



Social worker: Tina Goodby Registration number: SW72869 Fitness to Practise Final Order Review Hearing

Date of Hearing: 18 August 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed: Conditions of practice order (expiring 28 September 2026)

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

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final conditions of practice order under paragraph 15(2) of schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”) originally imposed after agreed disposal for a period of 12 months by case examiners on behalf of Social Work England on 24 September 2025.
2. Ms Goodby attended and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by in house case presenter, Ms Khan.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Eileen Carr	Chair
Stuart Entwistle	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Evie Mosley	Hearings officer
Heather Hibbins	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 conditions of practice order which came into effect on the 29 September 2025 for a period of 12 months, and which is due to expire on the 28 September 2026.
7. The panel noted all the documentation presented in support of the final order review hearing, namely the hearing bundle (88 pages) and the service and supplementary bundles (67 pages).

The concerns which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

8. As recorded in a final decision dated 24 September 2025, case examiners appointed by Social Work England determined that there was a realistic prospect that adjudicators would determine that Ms Goodby’s fitness to practise was impaired on the grounds of misconduct on the basis of the following regulatory concerns:
9. Whilst registered as a social worker between November 2021 and August 2022 you:
 - i. Did not maintain a professional relationship with Person A, when you:

- a. Remained in regular contact with Person A without professional reason to do so.
 - b. Remained in contact with Person A against management direction.
 - c. Disclosed to Person A that you were being investigated for being too close to them; Offered to take a letter and/or deliver a present to Person A's children on Person A's behalf.
 - d. Informed Person A that you were aware that they made a serious allegation against you to other professionals.
- ii. Did not maintain accurate and up to date records in relation to Person A.
10. The case examiners also determined that it was not in the public interest to refer the case to a final hearing and proposed to dispose of the case by making a twelve-month conditions of practice order in respect of Ms Goodby.
11. Ms Goodby consented to that proposed disposal on 15 July 2025.
12. The case was returned to the case examiners on 24 September 2025. The case examiners determined to accept Ms Goodby's response. The case examiners remained satisfied that an accepted disposal by way of a condition of practice order for 12 months, was a fair and proportionate disposal and was the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The case examiner on the 24 September 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

Personal Impairment:

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

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied: The maintenance of professional boundaries is an essential tenet of social work practice. Such conduct could be remediated by further reflection and specific training on professional boundaries. They could also be remediated by further education and training on managing people with complex personality disorders, mental health needs and offending behaviours. This could be reinforced (in the future) via robust structures of supervision and caseload management.

Insight and remediation: The social worker appears to be developing insight into the matters which caused problems in the management of Person A. They accept their failings together with most of the regulatory concerns. They recognise the importance of additional peer reflection. While they dispute

current impairment, their submissions appear to acknowledge that they may have been impaired at the time of these concerns.

For the 2.5 years that the social worker has been away from practice, they have engaged in further support; [PRIVATE].

With respect to specific professional remediation, this appears to the case examiners to have been more limited. The social worker has been away from frontline practice for 2.5 years; however, they do work in an allied discipline for the same Council. The social worker states that they have completed various continuing professional development (CPD) activities but has not provided any specific detail or evidence of this, stating that they don't have any 'practice type' evidence available. The case examiners have reviewed the reflective CPD which was submitted to Social Work England as part of the social worker's ongoing registration requirements. While this serves to demonstrate some insight, it does not demonstrate evidence of current practice proficiency, or evidence any recent professional updates in their knowledge.

Risk of repetition: Considering the lack of available CPD, or recent practice experience, endorsed by positive professional testimonies, or any further professional training, the case examiners are unable to be confident that any future risk of repetition would be low, should the social worker choose to return to practise.

Public Impairment:

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

The case examiners consider that a fully informed member of the public would be concerned to learn of these professional practice concerns. While they are historical in nature, such a member of the public would be very concerned to learn how the alleged behaviours of the social worker became so enmeshed with the life of a service user; this was to the extent that there was a risk of potential harm. Such member of the public would be keen to ensure that professional standards were maintained in the future, to ensure confidence in the social work profession. The case examiners conclude a realistic prospect of the adjudicators making a finding of impairment.

The case examiner on the 24 September 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

In determining the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case, the case examiners considered the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness.

No further action: The case examiners considered taking no further action. However, the case examiners considered that this would not be appropriate in this instance because they are not satisfied that a finding of impairment alone would protect the wider public interest. Furthermore, the case examiners have concluded there is a lack of remediation, and therefore some restriction to practice may be necessary.

Advice or Warning: The case examiners next considered whether offering advice or a warning would be sufficient. Advice will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings. The case examiners believe that issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they view the alleged misconduct, and again it would not adequately protect the public. A warning order implies a clearer expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct than an advice order. However, the case examiners are not satisfied that a warning order would send a strong enough message to the social worker, and particularly, the wider social work profession. Furthermore, a warning order is not likely to be appropriate where there is a risk of repetition, and again it would not adequately protect the public.

Conditions of practice: The case examiners then considered a conditions of practice order. The case examiners consulted their guidance, which states conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where (all 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.*

Whilst the social worker has insight, the case examiners note the social worker has not had an opportunity to apply this to their practice. They have shown some good reflection into the circumstances of the case, and conditions of practice could offer an opportunity to develop this via the provision of effective structures of supervision and support. The case examiners are of the view that workable conditions can be formulated that would support the social worker to develop the requisite practice skills to remediate their practice. Additionally, the order is subject to review, which can be extended or replaced with a different order if necessary.

Having concluded that a conditions of practice order is the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners went on to consider the length of time for the order. The case examiners consider that 12 months would allow the social worker sufficient time to demonstrate strengthened practice within an appropriate appraisal cycle. It would also be the minimum and least restrictive period necessary to allow the social worker to demonstrate that they are able to practice without further restriction. They consider that any longer period, given that some insight already been demonstrated, would be unnecessary and punitive.

Suspension or Removal Order: The case examiners went on to test the suitability of the conditions of practice order by considering the more severe sanctions, a suspension order and a removal order. Having considered their guidance, the case examiners did not consider these orders to be proportionate. Although, the concerns are serious, the case examiners consider that the public can be protected with an appropriate conditions of practice order.

To conclude, the case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a conditions of practice order of 12 months' duration. They will now notify the social worker of their intention and seek the social worker's agreement to dispose of the matter accordingly. The social worker will be offered 28 days to respond. If the social worker does not agree, or if the case examiners revise their decision regarding the public interest in this case, the matter will proceed to a final hearing.

Social Work England submissions:

13. The panel noted the written submissions from Social Work England as outlined in the notice of hearing dated 9 July 2026:

"Subject to any further evidence of remediation received prior to the review, Social Work England invites the reviewing Panel to extend and vary the current Conditions of Practice Order by a period of 12 months on the basis that the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The social worker has complied with the conditions in so far as they have been in effect. The social worker has submitted a reflective piece (not required as part of her conditions of practice) in which she demonstrates some insight into the impact of breaching professional boundaries. The social worker explained the consequences of her actions and recognised the impact upon the service user and their professional practice. However, they have only reflected on how they could implement their reflections in relation to their current non-social work role which does not address the risk of repetition should they resume social work registered practice. Additionally, the reflective piece lacks direct reference to

working with people with mental health needs, including complex mental health, and those with offending behaviours as specified by the Case examiners.

Similarly, whilst the social worker's SMART outcomes plan addresses the three areas stipulated by condition 10, this has not been formulated with their reporter and cannot address the shortfalls in the social worker's practice as they are not in a social work role. The social worker has also not provided professionally evidenced CPD which the Case examiners recommended. Additionally, their yearly appraisal does not link directly to the practice concerns raised and is not written by a supervisor or manager.

Social Work England therefore submits that the need for further learning and reflection remains. The social worker has stated that they are content in their current role and do not intend to pursue a social work role however, they wish to retain their Social Work England registration. It is therefore submitted that a variation to the current conditions of practice is required to afford the social worker an opportunity to demonstrate their insight and remediation whilst remaining outside the social work profession.

In light of this, Social Work England submits that condition 11 should be removed and condition 10 requiring the social worker to create a personal development plan is replaced with 10 hours of CPD focussed on the same three areas identified. It is also submitted that Condition 12d is varied to bring the conditions in line with the updated Conditions Bank. A copy of the proposed Conditions has been enclosed with this notice. Social Work England also invites the Panel to make recommendations for the social worker to assist their remediation and return to unrestricted practice. It is submitted that an updated reflective piece which focusses upon reflections regarding future social work practice and additional focus on working with people with complex mental health needs and offending behaviours would demonstrate full and effective insight. Additionally, testimonials from the social worker's employer that refer to the practice concerns would assist in demonstrating remediation.

A Conditions of Practice Order continues to be the necessary and proportionate order to assist the social worker in demonstrating adequate insight and remediation. On the information available to Social Work England at the point of drafting the Notice of Hearing, they invite the panel to find that although there has been some progress since the last review, due to the circumstances outlined above, the Social Worker's fitness to practise remains impaired.

It is submitted that a further twelve-month period of varied conditions would allow the social worker reasonable time to provide evidence of targeted CPD,

updated reflections focusing on social work practice and, relevant testimonials from their current employer to demonstrate their insight and remediation. Social Work England invite the Panel to extend and vary the Conditions of Practice Order for a further period of twelve months.”

14. Ms Khan supplemented Social Work England’s written submissions with the following oral submissions:
15. Ms Khan reaffirmed that upon further evidence submitted by Ms Goodby that Social Work England maintained their position to seek an extension and variation of the current conditions of practice order.
16. Ms Khan outlined the background and the Case Examiner’s findings in relation to impairment and sanction.
17. Ms Khan acknowledged that Ms Goodby had complied with the conditions in so far as they had been in effect. However, she noted that Ms Goodby has been working a non-social work role, did not wish to return to a social work role but wished to retain her registration.
18. Ms Khan submitted that Ms Goodby demonstrated some insight into the impact of breaching professional boundaries by explaining the consequences of her actions and recognising the impact it had on service users. However, Ms Khan submitted that Ms Goodby only reflected on how she could implement her reflections in relation to her current non-social work role which did not address the risk of repetition should she resume social work practice. Additionally, that the reflective piece lacked direct reference to working with people with mental health needs including complex mental health needs and offending behaviours which was specifically noted by the case examiners.
19. Ms Khan submitted that although Ms Goodby had provided evidence of her learning between 2008 and 2026 there was no evidence of professional CPD which the case examiners recommended. Ms Khan submitted that the record of learning submitted by Ms Goodby for the period of 2024 to 2026 was not relevant to the concerns raised. Furthermore, that the yearly appraisal submitted by Ms Goodby also did not directly link to the concerns raised and although it was approved by her manager the majority of the report was completed by Ms Goodby.
20. Ms Khan submitted that the need for learning, reflection and demonstration of safe practice remained and that the current Conditions of Practice Order continues to be necessary and is just and proportionate way to ensure a safe return to practice.
21. Ms Khan submitted that a further period of conditions would allow Ms Goodby a reasonable period to show further remediation, that conditions can be adhered to and Ms Goodby’s ability to manage a stressful work environment can be demonstrated in practice.

22. Ms Khan invited the panel to find that Ms Goodby's fitness to practice remained impaired and to vary and extend the conditions of practice order for a period of 12 months.

Social Worker's submissions

23. The panel noted the written submissions made by Ms Goodby dated 23 July 2026:

"I have been a qualified Social Worker since 2008 and, throughout my career, I have had no previous concerns regarding my fitness to practise. This matter relates to a single episode and does not reflect my wider professional conduct, values or practice history. I have worked for Stoke-on-Trent City Council for 37 years and currently hold a permanent management position as Adult Brokerage Team Manager within Adult Social Care. Although I have not worked in a frontline social work role since the incident, I have remained fully engaged within adult social care and continue to work closely with social work professionals on a daily basis.

My current role involves leading a team that supports adults aged 18 and over, working collaboratively with practitioners, commissioning colleagues, providers and partner organisations to achieve positive outcomes for individuals and communities. I regularly contribute to professional discussions, provide advice regarding commissioned services, support creative and person-centred approaches to meeting needs and assist colleagues in navigating complex situations.

Throughout my career I have been committed to the core values of social work and public service. My practice is underpinned by the values and behaviours of Stoke-on-Trent City Council, including being community focused, compassionate, accountable, collaborative and committed to achieving the best possible outcomes for local people.

Maintaining my Social Work registration remains important to me. Although I have no immediate intention to return to frontline practice, my registration enables me to continue contributing social work knowledge, professional values and expertise within my leadership role and supports my ongoing professional development.

In accordance with Social Work England's impairment and sanctions guidance, I have engaged fully, openly and honestly throughout this fitness to practise process. From the outset, I accepted that my fitness to practise was impaired at the time of the incident and I have maintained that position consistently throughout the investigation.

I have never sought to minimise my actions or avoid responsibility. I fully acknowledge that professional boundaries became blurred during my involvement with an adult who had highly complex mental health needs. Whilst there were mitigating circumstances, including significant workplace pressures, the challenges of managing a busy team, limited supervisory support and working with an individual whose presentation was particularly complex, I recognise that these factors do not excuse my actions. Ultimately, I am responsible for my own professional conduct and judgement.

At the time, I believed that my approach was helping to reduce conflict and achieve positive outcomes where previous interventions had been unsuccessful. However, through reflection and hindsight, I now understand that my judgement was impaired and that professional boundaries were crossed. I recognise that this fell below the standards expected of a registered Social

Worker and had the potential to undermine public confidence in the profession. Throughout these proceedings I have undertaken extensive reflection regarding the circumstances leading to the incident, the impact of my actions, and what I would do differently in the future. I have identified practical safeguards that I would now implement, including:

- Maintaining clear professional boundaries at all times.*
- Seeking early management oversight and supervision when faced with particularly complex situations.*
- Ensuring professional decisions are subject to appropriate challenge and scrutiny.*
- Recognising personal vulnerabilities and pressures that may affect professional judgement.*
- Maintaining robust recording and accountability processes.*
- Escalating concerns promptly and accessing support when required.*

As part of my remediation, I have actively engaged in professional development activities focused on professional boundaries and safe practice. This has included reading professional resources and attending webinars relating to:

- Professional boundaries in social work.*
- Managing professional relationships.*
- The importance of maintaining professional curiosity and accountability.*

- The "3 Ps of Professional Practice."
- National Safeguarding Adults Week learning relating to professional boundaries.

In addition, I have undertaken [PRIVATE] and strengthen my emotional resilience and self-awareness. This process has enabled me to develop a deeper understanding of the circumstances that contributed to my decision-making at the time and has further strengthened my insight into professional boundaries and ethical practice.

I have also continued to maintain my Social Work registration and undertake continuing professional development throughout this period. Furthermore, I have recently enrolled on the Future Stoke Leadership and Management Development Programme, an 18-month programme delivered in partnership with The Leadership Centre. This programme is supporting my development as a public service leader and strengthening my ability to lead ethically and effectively within complex systems.

Importantly, since the incident, there have been no further concerns raised regarding my conduct, competence or professionalism. I have continued to work responsibly and effectively within Adult Social Care and remain actively involved in supporting colleagues, adults and families through my leadership role.

My ongoing work alongside social workers, participation in peer discussions, and support to practitioners in managing complex cases demonstrate that I continue to uphold social work values and contribute positively to professional practice. I believe my actions since the incident demonstrate genuine remediation, insight and a commitment to maintaining the standards expected of a registered Social Worker. I also wish to express my sincere apology for my actions and for the consequences arising from them. I recognise the potential impact of my behaviour on public confidence in the profession, on the individual concerned and on the reputation of social work. I deeply regret the situation and have worked hard to ensure that I fully understand the lessons arising from it.

This incident represents an isolated episode within an otherwise long, successful and unblemished career spanning 37 years in public service and over 18 years as a qualified Social Worker. Prior to this matter, and since it occurred, there have been no concerns regarding my professional conduct or fitness to practise. I have engaged fully with the investigation process and complied with the Conditions of Practice Order throughout. I accepted that my fitness to practise was impaired at the time of the incident and have consistently demonstrated openness, honesty and accountability.

Through reflection, professional development, independent learning, [PRIVATE] and continued professional practice, I have developed a clear understanding of the standards expected of me and the importance of maintaining professional boundaries at all times. I have demonstrated genuine insight into my failings, accepted responsibility for my actions and identified the safeguards necessary to prevent any recurrence.

The absence of any further concerns, my sustained commitment to professional development, my continued contribution within Adult Social Care, and my ongoing adherence to social work values all support the conclusion that the concerns have been remediated and that the risk of repetition is low.

I do not believe that my fitness to practise is impaired today. I am confident that I possess the insight, knowledge and professional awareness necessary to practise safely, effectively and in accordance with Social Work England's standards.

I respectfully ask the Panel to consider my full engagement with the regulatory process, my acceptance of responsibility, my demonstrated remediation and insight, my otherwise exemplary career record, and the absence of any subsequent concerns. In light of these factors, I request that the current restrictions be revoked and that I be permitted to continue my Social Work registration without further conditions.”

24. Ms Goodby referred the panel to all the evidence that she had submitted including her written piece, testimonials and record of training.
25. Ms Goodby submitted that she has evidenced remediation through her ongoing professional learning, paid for registration, tried to identify certified courses since the order and reflected on the concerns raised. Ms Goodby confirmed prior to these proceedings that she had no background in mental health social work and only took on this case due resource issues.
26. Ms Goodby requested the panel to remove the conditions of practice because she believed she had fully engaged with the proceedings throughout, had complied with the conditions in so far as they have been in effect, shown remorse, and had evidenced that she has fully remediated.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

27. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the case examiners. However, it 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'.

28. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original case examiners, Social Work England's submissions, and documentation provided by Ms Goodby, including evidence of training, testimonials and a reflective piece.
29. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser, which it incorporated into the decision below.
30. The panel reminded itself of its powers under Paragraph 15 of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Worker Regulations 2018.
31. 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*:
- i. Address whether the fitness to practise is impaired before considering the appropriate sanction.
 - ii. Whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction.
 - iii. 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.
32. The panel had regard to the over-arching objective of protecting the public which involves the pursuit of the following objectives:
- i. To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public.
 - ii. To promote and maintain public confidence in the profession.
 - iii. To promote and maintain proper professional standards of conduct for members of the profession.
33. The panel first considered whether Ms Goodby'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 Goodby had demonstrated that she had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the case examiners.
34. The panel acknowledged Ms Goodby's participation and engagement throughout these proceedings and Ms Goodby's compliance with the conditions in so far as they have been in effect. It noted that Ms Goodby has been a social worker for many years with a previously unblemished career.
35. The panel considered Ms Goodby's submissions and read the written piece submitted by Ms Goodby in which she demonstrated insight into the impact of breaching

professional boundaries. In it, Ms Goodby explained how her conduct was below the accepted standard of a social worker, explained the consequences of her actions and recognised the impact upon service users. Ms Goodby acknowledged her shortcomings but explained that she was under a lot of pressure to take the case on due to the stress placed on the team of social workers that she managed, despite raising it with senior managers.

36. The purpose of the conditions of practice order was to allow Ms Goodby to demonstrate compliance with the conditions, show reflection, insight and remediation. The panel concluded that overall, there had been compliance. Although, Ms Goodby had not worked in a social work role for a long time and therefore it had not been possible for Ms Goodby 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 Goodby had been in a non-social work role, which appeared to have some similarities to the social work role, including work with vulnerable individuals. The panel therefore accepted that it was likely that Ms Goodby would have been able to develop and continue using relevant social work skills.
37. The panel read the written reflections that Ms Goodby submitted and found her reflection to be very thoughtful, insightful and remorseful. In her reflective piece, Ms Goodby took full responsibility for her actions, acknowledged she was under pressure at the time, but did not seek to blame others. The panel's view was that Ms Goodby 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 Goodby 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 very positive and supportive. The panel was satisfied that Ms Goodby's insight was complete.
38. The panel was satisfied that Ms Goodby had discharged the persuasive burden upon her that she has sufficiently addressed all the outstanding concerns. The panel considered that the risk of repetition is extremely low as Ms Goodby's failings had been sufficiently remediated and therefore the risk to the public no longer remained.
39. Considering the continuing evidence of remediation, insight and reflection the panel concluded that a failure to find Ms Goodby impaired would not undermine public confidence in the profession and the regulator. Nor would it undermine the maintaining of professional standards since Ms Goodby's recent submissions, and the reference and testimonial's provided demonstrate that she adheres to these.
40. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Goodby'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.

41. 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>