Social worker: Angela Parr
Registration number: SW141343
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of Hearing: 12 October 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Conditions of practice order (expiring 22 November 2026)

Hearing outcome:

Revoke the conditions of practice order with immediate effect

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final conditions of practice order under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) ("the regulations) originally imposed for a period of 18 months by case examiners on behalf of Social Work England on 21 May 2024, expiring on 23 November 2025.

2. The first review of the conditions of practice order took place on 13 October 2025 where the conditions of practice order was varied and extended by 12 months. That order expires on 22 November 2026.

3. Mrs Parr attended the hearing and was not represented.

4. Social Work England was represented by its case presenter, Mr Jonathon McCarthy.

5. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter "the panel") and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	**Role**
Clive Powell	Chair
Linda (Helen) Norris	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	**Role**
Jo Cooper	Hearings officer
Ryan Torr	Hearings support officer
Karen Park	Legal adviser

Preliminary matters:

6. The panel confirmed it had considered the following bundle of documents:

   - Final Order Review Hearing Bundle (253 pages)
   - Service and Supplementary Bundle (248 pages)

Hearing in private:

7. Mr McCarthy invited the panel to exercise its discretion under Rule 38(a)(ii) of the Social Work England Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) ("the rules") to hear part of the hearing in private.

8. The panel received advice that in accordance with Rule 37 a hearing should be held in public, subject to Rule 38. The panel, in determining whether to hold part or all the proceedings in private, should consider whether it would be appropriate to do so having regard to the vulnerability, interests or welfare of any participant in the proceedings (rule 38 (b)(ii)) or the public interest including the effective pursuit of the regulator's over-arching objective.

9. On application of Rule 38, and all of the information before it in relation to sensitive and personal health matters, the panel found that it would be appropriate to hold part of the hearing in private and that Mrs Parr's right to privacy should be maintained and that proceeding with part of the hearing in private would not place Mrs Parr at any disadvantage.

Review of the current order:

10. 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).

11. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire on 22 November 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 or workplace supervisor 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.*

    3) *(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 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) *(a) At any time you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must place yourself and remain under one-to-one supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by you, and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register. Supervision meetings should be held at least monthly.*

9) *(b) You must not start or continue work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.*

10) *You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 3 months and at least 14 days prior to any review, and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.*

11) *You must work with your workplace supervisor to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:*

- *Information governance*
- *Information sharing*
- *Managing risk*

12) *You must provide an agreed and signed copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England every 12 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.*

13) *You must read Social Work England's Professional Standards (2019) and provide a written reflection specifically related to the behaviour that gave rise to the finding of misconduct 4 weeks prior to the next review, which should address the following:*

a) *how you should have acted differently during the incident that led to the finding of misconduct;*

b) *how you would act again in a similar situation;*

c) *how your actions could have impacted upon Person A;*

d) *how your actions could impact on public confidence in the social work profession.*

14) *You must keep your professional commitments under review and limit your social work practice in accordance with your reporter's advice.*

15) *You must not work as an independent social worker.*

16) You must not be responsible for the administration and/or management of any independent social work practice/establishment.

17) You must not undertake any agency or locum posts of less than 6 months duration.

18) 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 17, 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.

19) You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 18, to any person requesting information about your registration status.

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

12. As recorded in a final decision dated 21 May 2024, case examiners appointed by Social Work England determined that there was a realistic prospect that adjudicators would determine that Mrs Parr's fitness to practise was impaired on the grounds of misconduct on the basis of the following regulatory concerns:

"Whilst registered as a social worker:

(1) You failed to handle confidential information in line with the law in that you disclosed confidential information about Person A without a legitimate or professional reason to do so.

The matters outlined in the regulatory concern amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct."

13. In summary, Mrs Parr was the social worker of Person A's child. Mrs Parr shared confidential information about Person A's mental health to a person she believed to be Person A's employer. Mrs Parr accepts calling Person A's work to report to her that her child had gone missing. Mrs Parr accepts that, during the conversation with the person who answered the call, who she believed to be Person A's employer, she disclosed details of Person A's mental health condition.

14. The data breach was deemed serious by Mrs Parr's employer, and the Information Commissioners Office were notified.

15. The case examiners noted that Mrs Parr had previously received relevant training in respect of information governance.

16. The case examiners found that Mrs Parr's actions breached the following standards within Social Work England Professional Standards (2019):

    I will:

    2.6 Treat information about people with sensitivity and handle confidential information in line with the law.

    Be accountable for the quality of my practice and the decisions I make

    3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.

Subsequent events:

17. Mrs Parr had been working as a social worker for Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust. Following complaints received about her, she was suspended from 10 April 2025 to 9 June 2025. Four complaints were upheld, as outlined to Mrs Parr within a letter to her from her employer, dated 24 June 2025. One of those complaints related to altering a patients care plan without obtaining prior consent.

18. The letter confirms that the findings constituted misconduct and an agreed 12-month final warning was imposed, effective from 20 May 2025. The order has since expired.

The previous final order review panel on 13 October 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

19. The panel considered whether Mrs Parr's fitness to practise remained impaired. It kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment, and the panel considered whether Mrs Parr had demonstrated that she had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the case examiners.

20. The panel found that Mrs Parr had not provided evidence and information to show development of insight and remediation to the required standard. The panel noted Mrs Parr's reflective statement did not demonstrate sufficient development of insight in relation to misconduct that arose from the regulatory concern, that she had not identified how she could have acted differently on the occasion that led to the concern, and how her actions could have impacted upon Person A, as well as impact public confidence in the social work profession.

21. The panel noted that whilst Mrs Parr had undertaken some relevant data protection training, she failed to fully reflect on how the learning would impact on her actions in the future.

22. The panel concluded there has been insufficient development of insight and remediation since the order was imposed. The panel were also concerned that one of the subsequent complaints included an allegation that Mrs Parr altered a document without the consent of the service user which the panel found demonstrated a repetition of acting without consent.

23. The panel concluded there remained a real risk of repetition and Mrs Parr's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of misconduct and that such a finding would undermine public confidence in the profession and similarly fail to uphold professional standards.

24. The panel recommended that a further review panel would be assisted by a reflective statement from Mrs Parr addressing how she believes she should have acted differently and how the behaviour that resulted in the finding would have foreseeably impacted upon Person A and the public confidence in social workers.

The previous final order review panel on 13 October 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

25. The panel considered that taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not adequately reflect the serious nature of Mrs Parr's misconduct. They would not adequately protect the public as they would not restrict her practice. The panel had assessed there to be a real and present risk of repetition and so considered that the public cannot currently be adequately protected unless Mrs Parr's practice is restricted.

26. Further, taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not maintain public confidence in the profession or promote proper professional standards in light of the particularly serious nature of the misconduct.

27. The panel next considered whether a condition of practice order would be sufficient to protect the public and wider public interest.

28. The panel noted paragraph 114 of the Guidance which provides that conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where the social worker has developed 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; and the social worker does not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice.

29. Save for the lack of adequate insight, the panel considered that each of the factors contained within paragraph 114 apply to Mrs Parr's current circumstances. It did note that Mrs Parr had been subject to conditions of practice for the past 18 months and had not taken the opportunity to provide adequate evidence that she has developed insight and remediation in that time.

30. Nevertheless, the panel was satisfied that a further period of conditions would be appropriate and proportionate. Whilst Mrs Parr's lack of trust in authority is hindering her progress, she has engaged with supervision and the regulatory proceedings and has undertaken some relevant training. In all of the circumstances, the panel considered that Mrs Parr should be given a further opportunity to develop and demonstrate full insight and remediation whilst continuing to practice.

31. The panel agreed that there should be variations to the conditions in light of all of the circumstances. The panel concluded that this should include supervision to ensure regular monitoring of her work, albeit considered that monthly supervision would be sufficient given the narrow concerns that gave rise to the finding of misconduct. The panel therefore approved the conditions as outlined in paragraph 11 above and that a further period of 12 months would be appropriate to give Mrs Parr sufficient opportunity to develop insight and remediation and to demonstrate that the risk of repetition has been adequately reduced.

Social Work England submissions:

32. The panel noted that within the notice of hearing dated 10 September 2026, Social Work England primarily submits that the panel should vary and extend the conditions of practice order by a further 12 months. It noted that Mrs Parr has experienced persistent difficulties in obtaining a suitable individual to act as their workplace reporter and supervisor and that a suitable individual was only appointed on 29 July 2026, with that individual undertaking both roles.

33. Given the recent appointment of the workplace reporter and supervisor, Mrs Parr has been unable to engage with the order in full, but where possible, she has demonstrated compliance.

34. In its written submissions dated 10 September 2026, Social Work England is of the view there remains insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mrs Parr has developed sufficient insight into her misconduct and that the risk of repetition has not been mitigated in the absence of any independent and objective evidence from Mrs Parr's recently appointed workplace reporter/supervisor.

35. By email dated 8 October 2026, Social Work England reviewed its position in light of the evidence submitted by Mrs Parr and her workplace reporter/supervisor. Whilst it remains of the view that Mrs Parr's fitness to practise remains impaired, it invites the panel to vary and extend the order for a further period of 10 months which would allow sufficient time for Mrs Parr to further build upon her progress, taking into account that which has already been demonstrated.

36. Social Work England considers that Mrs Parr has demonstrated full compliance with Condition 13 in respect of insight and reflection (in terms of how she would do things differently, how her conduct would have impacted Person A and how her actions would impact public confidence in the social work profession) and invites the panel to remove that condition. Furthermore, the panel is invited to consider the extent to which Mrs Parr has complied with condition 11 following submission of the personal development plan.

37. The first report submitted from Mrs Parr's workplace reporter/supervisor confirms meeting with Mrs Parr on four occasions, three of which have been professional reflective and supervision sessions, though the reporter confirms they have not had any direct sight of Mrs Parr's work and has compiled their conclusions from information provided by Mrs Parr's line manager, who is not a registered social worker. It is the reporter's assessment of Mrs Parr that she is fit to practise without restriction.

38. Social Work England acknowledges that Mrs Parr's employment is such that she is subject to a non-traditional organisational structure which does not align with condition 9(a). The previous panel felt a supervision condition was necessary following the subsequent concerns, and the influence of Mrs Parr's personal wellbeing on their fitness to practise.

39. The final 12 month written warning has since expired and Mrs Parr has moved to a different team which has led to improvement in her wellbeing, working relationships and professional capacity. Furthermore, Mrs Parr has been subject to consistently positive feedback from both her line manager, workplace reporter/supervisor and colleagues. No further concerns have been raised regarding Mrs Parr' professional conduct.

40. Social Work England, in its revised written submissions therefore invites the panel to consider whether a supervision condition is necessary and invites the panel to consider whether the public can be adequately protected by the continuation of the workplace reporter condition, in isolation to a supervision condition.

41. The panel heard oral submissions from Mr McCarthy as to the background and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanction. Mr McCarthy made further submissions in relation to the current review cycle.

42. Mr McCarthy emphasised the following:

- Mrs Parr has not practised as a social worker due, in part, with difficulties to have an approved workplace reporter/supervisor.

- **[PRIVATE]**
- Mrs Parr returned to work in July 2026 in a non-social work role and remained under restriction to practice until a reporter/supervisor was appointed on 29 July 2026.
- Mrs Parr's fitness to practise remained impaired for a number of reasons. She has not practised in a social work capacity until the appointment of her workplace reporter/supervisor. There has been a limited observable period of practice which is insufficient to the extent the risk of repetition has fallen away.
- The weight to attach to the workplace report status is limited because they have had no direct insight into Mrs Parr's work and have placed reliance on Mrs Parr's team manager (who is not a social worker) and colleagues.
- Social Work England does acknowledge that during the current cycle the feedback provided by Mrs Parr's team manager and colleagues has been generally positive and there have been no further concerns raised. Notwithstanding, there has been a limited period of time since Mrs Parr returned to work to demonstrate that she is fully remediated and that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.
- Social Work England further acknowledge that Mrs Parr has consistently and positively engaged with the order, and no breaches have been noted. Condition 13 of the order has been fully complied with and since Mrs Parr moved to a new team, her reflections and support have positively impacted her wellbeing and professionalism. There exists positive development of her insight as contained within the material submitted and the various feedback from her team members and team manager.
- The current review cycle details concerns regarding the workability of the supervisory conditions and the panel are invited to consider whether supervision remains necessary.
- The oral evidence provided from Mrs Parr's team manager confirms that the supervision which led to the report would be ongoing whether the conditions of practise order continue.

Social worker submissions:

43. Mrs Parr chose to give evidence and read from a prepared statement, the contents of which are copied below:

"I respectfully ask the panel to consider the full body of evidence of my remediation, insight and current safe practice over the past two and a half years, rather than assessing my progress solely by the short period in which an approved reporter/supervisor was in place.

I fully accept that my conduct in the original incident, when I disclosed confidential information about Person A without consent, lawful authority or sufficient professional justification, fell below the standards expected of a registered social worker. I

understand that this breached the duties to handle confidential information sensitively and lawfully, and to use professional judgement within legal and ethical frameworks. I recognise the potential impact on Person A's privacy, dignity and trust, and the potential effect on public confidence in social work.

Since the incident, I have undertaken substantial and sustained work to remediate the concerns. This has not been limited to completing training. I have reflected repeatedly on why my decision-making was wrong, what I should have done differently, and how I now apply that learning in day-to-day practice. My evidence includes a detailed Personal Development Plan, several written reflections, a specific reflection on information sharing and consent guidance, reflective supervision records, and a training log showing more than 260 hours of learning and development.

My development has focused directly on the areas identified in the conditions: information governance, information sharing and managing risk. This includes repeated Information Governance and Data Security training; learning on GDPR, the Data Protection Act 2018, consent, safeguarding, the Mental Capacity Act, mental health law, clinical risk, risk management, patient safety, care planning and multi-disciplinary working. I also reviewed the ERSCP Information Sharing and Consent guidance and produced a detailed reflection on how to make lawful, necessary, proportionate and clearly recorded decisions.

Most importantly, I have translated this learning into a clear change in my approach to practice. Before sharing information, I now pause and consider: whether I have informed consent; if not, whether there is a clear lawful basis or safeguarding justification; whether disclosure is necessary, proportionate and limited to the minimum information required; the likely impact on the person concerned; whether I need advice from a manager, supervisor, safeguarding lead or Information Governance lead; and how I will record my rationale, the advice received and the outcome.

I have developed a written confidentiality decision-making checklist and incorporated it into my Personal Development Plan. This is a practical safeguard, not simply a reflection on the past. It demonstrates the changed process I use to reduce the risk of any repetition.

Evidence of current practice and professional conduct:

The evidence from my current employment is positive and consistent. My manager reports that I hold a full caseload of 27 and manage it well, work appropriately within my scope of practice, seek specialist support from the multidisciplinary team where needed, and contribute to recovery-focused and person-centred outcomes. My care plans, risk assessments and safety plans are recorded at 90% or above Trust expectations.

My manager has audited clinical cases with me and confirmed that I am knowledgeable about my service users, follow clinical and MDT advice, and use Trust procedures

appropriately. The evidence also shows that I have reflected on managing workload and avoiding burnout, including being encouraged not to work outside hours.

The supervision records provide examples of my current practice. When beginning a new caseload, I identified the need to establish consent, clarify who a service user wished information to be shared with, and understand current and historical risks. In another complex case involving discharge, accommodation insecurity, alcohol use and potential exploitation, I identified safeguarding and housing risks, raised concerns within the multidisciplinary team, and developed a plan for face-to-face contact, risk management, professional liaison and support. These examples show that I am now actively considering consent, risk, information sharing, recording and multi-agency working in my practice.

My current line manager, colleagues across the multidisciplinary team and a consultant psychiatrist have provided positive feedback. They describe me as professional, organised, reliable, compassionate, approachable, thoughtful and committed to person-centred, strengths-based practice. No further concerns about my conduct or practice have been raised. My final written warning expired in May 2026 and is no longer live.

My workplace reporter/supervisor, Mr Williams, has confirmed that I attended all meetings, did not cancel any, engaged appropriately, responded to challenge, and showed developing reflective ability. He reviewed my Personal Development Plan and reflections and concluded that I had demonstrated a high level of insight, supported by extensive Information Governance and confidentiality learning. He expressed the opinion that I am fit to practise in full.

[PRIVATE]

This significantly reduced the period in which I could be in active practice, undertake supervised casework and produce evidence from daily work. The absence should not be interpreted as disengagement or a failure to remediate. During the overall period I continued to engage with my development, produce reflections and submit the required material.

There were also practical barriers outside my control. Despite repeated attempts by me and my employer to nominate suitable reporters/supervisors between October 2025 and July 2026, these arrangements were not approved until late July 2026. Until then, I was unable to work in a role requiring social work registration and was placed on alternative duties. Once an approved reporter/supervisor was appointed, I engaged promptly: I attended the required meetings, submitted my PDP and reflections, and obtained a report within the available timeframe.

I recognise Social Work England's concern that my approved workplace supervisor did not directly oversee my day-to-day practice. I do not seek to minimise that issue. However, the evidence shows this arose from the structure of an integrated NHS multidisciplinary team, rather than from any refusal by me to cooperate or place myself

under supervision. I would like to add that the Supervisor did have full access to my day-today working diary and my full caseload which he could have overseen at anytime. My manager did provide day-to-day operational oversight, audited my work, held management supervision and supplied evidence of my performance; the reporter/supervisor provided professional social work supervision and reporting. I complied with the arrangements that were approved and available to me, and there is no evidence that I avoided supervision or failed to engage.

My position on impairment and conditions:

I respectfully submit that the evidence now demonstrates genuine insight, sustained remediation, safe current practice and a significantly reduced risk of repetition. I have accepted responsibility, learned from the misconduct, undertaken extensive targeted development, changed my decision-making process, sought and responded to supervision, and practised without further concerns.

I ask the panel to give substantial weight to the positive independent workplace evidence, the absence of any new concerns, the completion of the written-reflection requirement, and the fact that the remaining limitation on evidence is substantially explained by sickness absence, delayed approval of a reporter/supervisor and the practical supervision arrangements within my NHS setting.

If the panel considers that further assurance is still required, I respectfully ask that any continued order be proportionate, focused on reporter oversight and the existing PDP, and take full account of the progress already made. I submit that a further lengthy period of conditions is not necessary to address the original concerns. I remain committed to ongoing supervision, reflective practice, lawful information sharing, careful recording and maintaining the standards expected of a registered social worker."

44. Mrs Parr, in response to questions by the panel, gave a full and detailed explanation of what steps she would take to do things differently going forward. This included approaching her manager, following guidance, speak to LADO and safeguarding to request advice and guidance. Mrs Parr emphasised she would not contact an employer ever again and that obtaining consent is first and foremost.

45. Mrs Parr called a witness to provide evidence. The witness is Mrs Parr's current operational team manager, Mr Gardner. The witness confirmed he has managed Mrs Parr for approximately five to six months following her transfer to his team. During that time Mrs Parr has been subject to performance improvement action plans around audits, caseloads and diligence around paperwork.

46. Mr Gardner confirmed Mrs Parr is closely monitored with two weekly supervision meetings and is to be recommended this week that she is stood down from her performance plan. He went on to explain that Mrs Parr would seek advice and guidance from other members of the multi-disciplinary team in particular he indicated that Mrs Parr would take cases to a complex case management team meetings on Wednesdays.

47. Mrs Parr's care planning is above the Trusts expectations of 90% for compliance and diligence, performing at around 94%. Mrs Parr's supervision and wellbeing are such that there have been no further concerns.

48. Mr Gardner, in response to a question from the panel, confirmed that whilst there is always an element of what drives a person to perform, Mrs Parr has proven she has the capability and there would be nothing preventing her from practising without restriction.

49. Mrs Parr, in closing, invited the panel to take into consideration that during the period of conditions, she has followed every condition to the best that she can and is continuing to do so. Mrs Parr does not agree that her fitness to practise remains impaired and is confident she can practise without conditions. Mrs Parr does not think she requires a further period of restriction, noting that nothing will change as she continues to practice to the best of her ability.

50. Mrs Parr confirmed that she has the oversight of managers and her associate director, who is her workplace reporter, for the past three months and no concerns have been raised.

51. Mrs Parr therefore invited the panel to consider whether, in light of the level of insight demonstrated, together with the positive workplace reporters/supervisors report, and all of the material provided, whether her fitness to practise remained impaired.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

52. 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 and previous panel. 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'.

53. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the case examiners which led to the agreed disposal and the previous review panel. The panel also took into account the new documentation provided by Ms Parr, which includes:

- a written reflective statement and evaluation of learning
- a personal development plan
- a log of training activities, comprising in excess of 50 sessions since the last review
- Written reflection following reading East Riding Safeguarding Children's Partnership – Information Sharing and Consent Guidance
- Reflection statement at 3 months after the imposition of the order (undated)

- Final reflection and report addressing condition 13 (a) to (d)
- a workplace reporter/supervisor report dated 25 September 2026, with appended several testimonials; and
- a professional reference dated 15 September 2026

54. The panel also took account of the written and oral submissions made by Mr McCarthy on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mrs Parr.

55. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the two-fold personal and public assessment in reaching its decision regarding current impairment.

56. The panel also heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to relevant case law to apply when assessing personal impairment, namely:

(i) **Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin)**: when assessing the personal element this should be established via an assessment of the risk of repetition, in particular whether the conduct is easily remediable, has already been remedied and is highly unlikely to be repeated in the future.

(ii) **CHRE v Grant and NMC [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin)**: an appropriate test for impairment is identified from the Fifth Shipman report and comprises various elements to show whether fitness to practice is impaired. By application, the panel were advised to consider whether:

- the social worker liable in the future to act so as to put people at unwarranted risk of harm;
- the social worker is liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute
- the social worker is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the social work profession

57. 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 maintain public confidence in the profession.

58. The panel first considered whether Mrs Parr's fitness to practise remains impaired. The panel kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment, and the panel considered whether Mrs Parr had demonstrated that she had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the original case examiners and previous review panel decisions.

59. The panel noted the extent to which Mrs Parr has acted upon the recommendations of the previous panel as to what might assist a future reviewing panel.

- The panel made an assessment of insight and considered Mrs Parr's submissions to be persuasive of her now satisfactory level of insight. The panel noted that her progress is such that her supervisor is recommending that she be stood down from her development plan, as mentioned in paragraph 45.

- The panel were impressed with the level of engagement and amount of evidence put forward regarding Mrs Parr's reflections, noting that Mrs Parr was no longer subject to a final warning. The panel were particularly impressed that Mrs Parr, whilst on a period of absence, continued to reflect and undertake continued professional development and compile a checklist which she now works from.
- Mrs Parr was able to demonstrate the training she has undertaken is reflected in practice and gave examples where this was the case.
- The panel determined that Mrs Parr had sufficiently demonstrated how she would do things differently, and how her conduct would have impacted person A and public confidence in the profession. She now has in place her checklist and learning around data protection and boundaries. There have been no repeated concerns and the material provided is sufficient to mitigate any risk of repetition.
- The panel noted Mrs Parr has continued to develop insight and reflection during the current review cycle. This insight and reflection has been endorsed by her team manager and reporter. The training logs are very clear in terms of the vast amount of training undertaken since the last review and Mrs Parr's application of learning to practice.
- The panel noted that Mrs Parr had returned to a new team and has shown how her insight had developed in a short period of time. Her workplace reporter/supervisor has seen growth and change and provides positive feedback, albeit the panel accept this has only been tested for a short period of time.
- The panel also had particular regard to the content of the first workplace report and appended testimonials, all of which are very positive. The panel were mindful of the limited passage of time in practice to test the level of oversight and remediation, but on balance concluded that there is no evidence to suggest a repeat of the conduct which gave rise to the regulatory concern.
- The panel reminded themselves that the conduct which gave rise to the regulatory concern was an isolated incident, albeit a serious breach of confidentiality. The panel also noted the subsequent conduct which gave rise to the final written warning and the previous panels observations regarding repetition. However, on balance the panel determined Mrs Parr has shown sufficient remediation, and that as a result, it is highly unlikely Mrs Parr will repeat her misconduct.
- The panel considered the overall public interest and whether a member of the public, in possession of the fact, would be satisfied that there has been sufficient remediation and would not undermine public confidence, or professional standards in the profession.
- The panel concluded that a fair-minded member of the public would make this assessment and public confidence would be upheld without a further finding of impairment.

- The panel determined that the public interest includes retaining the skills of high performing social workers and that Mrs Parr, through the submissions and evidence, is performing significantly above the Trusts expectations in a supportive multi-disciplinary team.
- The panel therefore find that there is no evidence to make a finding of current impairment in the wider public interest.

Decision and reasons:

60. The panel therefore concluded that the condition of practice order should be revoked with immediate effect as Mrs Parr's fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

The Professional Standards Authority

61. 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