

Social worker: Ruth Yvonne
Johannsen
Registration number: SW74647
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of hearing: 10 September 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Conditions of practice order (expiring 22 October 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 originally imposed by accepted disposal on 17 April 2025 for a period of 18 months.
2. Ms Johannsen attended and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by its 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
Miriam Karp	Chair
Sue Williams	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Hannah Granger	Hearings officer
Ellie Roberts	Hearings support officer
Scott McDonnell	Legal adviser

Preliminary matters:

5. The panel confirmed that it had received and read the hearing bundle (170 pages) and the service and supplementary bundle (102 pages).

Review of the current order:

6. 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).
7. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 22 October 2026. The order subject to review is a conditions of practice order, the conditions of which are as follows:
 1. You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.
 2. You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter referred to in these conditions.

3. a. At any time you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England's register.

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

4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 3 months and at least 14 days prior to any review.

5. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.

6. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.

7. You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.

8. You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days of the date of application [for future registration] or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect [for existing registration].

9. You must work with your reporter to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:

- The importance of making professional relationships and maintaining professional boundaries with service users.
- The impact on service users when professional boundaries are not maintained.
- Responding effectively to safeguarding concerns, including out of hours.
- The importance of management oversight when a safeguarding concern is raised.

10. You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 4 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.

11. You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019) and provide a written reflection 6 months after these conditions take effect,

focusing on how your conduct in respect of professional boundaries and safeguarding was below the accepted standard of a social worker, and outlining what you should have done differently.

12. You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at 1 to 11, above:

- Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.
- Any locum, agency or out-of-hours service you are registered with or apply to be registered with in order to secure employment or contracts to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any organisation, agency or employer where you are using your social work qualification/knowledge/skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.

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

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

The allegations which were accepted by Ms Johannsen and resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

1. On or around the 14 February 2023 you failed to maintain a professional relationship with a family supported by the local authority in that you:
 - 1.1. Made inappropriate comments to the family.
 - 1.2. Shared your own personal historical information with the family.
 - 1.3. Repeatedly swore during a conversation with the family.
2. On or around the 03 February 2023 you failed to safeguard a child (child A) in that you:
 - 2.1 Did not raise a safeguarding concern to a manager regarding bruising on child A's arm.

The case examiners on 21 February 2026 determined the following with regard to impairment:

“Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:

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

Personal element

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

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

The case examiners consider the conduct in relation to the remaining concerns is remediable, in that the social worker could demonstrate their understanding of what has gone wrong and what steps they could take to ensure this does not happen again, for example, by evidencing any support they have accessed, completing relevant associated training, and/or a critical reflection addressing the concerns raised.

Insight and remediation

The social worker has provided submissions to the regulator. Whilst the case examiners consider the submissions detailed in their content, they are not satisfied that the social worker has provided a clear understanding or explanation as to their conduct in regulatory concerns 1 and 2, given they state this was not usual practice for them. Furthermore, the social worker has not addressed in full the wider impact of this conduct and has not set out how they would prevent this conduct being repeated in future practice.

The case examiners are not satisfied that the social worker has provided a significant level of insight or demonstrated any remediation.

Risk of repetition

Taking the above into account, the case examiners are of the view that the social worker has not sufficiently demonstrated their understanding of the risk their alleged conduct posed and whilst stating the conduct would not be repeated has not offered tangible means by which this could be evidenced.

Having considered the evidence available to them, the case examiners consider the risk of repetition to remain high.

Public element

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

The case examiners are of the view that a member of the public would be extremely concerned about an allegation that a social worker failed to maintain professional boundaries and failed to safeguard a child. The case examiners consider both elements of the concerns relate to fundamental tenets of social work including safeguarding and making and maintaining effective professional relationships.

Adjudicators are likely to consider there is potential risk of harm to the wider public in terms of a social worker who failed to safeguard a child and to trust and have confidence in a social worker who is alleged to have failed to maintain professional boundaries. The concerns are serious, and the case examiners are of the view that, given the alleged conduct in this case, a failure to find impairment may undermine public confidence in the profession and fail to maintain the professional standards expected of social workers.

The case examiners consider there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the social worker currently impaired."

The case examiners on 21 February 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

"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 insight and 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. An advice order will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings. The case examiners believe that issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they view the 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 lack of insight and 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 have consulted their 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.*

Whilst the social worker has not demonstrated full insight, the case examiners note that they have shown some reflection into the circumstances of the case, and that this could offer an opportunity to develop further insight and remediation. The case examiners are of the view that workable conditions can be formulated that would support the social worker to develop the requisite insight and 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 18 months would allow the social worker sufficient time to demonstrate strengthened practice within a full appraisal cycle. They consider that any longer period, given that some insight and remediation has 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 next most 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 18 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."

Following the case examiners decision Ms Johannsen completed the accepted disposal response form and returned this on 02 April 2025. Within the form she stated: *'I appreciate the case examiners considerations in these matters and agree to a conditions of practice order of 18 months duration.'*

8. On 17 April 2025 the final outcome was an accepted disposal of a conditions of practice order (18 months).

Social Work England submissions:

9. The panel heard submissions from Ms Khan as to the background and the case examiners' findings in relation to impairment and sanction.
10. Ms Khan submitted that Social Work England invited the reviewing panel to extend and vary the current conditions of practice order by a period of twelve months on the basis the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired.
11. Ms Khan invited the panel to vary conditions 1,2,9, and 12 to bring the conditions in line with the updated conditions bank and remove condition 11.
12. Ms Khan informed the panel that Ms Johannsen had breached two conditions and failed to comply in a timely manner on eleven occasions with condition 12. Ms Johannsen had complied with condition 11 by providing a reflective piece within the timescales. A summary of the compliance of the conditions of practice order was provided;

Condition 1

13. Ms Johannsen failed to notify Social Work England within 7 days of working for two days at Wirral Council. Ms Johannsen confirmed on 20 August 2025 that she started the role in June 2025 after several requests for an update.

Condition 3

14. Ms Johannsen breached this condition by starting a social work role at Wirral Council without an approved reporter in place for a period of two days.

Condition 11

15. Ms Johannsen complied with this condition in full by submitting a reflective piece within the required timeframe.

Condition 12

16. Ms Johannsen complied with condition 12 but repeatedly failed to either provide the employer the conditions at the time of application and/or failed to provide Social Work England evidence of this within the timescales on eleven separate occasions. A summary was provided by Ms Khan:

- Conditions and evidence were supplied to prospective employers and Social Work England outside of the timeframes for seven employers, namely Liquid Personnel, Wirral Council, Connect Social Work, Birmingham Children's Trust, Hereford Council, Non-Stop Recruitment and Social Personnel.
- Evidence of the conditions being supplied to prospective employers was submitted late to Social Work England on three occasions for the Isle of Man role via Social Personnel, Devon and Staffordshire via Non-Stop Recruitment and, Shropshire via Social Personnel.
- Full compliance with condition 12 was fulfilled by supplying prospective employers with the conditions at the time of application and providing Social Work England evidence of this within the timeframes for only two prospective employers, namely Cheshire West via Social Personnel and Red Sector.

17. Ms Khan informed the panel that as a result of the two breaches in June 2025, Ms Johannsen was provided with an explanation from their case review officer as to why the breaches occurred. In August 2025, a further five breaches occurred despite case review explaining the requirements for applying to social work roles clearly and Ms Johannsen confirming she understood the seriousness of the breaches.

18. In October and December 2025, Ms Johannsen confirmed she had not applied for any more social work roles despite doing so and therefore failed to provide evidence of this to Social Work England within the timeframe.

19. The case review team sent an email with the summary of the above breaches on the 31 December 2025, and explained that if further breaches occurred, Social Work England would seek early review advice. Ms Johannsen subsequently provided evidence of compliance with condition 12 after prompting therefore, as no further breaches occurred, Social Work England did not seek early review advice.

20. Ms Johannsen confirmed on 15 June 2026 that she had not applied for any more social work roles and that she had no new information to submit in response to Social Work England's evidence request emails.

21. Ms Khan informed the panel that Ms Johannsen had previously requested Voluntary Removal guidance in October 2025 and submitted a partial application in November 2025. However, when asked to complete the application in full in December 2025, Ms Johannsen stated that she only wanted a career break rather than permanent removal.

22. Ms Khan informed the panel that Ms Johannsen was apparently applying for social work roles throughout this period therefore it is unclear as to what her current position is regarding her social work registration.
23. Ms Khan informed the panel that while it is acknowledged that Ms Johannsen did make efforts to comply with the conditions, the repeated nature of the breaches raises concerns with regards to the Ms Johannsen's ability to comply with the order. Additionally, although Ms Johannsen had made several attempts at securing a social work role, she had not practised as a social worker so as to demonstrate remediation and safe practice or implement a personal development plan.
24. Ms Khan submitted that although condition 11 should be removed as the reflective piece sufficiently addresses insight into the concerns and reflects how Ms Johannsen would remediate her practice in the future, the risk of repetition remains as she had not demonstrated these learnings in practice.
25. Ms Khan submitted that as a result, Ms Johannsen's fitness to practise remains impaired and the need for demonstrating the reflection and evidencing safe practice, remains.
26. Ms Khan submitted that a conditions of practice order continued to be the necessary and proportionate way to ensure a safe return to practice.
27. Ms Khan submitted that although there has been some change since the last review, due to the circumstances outlined in submissions, Ms Johannsen's fitness to practise remained impaired as there is still a risk of repetition.
28. Ms Khan submitted that a further twelve month period of conditions would allow Ms Khan reasonable time to secure a social work role where she could demonstrate safe practice with support from her personal development plan.
29. Ms Khan invited the panel to impose a further period of conditions of practice for twelve months.

Social worker submissions:

30. Ms Johannsen provided written submissions contained within the service and supplementary bundle and also made oral submissions and gave evidence under affirmation during the review hearing.
31. Ms Johannsen submitted that her fitness to practise was no longer impaired and invited the panel to revoke the conditions of practice order with immediate effect.
32. Ms Johannsen submitted that she had demonstrated insight and remediation having completed training and provided a reflective piece to the panel, recognising professional boundaries, being accountable for the quality of her practice and decisions as well as what she would do differently if she was faced with the same challenges, which led to the concerns raised against her.

33. Ms Johannsen provided detail to the panel about the circumstances leading to the concerns being raised and also how the breaches of the conditions of practice identified by Social Work England came about.
34. With regard to the breach of condition 1 and condition 3 the manager who she was supposed to report to was off sick on the first day and on holiday on the second day. As such she had no one to report to and in addition undertook no work on those two days. The attendance was for administrative purposes only. Ms Johannsen submitted that this meant there had been no breach of those conditions.
35. Ms Johannsen informed the panel that she had tried to obtain work as a social worker, but the conditions of practice were “a red flag” for prospective employers and meant she was unsuccessful in applying for roles.
36. With regard to Ms Johannsen’s employment since the conditions of practice being imposed she shared with the panel that she had worked in areas, which demonstrated skills adjacent to the field of social work.
37. Ms Johannsen informed the panel that she had worked with vulnerable people and intervened when a care worker had not realised that an elderly person had suffered a stroke. Ms Johannsen said she had reacted in a calm manner and acted confidently including contacting her manager and the emergency services.
38. Ms Johannsen told the panel that she had reflected on professional boundaries and identified this as an area of learning. She referred to her upbringing and earlier life, which she now understood had caused her to have too much empathy. She had now learnt not to overstep the mark.
39. Ms Johannsen described other roles including carrying out surveys with members of the public at their homes, which required her to engage appropriately with them and demonstrate professionalism and trustworthiness.
40. Ms Johannsen had also worked at a nursery at an RAF station, which required her to pass checks including enhanced DBS vetting.
41. In conclusion Ms Johannsen submitted that her practice was no longer impaired due to the work that she had done since the conditions of practice order was imposed including demonstrating insight and remediation so that she no longer posed a risk to others.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

42. 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 accepted disposal. However, it exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’.

43. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it. The panel also took account of the written and oral submissions made by Ms Khan and Ms Johannsen and Ms Johannsen's evidence at the review hearing.
44. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel was reminded that a social worker's fitness to practise is impaired if they pose a risk to public safety, or if their conduct or performance undermines the confidence the public is entitled to place in all social workers in England. A social worker's fitness to practise may also be impaired if their actions make it necessary to send a public message about the standards expected of social workers.
45. If the panel decided that Ms Johannsen's practice is currently impaired, then it should then consider what sanctions are available and refer to Social Work England's "Impairment and Sanctions Guidance". The panel must start from the least restrictive sanction. Insight and remediation are important factors.

Revoke the conditions of practice order with effect immediately

46. The panel first considered whether Ms Johannsen's fitness to practise remains impaired.
47. The panel noted the breaches of some of the conditions of practise and how they had arisen.
48. The panel also took account of the work that Ms Johannsen had done in adjacent roles, which were directly related to the skills of a social worker.
49. Ms Johannsen had shown that she had worked with vulnerable people and provided support to them including safeguarding, acting quickly and getting medical help.
50. The panel assessed that Ms Johannsen, both in her submissions and evidence provided at the review hearing, demonstrated that she knew what was required of her and clearly understood where the professional boundaries lay. Ms Johannsen had shown significant insight and remediation.
51. The panel assessed that the experience of being subject to a conditions of practice order and the non-social work roles undertaken during the period of the order had changed her as a professional.
52. It was clear to the panel that Ms Johannsen was embarrassed by her conduct. The panel was satisfied that Ms Johannsen understood the seriousness of the admitted allegations, had properly reflected upon her failings in relation to professional boundaries and safeguarding, had undertaken relevant training and reading, and had demonstrated through her reflective pieces and her oral evidence that she would not behave in the same way again. The panel therefore concluded that the risk of repetition was very low.

53. The panel decided that Ms Johannsen no longer posed a risk to others and that a member of the public, fully informed of the circumstances of this case, would not expect her practice to be restricted in any way.
54. The panel determined that Ms Johannsen's practice was no longer impaired and the conditions of practice order should be revoked with immediate effect.

The Professional Standards Authority

55. 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>