manner in that you,*

*(e) On or around 29 November 2018 failed to arrive at a timely decision as to what you thought should happen to Service User 5.*

*(f) On or about the 31 January 2019 and thereafter, failed to make a timely decision to report Child 2 as missing and/or escalate the case of Child 2 as a missing child to your line manager.*

*(6) On 16 March 2020 whilst working as an Independent Reviewing Officer for Gloucestershire County Council you used discriminatory and inappropriate language in relation to a young person's gender identity before, and/or during and/or after a looked after child review meeting, in that you,*

*(c) Made reference to your own church condemning transgender people as 'sinful.'*

*(7) Failed to provide Social Work England with your current and former employer details as requested on 15 June 2020.*

*(8) Between 3 March 2020 and 3 April 2020 your record keeping was inadequate in that you;*

*(a) Failed to record the minutes and decisions taken during three child review meetings that you chaired during the week of 3 – 10 March 2020 within the statutory timescale or at all.*

*(b) Failed to record the decisions taken for six out of seven child review meetings that you chaired during the week of 19 – 26 March 2020 within the statutory timescale.*

*(c) Failed to record the decisions taken for five child review meetings that you chaired during the week 27 March – 3 April 2020 within the statutory timescale.*

### **The final panel on the 12 June 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:**

8. The panel considered that Mr Hall's misconduct was capable of remediation. However, Mr Hall has failed to fully acknowledge both the impact or harm that his behaviour had upon service users and the wider public.
9. Despite making lengthy submissions before the panel, the panel considered that Mr Hall had failed to appropriately consider the risk of harm posed to service users by the allegations found proved.
10. The panel considered that Mr Hall's insight is embryonic and he has not fully acknowledged the extent of his failings.
11. The panel concluded that Mr Hall sought to minimise his role and deflect his responsibilities in relation to the allegations found proved. The panel accepts that Mr Hall perceived there to be inappropriate attitudes displayed towards him, which at

times he described as racism. Despite his significant experience in the profession, the panel noted that he failed to raise such issues as and when they occurred.

12. Despite making reference to reflecting upon the allegations, the panel considered Mr Hall has failed to provide tangible evidence of his reflections, which adequately address the risk of repetition. The reflective material Mr Hall relied upon is significantly outdated, dating back to 2020, and fails to correctly acknowledge the panel's findings.
13. Mr Hall, through his submissions, referred to the impact that matters have had upon him. However, whilst Mr Hall has apologised, the panel considered that he has not fully acknowledged the potential harm caused to child service users by his conduct, nor has he sufficiently addressed the panel on steps he would take to prevent such failures re-occurring in the future.
14. While Mr Hall engaged in the hearing process and was able to articulate certain matters that he would approach differently, the panel considered that both his current responses to the allegations found proved, and his past actions, demonstrate a failure to adhere to some professional standards. Further, his responses demonstrate a failure to understand many basic tenets of the Social Work profession.
15. While Mr Hall has shown some remorse for his actions, and referred to his apology, the panel considered that he has failed to demonstrate within his evidence an appropriate level of insight, at this time, into the seriousness of the allegations found proved and the potential risks to service users.
16. While the panel notes that there is potential for remediation in this case, the panel considered that Mr Hall's focus upon the actions of others and failure to understand the significance of his failures to adhere to professional standards, has hindered his ability to remediate fully.
17. Further, the panel concluded that Mr Hall has not sufficiently evidenced remediation, for example a demonstration of efforts on his part to retrain or specifically address the identified failings in his practice. While the panel noted that Mr Hall has engaged in CPD, the panel considered that the evidence of the CPD he has undertaken to date does not sufficiently address the failings identified. The panel considered that unfortunately the CPD undertaken was more generalised in nature.
18. The panel has information regarding Mr Hall's significant previous work history and is aware of his previous good character, which the panel has taken into account. The panel noted that it had no evidence before it in relation to any further training undertaken by Mr Hall. While the panel understands Mr Hall is currently restricted from working in a social work capacity, the panel considered that this should not have prevented Mr Hall from undertaking meaningful and focused training to address the concerns raised.
19. The panel noted that the majority of the testimonials placed before it, do not acknowledge that the persons providing the testimonial are aware of the current proceedings. As such the panel considered that these testimonials had limited weight.

The panel noted that some testimonials were either from family or related to unrelated matters.

20. The panel considered that Mr Hall had not demonstrated sufficient remediation or insight. Mr Hall's conduct placed child service users at risk of harm. His misconduct related to failings in his core obligations as a social worker. The panel considered that Mr Hall's conduct amounted to a breach of a fundamental tenet of the profession. Due to these findings, together with an absence of evidenced remediation and embryonic insight, the panel concluded that there was a risk of repetition of the misconduct.
21. The panel was satisfied that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the public, particularly service users. Further, the panel considered that reasonable, well informed, members of the public would be concerned about Mr Hall's conduct and the potential consequences of his failings. The panel therefore concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to maintain and promote public confidence in the social work profession.
22. The panel was satisfied that professional standards would not be promoted and maintained by a finding that Mr Hall's fitness to practise is not currently impaired, particularly considering the panel's assessment of his embryonic insight and limited remediation.
23. The panel therefore concluded that, because of Mr Hall's misconduct, a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the public, promote and maintain public confidence in the social work profession and declare and uphold proper professional standards.
24. [PRIVATE]
25. [PRIVATE]
26. The panel noted the conclusions set out above in respect of risk and noted that Mr Hall has demonstrated a failure to understand many basic tenets of the profession. The panel concluded that this in turn presented a risk of harm to members of the public.
27. [PRIVATE]. The panel therefore concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to maintain and promote public confidence in the social work profession.
28. Given that Mr Hall is [PRIVATE], and this relates to some of the findings made by the panel, the panel was satisfied that professional standards would not be promoted and maintained by a finding that Mr Hall's fitness to practise in this regard is not currently impaired.
29. In conclusion, for the above reasons the panel consider that Mr Hall's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal element and the wider public interest element.

The final hearing panel on the 12 June 2024 determined the following with regard to sanction:

30. The panel considered that taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not adequately reflect the serious nature of Mr Hall's misconduct. These outcomes would not adequately protect the public, as they would not restrict Mr Hall's practice. The panel has assessed there to be a risk of repetition, and so considered that the public could not currently be adequately protected unless Mr Hall's practice is restricted.
31. Further, taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not maintain public confidence in the profession or promote proper professional standards, considering the panel's finding that Mr Hall breached fundamental tenets of the profession and put child service users at a risk of harm.
32. The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be sufficient to protect the public and wider public interest. The panel, however, noted paragraph 114 and 128 of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, which states:

*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*

33. [PRIVATE]

34. The panel went on to consider making a suspension order. The panel considered paragraphs 137 -138 of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, which state as follows:

*"137. Suspension may be appropriate where (all of the following):*

- *the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards*
- *the social worker has demonstrated some insight*
- *there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings"*

*138. Suspension is likely to be unsuitable in circumstances where (both of the following):*

- *the social worker has not demonstrated any insight and remediation*
- *there is limited evidence to suggest they are willing (or able) to resolve or remediate their failings”*

35. The panel noted that all of the conditions set out in paragraph 137 were present. The panel considered that while the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards, Mr Hall’s insight was developing and there was evidence that he was willing and able to resolve or remediate his failings.

36. The panel noted that Mr Hall has had a long and unblemished career and the panel considered that Mr Hall ought to be provided an opportunity to remedy his failings and reflect upon his practice.

37. The panel considered paragraph 148 of the SG, which states:

*“148. A removal order must be made where the decision makers conclude that no other outcome would be enough to (do one or more of the following):*

- *protect the public*
- *maintain confidence in the profession*
- *maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England”*

38. The panel considered that a removal order in the present case would not be proportionate. Mr Hall has demonstration of some, albeit emerging, insight and has demonstrated to the panel a willingness to reflect upon his practice.

39. The panel determined that this was not a case in which no other outcome would be enough to either protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession or maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.

40. The panel considered that a removal order would remove an experienced practitioner from the workplace, in circumstances where there is clear potential for Mr Hall to remediate the concerns.

41. The panel therefore determined that the most appropriate sanction in this case was a suspension order.

42. Having determined that a suspension order ought to be imposed, the panel went on to consider the length of such an order. The panel concluded that a 12-month order ought to be imposed.

43. The panel noted that 12 months was a sufficient period to mark the seriousness of the concerns but also would provide Mr Hall with sufficient time to begin the remediation process and develop his insight. The panel therefore considered that 12 months was an appropriate and proportionate length for the suspension order.

44. The panel recognised the impact a 12-month suspension order would have on Mr Hall and took this into account. However, it considered the public interest outweighed Mr Hall’s interests. The panel therefore concluded that the only sanction which achieved the aim of public protection in all three limbs was a 12-month suspension order, with no lesser sanction being sufficient.
45. This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, should Mr Hall choose to engage at a future date, a future reviewing panel would expect Mr Hall to attend the review hearing. It would be of assistance to that panel if he was able to provide evidence that he has undertaken steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. The panel suggested a further reviewing panel may wish to see the following information:
- A reflective piece focusing on his failings found proved preferably using a recognised reflective tool such as Gibbs reflective cycle or an equivalent;
  - Current testimonials and character evidence, which demonstrate that the persons providing such evidence are aware of the concerns found proved;
  - Evidence of learning self-directive or otherwise on a course;
  - Evidence of relevant CPD.

### Social Work England submissions:

46. The panel noted the written submissions from Social Work England as outlined in the notice of hearing dated 27 April 2026:

*“Social Work England invite the panel to find that the social worker’s fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of the concerns found proven by the panel at the final hearing. There has been no further evidence of remediation since the last review and no evidence to support that recommendations of the previous review panel have been followed.*

*Although the social worker engaged with the Social Work England case review team prior to the previous review hearing he appears to have disengaged since that hearing. Correspondence from the case review team has gone unanswered. This is concerning given the progress that the social worker demonstrated that he was previously making. It is submitted that the failure to engage further is a backward step.*

*The previous panel indicated that a future panel may be assisted by:*

- i. Seeking testimonials from colleagues who were fully appraised of and had had sight of the initial findings, and which speak to the issues such as conduct, professionalism, record keeping, engagement with the public and/ or equality and diversity, would be of assistance,*
- ii. [PRIVATE]*

iii. *Continued evidence of remediation, training courses to keep the social worker's social work practice, skills and knowledge up to date, and training specifically related to equalities, diversity and inclusion in order to offer assurance to a future panel that the risk of inappropriate comments was diminished.*

iv. *[PRIVATE]*

*There is, as matters stand, no testimonial or reference evidence which could enable the social worker to demonstrate his ability to put any previous learning and reflection into action. Social Work England invites the panel to find that the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired. He has not demonstrated that he has developed sufficient insight and remediated sufficiently to reduce the risk of repetition. He remains, it is submitted, a risk to the public. Insofar as the wider public interest is concerned, it is submitted that the social worker remains impaired on the basis that an informed member of the public would, in the circumstances, be surprised to learn there was no restriction to his practice whilst he remains [PRIVATE].*

*[PRIVATE]. It is therefore submitted that, at the third final order review it is now appropriate for the panel to consider a removal order. Social Work England will review their position should the social worker provide further evidence prior to the review'.*

47. Mr Batstone supplemented Social Work England's written submissions with the following oral submissions:
48. Mr Batstone outlined the background and the 2024 and June 2025 panels' findings in relation to impairment and sanction. Mr Batstone stated that not all of the allegations were found proved, and of the allegations found proved, not all of them amounted to misconduct.
49. Mr Batstone stated that since the last review there has been a lack of engagement from Mr Hall and he has failed to respond to correspondence sent out to him. Furthermore, Mr Hall has not fully complied with the recommendations as suggested by the previous panel and Mr Hall only provided his evidence this morning. Mr Batstone noted that most of the documents had already been submitted previously and the only new documents related to a CPD training on Equality and Diversity and a limited update on [PRIVATE].
50. Mr Batstone submitted that there is no evidence of Mr Hall undertaking training relevant to social work practice or in respect of the concerns set out in the facts upon which his practice was found to be impaired. In particular there is no evidence of adequate record keeping or an ability to make decisions within a timely manner.
51. Mr Batstone invited the panel to consider that there is an absence of testimonial or character evidence from individuals who are aware of the findings made against Mr Hall. Mr Batstone stated that there is limited evidence of remediation, and this demonstrates that Mr Hall has failed to comprehend what was expected of him, by not

presenting any meaningful evidence to show that he has complied with any of the recommendations made by the previous panel.

52. Mr Batstone invited the panel to find that Mr Hall's fitness to practice remains impaired according to the personal impairment test, due to his lack of engagement and that Mr Hall has not demonstrated that he has developed sufficient insight and remediated sufficiently to reduce the risk of repetition.
53. Insofar as the wider public interest is concerned, Mr Batstone submitted that Mr Hall remains impaired on the basis that an informed member of the public would, in the circumstances, be surprised to learn there was no restriction to his practice.
54. Mr Batstone submitted that due to Mr Hall's lack of engagement, insight and reflection he remains a risk to the public and invited the panel to impose a removal order. Mr Batstone submitted that despite Mr Hall attending today and presenting some evidence, the fact remains that [PRIVATE] coupled with the absence of any real evidence of remediation specifically targeted towards the wider concerns, it appears that Mr Hall is unwilling or unable to remediate. The Social Work England position remains that a taking into account all the above that a removal order is the appropriate order.
55. However, it is a matter for the panel as to whether the information provided by Mr Hall is sufficient to satisfy them that it addresses the concerns and whether Mr Hall should be given another opportunity to comply. Mr Batstone stated that if the panel was to give another chance to Mr Hall, then Social Work England would invite the panel to impose a suspension order in the interim as it remains necessary and proportionate in the wider public interest in promoting proper professional standards and maintaining public confidence in the profession.

### Social worker submissions:

56. Mr Hall chose not to give evidence but made the following submissions:
57. Mr Hall stated that in relation to the matters where the allegation had been found against him; he had taken these findings on board. He submitted that he had undertaken a detailed range of CPD in order to support his return to social work practice. This involved him engaging in some self-directed learning, reading and reflection about the importance of a variety of social work-related matters. Mr Hall stated that he had also reflected on the difficulties that he had experienced in relation to record keeping.
58. Mr Hall stated that the concerns arose from isolated errors within his practice, and within the context of stress and concerns about management style and lots of other issues. That it was uncharacteristic of his behaviour and that he had practiced as a social worker for many years in different capacities, including as a senior manager, and that past behaviour is indicative of future behaviour. Mr Hall stated however that he understood his failings and had undertaken detailed reflection on these as evidence by the reflective practice document before the panel.

59. Mr Hall maintained that it is evident that he has learnt from this experience, stating that this is personal – it involves remorse, suffering, and shame. Mr Hall invited the panel to note the impact that the proceedings had had on him emotionally and financially and that he had not been able to work as a social worker for a number of years. He was currently working as a vehicle recovery driver, where he is very focussed on delivering excellent customer service which is a transferable skill he could bring to social work.
60. Mr Hall stated that he has reflected upon the finding relating to the comments made by him. He considers these may have been misconstrued but nonetheless has reflected carefully on the findings and considers that he has learnt from these findings and would not repeat this in the future if he is permitted to return to work as a social worker.
61. [PRIVATE]
62. Mr Hall disagreed that he continued to pose a risk and asserted that he has demonstrated remediation, stating that he considered there to be sufficient information before the panel today and that he is therefore opposed to the application made by Social Work England for the removal order.

### Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

63. 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 previous panels. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
64. The panel had regard to all the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Mr Batstone on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr Hall.
65. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser, which it incorporated into the decision set out below.
66. 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.
67. The panel reminded itself of its powers under Paragraph 15 of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018.
68. 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.
69. 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.
70. The panel first considered whether Mr Hall's fitness to practise remains impaired. It kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment, and the panel considered whether Mr Hall had demonstrated that he had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the previous panels.
71. The panel considered Mr Hall's participation and engagement since the last review. The panel noted that since then Mr Hall had disengaged with Social Work England. The only contact recorded since the last review was an email sent by Mr Hall on 13 May 2026 to confirm his attendance for today's hearing. A further email was sent on 18 May 2026 in which Mr Hall confirmed that he would not be providing written submissions but would be making oral submissions. The panel expressed concern that Mr Hall only submitted his evidence this morning for the panel to consider, despite being told to submit it prior to the hearing taking place.
72. The panel next considered the extent to which Mr Hall has acted upon the recommendations of the previous panel as to what might assist a future reviewing panel. The panel noted that since the last review Mr Hall has only undertaken CPD training in relation to Equality and Diversity. The panel also noted that Mr Hall had not been able to provide any new testimonials from people in a professional capacity who had been appraised of the previous panel findings and who had been able to comment as to whether Mr Hall had remediated or shown increased insight into the findings made regarding his fitness to practise.
73. [PRIVATE]
74. The panel were not satisfied that Mr Hall had taken the necessary steps to address the concerns, as he had disengaged with Social Work England and provided very limited evidence of reflection, insight or remediation since the last review. There was limited

evidence to show that Mr Hall had acted upon the recommendations of the previous panel as to what might assist a future reviewing panel.

75. The panel, therefore, concluded that Mr Hall's fitness to practice remained impaired on the personal and public elements.

### Decision and reasons

76. Having found Mr Hall's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to the submissions made along with all the information and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.
77. The panel considered the submissions made by Mr Batstone, on behalf of Social Work England, during which he invited the panel to consider imposing a removal order and Mr Halls submissions. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
78. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Hall, 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 Hall's interests with the public interest.

### Take no further action/advice/warning

79. The panel noted that none of these sanctions would restrict Mr Hall's ability to practise. As such they were not appropriate or sufficient to address the concerns raised due to the nature of Mr Hall's impairment which has not yet been demonstrably remedied.

### Conditions of practice order

80. The panel considered that the lack of engagement since the last review by Mr Hall demonstrated that deficiencies identified with Mr Hall's practice still exist. The panel were not satisfied that appropriate, workable conditions could be formulated at this stage or that this would be the appropriate decision for a panel to make today as there continues to be concerns about Mr Hall's ability to demonstrate full insight and evidence remediation. Furthermore, some of the concerns relate to Mr Hall's behaviour and attitude, particularly in the way he communicated with service users. This type of misconduct is more difficult to remediate by means of conditions of practice. In summary, due to the lack of engagement since the last review, the panel were not satisfied that Mr Hall would comply with any conditions.

### Suspension order

81. The panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time and determined that it would be appropriate to do so. The panel

was satisfied that there remain serious ongoing concerns relating to insight, evidence of remediation and engagement in relevant training.

82. A suspension order would prevent Mr Hall from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest. A suspension order would give Mr Hall the opportunity to demonstrate to a future panel that he is capable of remediation, through evidencing insight, reflection and training. Having determined that a suspension order ought to be imposed, the panel went on to consider the length of such an order. The panel concluded that a further 6 month order ought to be imposed.
83. The panel noted that a further 6 months would provide Mr Hall with sufficient time to continue the remediation process and further develop his insight. [PRIVATE].
84. The panel recognised the impact a further 6-month suspension order would have on Mr Hall and took this into account. However, it considered the public interest outweighed Mr Hall's interests. This panel therefore concluded that the only sanction which achieved the aim of public protection in all three limbs was a further 6-month suspension order.
85. The panel agreed with the previous panel's recommendations to Mr Hall regarding any future reviews. However, the panel made it clear that Mr Hall should start planning immediately for the next review, to be able to demonstrate that he can plan, organise and address all the outstanding concerns identified. The panel agreed that a future reviewing panel would find it helpful for Mr Hall to attend a future review hearing and it would be of assistance to a future panel if Mr Hall were able to provide evidence that he had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. The panel stressed that these should be submitted prior to any future review hearing. This may include:
  - Testimonials from social work qualified colleagues who have practiced with, or managed Mr Hall during his lengthy career prior to the substantive hearing. Mr Hall's insight into the current concerns raised would need to be shared with the author in order that they can give pertinent information regarding his ability to remediate the misconduct.
  - Testimonials from Mr Hall's current employment that can speak to the appropriateness of current behaviours towards colleagues.
  - Panels have seen a large amount of evidence regarding Mr Hall's ability to link theory to practice. A review panel requires CPD that reflects on each of the individual findings and focuses on the potential impact of Mr Hall's practice for that particular child, family or colleague. We urge Mr Hall to consider the impact of his actions from the child's or other person's perspective. How could his action or inaction have impacted on their daily lived experience? Mr Hall may wish to use Gibbs as a framework.

- A review panel requires evidence that Mr Hall is maintaining his social work knowledge by keeping up to date with national practice developments in the profession. The aim would be to support his return to practice should that be the eventual outcome of these proceedings.
- A number of the findings relate to timeliness, decision making, observance of processes and recording. Mr Halls submitted CPD which details at length steps he will take to address these issues. Yet today, documents were submitted to the panel late, when Mr Hall had informed Social Work England that only oral submissions would be made. The submissions made today did not address the requests of the previous panel and Mr Hall did not observe process by submitting in a timely way. We invite Mr Hall to demonstrate to the next review panel that the changes he proposed to make in his CPD are put into practice in the way that he approaches the creation of CPD, testimonials, attendance and submissions for the next review panel.

### Removal order

86. The panel was satisfied that it could consider a removal order as Mr Hall's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of one or more grounds as set out in regulation 25(2)(a), (c), (d), (f) or (g). The panel gave serious consideration to imposing a Removal order.
87. This panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest. This panel took the view that Mr Hall was very close to being made subject to a removal order today. However, after some very serious considerations the panel determined that it would not impose it because Mr Hall has demonstrated some, albeit limited insight and has demonstrated to the panel a willingness to reflect upon his practice and therefore were prepared to give Mr Hall an opportunity to demonstrate to a future panel that he can remediate.

### Right of appeal:

88. 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.

89. 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.
90. 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.
91. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

### Review of final orders:

92. 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).
93. 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

94. 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>