



# Social worker: Shannon Shaw

## Registration number: SW131342

### Fitness to Practise

## Final Order Review meeting

Date of meeting: 15 June 2026

Meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:  
Suspension order (expiring 29 July 2026)

Meeting outcome:  
Impose a new order namely a removal order with effect from the expiry of the current order

### Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 2 years by the case examiners on 24 July 2024.
2. Ms Shaw 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:

<b>Adjudicators</b>	<b>Role</b>
Eileen Carr	Chair
Miriam Fagan	Social worker adjudicator

<b>Hearings team/Legal adviser</b>	<b>Role</b>
Ruby Wade	Hearings officer
Ellie Roberts	Hearings support officer
Nkem Omisa	Legal adviser

### Service of notice:

5. The panel was informed by a written submission on behalf of Social Work England that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Shaw by email to an address provided by Ms Shaw to the case examiner previously and their registered email address as it appears on the Social Work England register. Social Work England submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
6. The panel of adjudicators 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 13 May 2026 addressed to Ms Shaw at their email address which they provided to the case examiners.
7. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice. Having had regard to Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been properly served.

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

8. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser and considered the relevant factors, including Rule 43 of the Rules, the principles in R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5, GMC v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162, and Social Work England’s guidance Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker.

9. The panel noted that Ms Shaw had been sent notice of today's hearing and was aware of it. The panel noted the email from Ms Shaw dated 28 May 2026 which stated: "*I do not want any further contact from SWE, or for my name to be on the register.*" The panel decided that an adjournment would not secure her attendance.
10. The panel concluded that Ms Shaw had voluntarily absented herself. Having weighed her interests against the public interest in the expeditious disposal of regulatory proceedings, the panel determined that it was fair and appropriate to proceed in her absence.

### Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

11. The notice of final order review informed Ms Shaw 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 28 May 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.'*

12. No submissions were received by Ms Shaw.
13. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser regarding Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), which permits a review to proceed as a meeting where the social worker does not indicate an intention to attend.
14. The panel was satisfied that it was fair and appropriate to conduct the review as a meeting.

### Background:

15. The local authority alleged that Ms Shaw, whom they employed as an agency worker within children services, was dishonest about tasks they reported to have completed whilst working from home. The local authority terminated Ms Shaw's contract after 15 days.
16. [PRIVATE].
17. The concerns primarily related to two cases in which Ms Shaw recorded direct interventions, whilst working from home, that the local authority alleged did not take place.

### Review of the current order:

18. This final order review meeting is conducted 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).
19. The purpose of this review is to review the current suspension order, which is due to expire at the end of 29 July 2026.

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

20. The case examiners addressed regulatory concern 1 (in its entirety) as they relied upon its full evidence. The case examiners' decision (24 July 2024) found a realistic prospect of the following regulatory concerns being proven:

#### *Regulatory concern 1*

*Whilst registered as a social worker in or around May 2022, you:*

- 1.1) falsified contact records with service users.*
- 1.2) failed to complete the work required of you.*

#### *Regulatory concern 2*

*Your actions at 1.1 were dishonest.*

### The Case Examiners on 24 July 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:

21. The concerns amounted to misconduct.
22. The social worker's fitness to practise was impaired on both personal and public element.
23. A 2-year suspension order was the proportionate sanction.
24. On 17 July 2024, Ms Shaw provided a response and confirmed,  
  
*"I have read the case examiners' decision and accepted disposal guide. I admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that my fitness to practise is impaired. I understand the terms of the proposed disposal of my fitness to practise case and accept them in full."*
25. Ms Shaw recorded detailed case notes for contacts that did not occur, including a claimed 1 hour 23 minute call with Service User A and a lengthy phone/video call with Service User B and Child A.
26. Both service users contradicted these accounts.
27. Electronic audit data showed minimal case activity during the relevant period.

28. Ms Shaw denied dishonesty and provided limited insight.
29. There was no evidence of remediation.
30. Dishonesty is inherently serious and difficult to remediate.
31. There was a risk of repetition.
32. Public confidence required a finding of impairment.
33. The case examiners imposed a 2-year suspension order to allow time for reflection, remediation, and potential improvement in health.

**The Case Examiners on 24 July 2024 determined the following with regard to sanction:**

34. The case examiners considered taking ‘no action’. They concluded that due to the nature and seriousness of Ms Shaw’s alleged conduct had not been remediated, this sanction was not appropriate. Further, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, it would be inappropriate to take ‘no action’. It would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession.
35. The case examiners considered whether to issue an ‘advice or warning’. They noted that neither of these sanctions would restrict Ms Shaw’s ability to practise and, therefore, it is not appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety.
36. In relation to a warning, the case examiners had regard to paragraph 108 of the guidance, which reads, a warning order is likely to be appropriate where (all of the following):
  - The fitness to practise issues is isolated or limited
  - There is a low risk of repetition
  - The social worker has demonstrated insight
37. The case examiners did not consider that issuing advice or a warning would be sufficient to promote and protect public confidence in the profession. Such sanctions would not restrict the social worker’s practice; the case examiners have already identified that the risk of repetition remains.
38. The case examiners next considered a ‘conditions of practice order’ having consulted paragraph 114 of the guidance which states, 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

39. The case examiners acknowledged that Ms Shaw’s alleged conduct is not about their skill or performance as a social worker and considered that there are no identifiable areas of practice which might benefit from retraining. The matters subject of the concerns relates to dishonesty; and the social worker has not provided evidence of sufficient remediation or insight within the documentary evidence.

40. The case examiners noted that Ms Shaw has not renewed their professional registration due to ill health, and notified the regulator they are not in a social work role. Under these circumstances, remediation is unlikely.

41. The case examiners determined that they could not formulate conditions that would adequately address the risk posed by Ms Shaw that would protect service users, colleagues, and members of the public. Nor would conditions of practice address the public interest in this case.

42. The case examiners went on to consider whether a ‘suspension order’ might be an appropriate sanction and determined that the most appropriate sanction in this case was a suspension order.

43. The case examiners considered the guidance, which states:

*‘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’*

44. The guidance also states a suspension order may be appropriate where workable conditions cannot be formulated. In this instance, the case examiners considered the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards. They note that it is two years since the conduct took place, and that the social worker’s remediation remains incomplete.

45. On 18 January 2024, Ms Shaw informed the regulator, that they have chosen not to renew their registration, and explains that they have had to finish work due to their health and will not be returning to social work in the future.

46. Paragraph 144 of the ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’ states that there may be instances where a social worker does not intend to remediate or practise in the short term but may wish to do so later. [PRIVATE]. In this case, the case examiners

acknowledged that Ms Shaw had initially engaged in the fitness to practise process, however, subsequently appears to have disengaged. The reason for this is not clear, however, Ms Shaw's health may offer a possible explanation for this.

47. The case examiners considered that a suspension order may be an appropriate disposal of the fitness to practise case. A suspension order would provide an opportunity for Ms Shaw time to demonstrate insight into how their conduct may be viewed, and the potential impact of their actions upon people they may work with, or on the wider public affected by alleged dishonesty.
48. The case examiners acknowledged Ms Shaw's reported intentions of not returning to social work due to ill health. However, they considered that a suspension order will offer Ms Shaw an opportunity to provide evidence of improving insight and remediation at the review hearings should their health sufficiently recover, and they wish to return to social work in the future.
49. The case examiners considered that a suspension order of one-year may not afford Ms Shaw time to address any health matters. The case examiners considered that a suspension order for 2-years would be more achievable and a proportionate timescale to protect the public and the wider public interest. A prolonged suspension of 3-years duration is considered disproportionate and a risk of deskilling.
50. The case examiners next considered whether the next available sanction, a removal order would be appropriate and proportionate. Whilst the case examiners considered that a removal order may be considered appropriate due to the dishonesty and the lack of demonstrated insight and remediation, they considered that this would be a disproportionate outcome in this case, at this time. A suspension order is more proportionate given the reported health matters.

### Social Work England's submissions:

51. The panel read the written submissions from Social Work England as to the background and the case examiners' findings in relation to impairment and sanction.
52. They emphasised the following:

*“Social Work England submit that the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired and invite the panel consider imposing a removal order.*

*The social worker has had no engagement with Social Work England since the final order was made. Her case review officer has written to her on eight occasions since the final order was made but the social worker has not responded. There has been no evidence provided by the social worker to demonstrate insight, reflection and remediation.*

*The social worker's current circumstances are not known. The panel will be aware that the social worker indicated to the case examiners that she had health difficulties and did not intend to practise in the future. This position has not been*

*recently confirmed by the social worker and there is no update on her current health or future intent with respect to her registration.*

*[PRIVATE].*

*The social worker has not provided any evidence with respect to training, development or keeping her knowledge of social work up to date.*

*Social Work England submit that, after a period of 22 months without any response, there is a strong indication that the social worker remains unwilling or unable to remediate. The social worker will have 28 days from service of the notice of hearing for this review to update the regulator on her health and future intention, and if she wishes to remain on the register. In the absence of evidence of insight, reflection and remediation Social Work England submit that a removal order is now the appropriate sanction.”*

### Social worker’s submissions:

53. Ms Shaw did not attend and made no written submissions.

### Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

54. The panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It considered the case examiners’ decision but exercised its own independent judgement. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’.

55. The panel considered all the documentation before it, including the original decision and the written submissions from Social Work England. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser.

56. 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 to maintain public confidence in the profession.

57. The panel first considered whether Ms Shaw’s fitness to practise remains impaired. It noted that:

- Ms Shaw has not engaged with Social Work England since the suspension order was imposed.
- Ms Shaw has provided no reflective statement, no evidence of insight, and no remediation.
- Ms Shaw has not renewed her registration and previously indicated she does not intend to return to social work due to ill health.
- There is no evidence of training or steps taken to address the dishonesty findings.

58. Accordingly, given the absence of engagement and the seriousness of the original dishonesty allegation, the panel concluded that in light of the above, the risk of repetition remains. Therefore, the panel determined that Ms Shaw's fitness to practise remains impaired on both the personal and public components.

#### Decision and reasons:

59. Having found Ms Shaw'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 on the sanctions available to them.

60. The panel considered the written submissions made by Social Work England during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a removal order. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.

61. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Shaw, 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 Ms Shaw's interests with the public interest.

62. The panel considered the sanctions available to it, starting at the least restrictive sanction.

#### No further action, advice or warning:

63. The panel noted that none of these sanctions would restrict Ms Shaw's ability to practise. As such, they were not appropriate or sufficient to address the concerns raised due to the serious nature of Ms Shaw's misconduct and lack of any insight or remediation.

#### Conditions of practice order:

64. The panel considered the case examiners' reasons for not imposing a conditions of practice order and decided that nothing had changed and concluded that a conditions of practice order was not appropriate. In coming to this conclusion, it took into account that there was still a lack of engagement and also the serious nature of the case examiners' findings which Ms Shaw admitted. The panel was therefore not satisfied that appropriate or workable conditions could be formulated due to Ms Shaw's lack of engagement and dishonesty.

#### Suspension order:

65. The panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time and determined that it would not be appropriate to do so. The panel was satisfied that there remained serious ongoing concerns relating to insight, remediation and engagement, along with Ms Shaw's wish as set out in her email of 28

May 2026, not to practise as a social worker. The panel concluded that on this basis and without any evidence of ongoing health conditions, that a further period of suspension would not be appropriate.

#### Removal order:

66. The panel took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' and was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Ms Shaw'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).
67. The panel therefore went on to consider a removal order and concluded that no other outcome would be enough to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession, and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.
68. The 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.
69. The panel considered a removal order appropriate. In coming to this conclusion, the panel took account of the serious professional dishonesty in this case which could directly or indirectly put service users at serious risk of harm. It also took into account that Ms Shaw has been unwilling and/or unable to remediate and has stated that she does not wish to practise as a social worker in the future.
70. The panel therefore determined that a removal order be imposed and that Ms Shaw's name be removed from the Social Work England register.

#### Right of appeal:

71. 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.
72. 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.
73. 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.

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

### The Professional Standards Authority:

75. 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>.