# Case Examiner Decision
# Bernice Tutu Tabuaa
# SW148896
# FTPS-24939

## Contents

The role of the case examiners ..... 3
Decision summary ..... 4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns ..... 6
Preliminary issues ..... 8
The realistic prospect test ..... 10
The public interest ..... 19
Accepted disposal ..... 21

## The role of the case examiners

The case examiners perform a filtering function in the fitness to practise process, and their primary role is to determine whether the case ought to be considered by adjudicators at a formal hearing. The wider purpose of the fitness to practise process is not to discipline the social worker for past conduct, but rather to consider whether the social worker's current fitness to practise might be impaired because of the issues highlighted. In reaching their decisions, case examiners are mindful that Social Work England's primary objective is to protect the public.

Case examiners apply the 'realistic prospect' test. As part of their role, the case examiners will consider whether there is a realistic prospect:

- the facts alleged could be found proven by adjudicators
- adjudicators could find that one of the statutory grounds for impairment is engaged
- adjudicators could find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired

If the case examiners find a realistic prospect of impairment, they consider whether there is a public interest in referring the case to a hearing. If there is no public interest in a hearing, the case examiners can propose an outcome to the social worker. We call this accepted disposal and a case can only be resolved in this way if the social worker agrees with the case examiners' proposal.

Case examiners review cases on the papers only. The case examiners are limited, in that, they are unable to hear and test live evidence, and therefore they are unable to make findings of fact.

## Decision summary

| Decision summary | |
|---|---|
| 1st Preliminary outcome | 30 July 2026 |
| | Amendments and submissions requested |
| 2nd Preliminary outcome | 16 September 2026 |
| | Accepted disposal proposed – conditions of practice order (18 months) |
| Final outcome | 21 October 2026 |
| | Accepted disposal - conditions of practice order (18 months) |

### Executive summary

The case examiners initially paused their consideration of the case and adjourned to deal with a preliminary issue.

On subsequent review, the case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, [redacted] 3, [redacted] and 5 being found proven by the adjudicators.

2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct and of regulatory concern 5 being found to amount to a lack of competence or capability. [redacted]

[redacted]

3. For regulatory concerns 1, 3 and 5, there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

The case examiners did not consider it to be in the public interest for the matter to be referred to a final hearing and determined that the case could be concluded by way of accepted disposal.

As such, the case examiners requested that the social worker be notified of their intention to resolve the case with a conditions of practice order of 18 months. The social worker subsequently agreed to the accepted disposal.

The case examiners have considered all of the documents made available within the evidence bundle. Key evidence is referred to throughout their decision and the case examiners' full reasoning is set out below.

## Anonymity and redaction

Elements of this decision have been marked for redaction in line with our Fitness to Practise Publications Policy. Text in **blue** will be redacted only from the published copy of the decision, and will therefore be shared with the complainant in their copy. Text in **red** will be redacted from both the complainant's and the published copy of the decision.

## The complaint and our regulatory concerns

| The initial complaint | |
|---|---|
| The complainant | The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer, [redacted] Children's Social Care |
| Date the complaint was received | 18 August 2025 |
| Complaint summary | The complainant advised that the social worker had not passed their probationary period of employment, due to concerns about their ability to practise as a newly qualified social worker. The complaint is reflected in the regulatory concerns below. |

### Regulatory concerns

Between on or around September 2024 and June 2025 and whilst registered as a social worker:

1. You falsified **an** assessment~~s~~.

[redacted]

3. Your conduct at Regulatory Concern 1 above was dishonest.

[redacted]

5. You failed to complete key tasks in a timely manner and/or to the appropriate standard.

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1-4 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

The matters outlined in regulatory concern 5 amount to the statutory ground of lack of competence.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct and / or lack of competence or capability.

Minor amendments made by the case examiners are indicated in bold.

## Preliminary issues

| Investigation | | |
|---|---|---|
| Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has been notified of the grounds for investigation? | Yes | ☒ |
| | No | ☐ |
| Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators? | Yes | ☒ |
| | No | ☐ |
| Are the case examiners satisfied that they have all relevant evidence available to them, or that adequate attempts have been made to obtain evidence that is not available? | Yes | ☒ |
| | No | ☐ |
| Are the case examiners satisfied that it was not proportionate or necessary to offer the complainant the opportunity to provide final written representations; or that they were provided a reasonable opportunity to do so where required. | Yes | ☒ |
| | No | ☐ |

| Requests for further information or submissions, or any other preliminary issues that have arisen |
|---|
| 30 July 2026 |
|  |

[redacted]

This case was initially presented to the case examiners with the statutory ground of misconduct only. Whilst this ground is appropriate for some of the regulatory concerns, the evidence suggests that the statutory ground of lack of competence or capability may be more appropriate for regulatory concern 5, in particular. The social worker was newly qualified and working with a reduced caseload but appears to have been struggling to carry out what was expected of them.

The case examiners therefore requested that the social worker was notified of this additional statutory ground and offered another opportunity to provide submissions, before the case examiners could continue their considerations.

September 2026

[redacted]

The case examiners are satisfied there are no further preliminary matters.

## The realistic prospect test

### Fitness to practise history

The case examiners have been informed that there is no previous fitness to practise history.

### Decision summary

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Is there a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired? | Yes | ☒ |
| | No | ☐ |

The case examiners have determined that there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, [redacted] 3, [redacted] and 5 being found proven, that concerns 1 and 3 could amount to the statutory ground of misconduct and regulatory concern 5 could amount to a lack of competence or capability and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

### Reasoning

#### Facts

Between on or around September 2024 and June 2025 and whilst registered as a social worker:

1. You falsified an assessment

The case examiners have been provided with an email from an elective home education (EHE) worker which sets out sections of the social worker's assessment where they state they had not made comments attributed to them. The email states that the social worker has written that the EHE worker has undertaken a home visit with the family on 12 March which did not occur as the EHE worker has never met the family and was on leave on this date. The email further states that assessment

suggests that the EHE worker believes home education to be suitable for the family and has a positive opinion of a specific learning provider, both of which they deny.

The case examiners note they have not been provided with the original assessment, and it appears this has now been rewritten and corrected so would not be available as primary evidence. However, the email from the EHE worker quotes the relevant sections of the assessment, which the case examiners consider to be adequate. The social worker accepts the content of that email and the regulatory concern.

As the regulatory concern alleges falsification, the case examiners next considered whether the inaccuracies in the social worker's assessment could represent dishonesty.

When considering dishonesty, the case examiners have applied two tests, in line with relevant case law. Firstly, they have assessed the evidence to establish what adjudicators may determine the social worker's actual state of knowledge or belief was at the relevant time (the subjective test). Secondly, they have considered whether the social worker's conduct could be deemed as dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people (the objective test).

The case examiners have considered whether the social worker knew the EHE worker had not visited the family when they wrote it in the assessment. The social worker acknowledged that they had made an assumption that the EHE worker had visited as they were planning to and that 'no news was good news'. The case examiners consider that if the social worker recorded in the assessment that no concerns had been raised, then this may have been inadequate but not dishonest. In contrast, the social worker appears to have recorded in their assessment that the EHE worker "has since informed that there are no concerns following her visit to the family home on 12/03/2025". The case examiners are of the view that the social worker would have known they had not been informed this by the EHE worker.

The case examiners are of the view that an ordinary, decent person would consider the social worker writing they had been informed of a view when they knew they had not, to be dishonest.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to a hearing.





3. Your conduct at Regulatory Concern 1 above was dishonest.

The case examiners have already considered dishonesty in regulatory concern 1 above and to reiterate, they consider that both the subjective and objective tests are met.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to a hearing.



5. You failed to complete key tasks in a timely manner and/or to the appropriate standard.

The case examiners note a lack of primary evidence provided by the former employer, meaning they do not have much of the work which is stated to be insufficient or not of the appropriate standard.

However, the case examiners have been provided with supervision records and emails from senior colleagues which set out issues with case summaries, group supervision notes, responding to other professionals and going on annual leave with important tasks not complete.

The case examiners note that as the regulatory concern alleges a failure, it is appropriate to consider what was expected of the social worker. It appears that the social worker was allocated significantly less children than would be normal in the team, due to being newly qualified and that support was provided to assist the social worker in managing their workload and completing work to the required standard.

The case examiners consider that there is sufficient evidence for them to make a decision about the realistic prospect as the emails were written at the time of the concerns and it appears there are senior colleagues who are prepared to provide an account of the tasks not completed adequately.

The social worker accepts there were some issues with the timeliness of their work and submits that they were struggling at the time and feeling completely overwhelmed. [redacted]

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to a hearing.

## Grounds

Regulatory concerns 1, [redacted] 3[redacted]

The case examiners are aware that there is no legal definition of misconduct, but it generally would consist of serious acts or omissions, which suggest a significant departure from what would be expected of the social worker in the circumstances.

To help them decide if the evidence suggests a significant departure from what would be expected in the circumstances, the case examiners have considered the following standards, which were applicable at the time of the concerns.

As a social worker, I will:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.



3.11 Maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions.

As a social worker, I will not:

5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.

5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others.



The case examiners consider the conduct in regulatory concerns 1 and 3 to be serious, this is supported by the impairment and sanctions guidance which sets out that "honesty is key to good social work practice. Social workers are routinely trusted with access to private spaces, such as people's homes, and highly sensitive and confidential information, such as case notes". Whilst the case examiners acknowledge that the social worker appeared overwhelmed and may not have considered the full implications of the alleged dishonesty within the assessment, the potential consequences could have been serious. The social worker recommended that the assessment of the children was closed down with no further action but without an accurate view from the EHE worker and further exploration of the resources being accessed, the case examiners consider there remained a tangible risk to the children. There were reported safeguarding concerns about the children and home education may have been a method of concealing these concerns. Therefore, the evidence suggests that a robust and honest appraisal of the family was required. The case examiners are of the view this was a significant departure from what was expected and there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 3 engaging the statutory ground of misconduct.

Regulatory concern 5

The case examiners have next considered whether there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 5 being found to amount to the statutory ground of lack of competence or capability.

The case examiners' guidance explains that lack of competence or capability suggests a standard of professional performance which is unacceptably low. It means a social worker has demonstrated that they may lack the knowledge and skills to do their work in a safe and effective manner. This must usually be demonstrated over a fair sample of a social worker's work. There is no set definition of 'fair sample', but it suggests a sample sufficient to show the social worker's usual standard of work over a period of time.

The case examiners note that the conduct in regulatory concern 5 covers a period of around 10 months and there appear to have been issues with several of the social worker's cases. Given that the social worker was only allocated a small number of families, the case examiners are satisfied this represents a fair sample of their work.

The case examiners have been provided which suggests that managers regularly reviewed the work carried out by the social worker and despite support, issues

remained. The social worker accepts they felt totally overwhelmed and struggled to do everything expected of them.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 5 engaging the statutory ground of lack of competence or capability.

### Impairment

The case examiners have then considered in relation to regulatory concerns 1, 3 and 5, whether the social worker's fitness to practice could be found impaired.

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 that a lack of competence or capability can normally be remediated through further learning, training or experience of implementing the learning to evidence development of skills. Particularly in cases when the social worker is newly qualified, they may require more time to find an area of practice which suits them and where they can develop their competence and consolidate their training.

The case examiners note that conduct involving dishonesty may be more difficult to remediate given it may relate to a character flaw or attitudinal concern. However, the case examiners note that they have been given substantial evidence in this case to demonstrate the social worker was struggling to manage their caseload and they are of the view that while lack of competence cannot excuse dishonesty, they may be linked. The case examiners consider the alleged dishonesty appears to be limited to one incident and there is evidence that the social worker was transparent and open about other mistakes or issues they experienced. With this in mind, and the absence

of any adverse history or further concerns, the case examiners do not consider that this case involves deep seated attitudinal concerns. Therefore, they are of the view the conduct can be remedied.

Insight and remediation

The case examiners consider that the social worker has demonstrated remorse and appreciates what went wrong. The social worker has provided evidence of reflection which states;

"I failed to fully grasp the seriousness of my actions and their potential consequences. I now realise that assessments are not merely procedural formalities but essential tools for ensuring safety, competence, and high standards. Any deviation from honest and accurate reporting risks weakening these safeguards. Even if pressure such as time constraints, external expectations, being inexperienced or workplace culture affected my decisions, I acknowledge that these are not valid justifications". The case examiners consider there to be evidence of developing but not full insight.

The social worker has not practised since the concerns were raised, and so is not able to evidence that they would act differently in the future, but their insight provides some assurance that they understand why this conduct was so serious.

The social worker has also acknowledged that they struggled to manage their caseload, but they have not provided evidence of learning or remediation as they state they no longer intend to practise as a social worker.

Risk of repetition

Given the lack of remediation and no evidence of subsequent practice provided, the case examiners consider that a risk of repetition remains.

**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 consider that the public need to be confident and assured that social workers tasked with supporting vulnerable people are competent and have the skills necessary to carry out this work. Whilst a well-informed member of the public may understand that a newly qualified social worker needs time and support to develop their practice, they would expect the regulator to ensure that those in

unrestricted practice are safe. A finding of impairment is therefore required, to maintain confidence in the profession and protect the public.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.

## The public interest

| Decision summary | | |
|---|---|---|
| Is there a public interest in referring the case to a hearing? | Yes | ☐ |
| | No | ☒ |

| Referral criteria | | |
|---|---|---|
| Is there a conflict in the evidence that must be resolved at a hearing? | Yes | ☐ |
| | No | ☒ |
| Does the social worker dispute any or all of the key facts of the case? | Yes | ☐ |
| | No | ☒ |
| Is a hearing necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession, and/or to uphold the professional standards of social workers? | Yes | ☐ |
| | No | ☒ |

### Additional reasoning

The case examiners have noted that the social worker has not indicated to the regulator whether they consider their fitness to practise to be currently impaired. Where a social worker does not accept impairment, case examiner guidance suggests that a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest.

However, the case examiners note that the guidance states the social worker must accept the matter of impairment at the point of concluding the case and are of the view that this does not prevent them offering accepted disposal prior to this.

The case examiners consider that it is reasonable to offer accepted disposal in this case because:

- There is no conflict in the evidence.

- The social worker does not dispute the key facts of the case.
- The accepted disposal process will provide the social worker an opportunity to review the case examiners reasoning on impairment and reflect on whether they are able to accept a finding of impairment. It is open to the social worker to reject any accepted disposal proposal and request a hearing if they wish to explore the question of impairment in more detail.

The case examiners are also of the view that the public would be satisfied to see the regulator take prompt action in this case, with the publication of an accepted disposal decision providing a steer to the public and the profession on the importance of adhering to the professional standards expected of social workers in England. The case examiners will therefore seek to resolve this matter through the accepted disposal process.

## Accepted disposal

| Case outcome | | |
|---|---|---|
| Proposed outcome | No further action | ☐ |
| | Advice | ☐ |
| | Warning order | ☐ |
| | Conditions of practice order | ☒ |
| | Suspension order | ☐ |
| | Removal order | ☐ |
| Proposed duration | 18 months | |

### Reasoning

In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's sanctions guidance and reminded themselves that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker but to protect the public and the wider public interest. Furthermore, the guidance requires that decision makers select the least severe sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest. In considering sanctions, the case examiners have considered the following mitigating and aggravating factors:

Mitigating

- The social worker's developing insight.
- The social worker was newly qualified and therefore lacking experience.

[redacted]

Aggravating

- Lack of remediation

- No evidence of good practice previous to the period of concern.

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, advice, and warning order

The case examiners have already determined there is a realistic prospect that the social worker's fitness to practise would be found impaired. The sanctions guidance advises that if the personal element of impairment is found, "a sanction restricting or removing a social worker's registration will normally be necessary to protect the public". The case examiners are therefore led to consider sanctions which restrict the social worker's practice. They note that the guidance suggests it may therefore "be reasonable to move beyond the lower sanctions (no action, advice or a warning) on this basis alone".

The case examiners have already determined that they do not consider that the social worker has demonstrated sufficient insight or remediation and that a risk of repetition remains. Therefore, the sanctions of no further action, advice or a warning are considered inappropriate on the basis that these outcomes will not restrict practice and therefore not sufficiently protect the public.

The case examiners therefore next considered restrictive sanctions.

Conditions of practice order

The primary purpose of a conditions of practice order is to protect the public whilst the social worker takes any necessary steps to remediate their fitness to practise. The case examiners have consulted the sanctions 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.

The case examiners are of the view that the above considerations apply in this case. Whilst they are mindful that the social worker has stated they do not intend to practise as a social worker in the future, this view may change and there is no evidence to suggest that the social worker cannot comply or would breach conditions.

The case examiners consider there are workable conditions that could be put in place which would enable the social worker to practise without risk of harm to the public.

A conditions of practice order would offer the social worker an opportunity to develop their skills and experience as well as demonstrate remediation, whilst under the supervision of a reporter and workplace supervisor, should they resume social work employment.

While the case examiners note that conditions of practice will often be suitable for concerns around lack of competence, they may be less appropriate in cases involving dishonesty. However, the case examiners are of the view that whilst dishonesty is serious, it exists on a spectrum of behaviour and this isolated incident which was neither persistent nor concealed does not represent the most serious instance. As they have noted that the social worker's lack of competence may have been a contributory factor in the alleged dishonesty, it appears appropriate to manage any ongoing risk with a conditions of practice order.

The case examiners have therefore decided that a conditions of practice order is necessary, proportionate and would protect the public.

Suspension order

The case examiners have established that for the reasons outlined above, it is possible for them to offer a conditions of practice order. To test their reasoning, they next considered a suspension order.

The case examiners have considered carefully whether the social worker's alleged dishonesty suggests that they cannot return to practice at this time. They acknowledge that falsification of records could be seen as incompatible with continued registration as a social worker. However, they have concluded that this is not the case due to the rationale above, which suggests this was an isolated incident and the social worker was normally transparent.

Based on the above considerations, the case examiners are of the view that suspension from the register would be a punitive outcome in this case, where it is considered that risk to the public could be managed by appropriate and workable

conditions of practice. Furthermore, a suspension order would risk deskilling the social worker.

Length of the conditions of practice order

As the case examiners have determined that a conditions of practice order is the appropriate sanction in this case, they next considered the length of the order. The case examiners are aware from the sanction's guidance that conditions of practice orders can be imposed for up to three years.

As the social worker is not currently in practice, the case examiners consider that a one-year order would not allow the social worker sufficient time to complete the required remediation. Instead, a period of 18 months would allow the social worker to gain further insight, demonstrate remediation, and return to practice.

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.

## Content of the conditions of practice

Conditions 1-15 (inclusive) should be in place for an 18 month period. In accordance with paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018, the regulator must review the conditions of practice order before its expiry. The social worker and/or Social Work England can seek early review if new evidence becomes available to suggest the current order needs to varied, replaced or removed.

1. You must notify Social Work England at any time you are employed in a role, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England 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 social work educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.

3. a. At any time you are employed in a role, or 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 (and can be the same person as the workplace supervisor).

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 and Social Work England will make these reports available to any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions on request.

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. 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 the close supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by you, and approved by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register (and can be the same person as the reporter).

b. You must not start or continue to 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/reporter, to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:

- Completing work within expected timescales

- Information gathering and analysis in assessments

- Professional curiosity and challenge

12. You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 4 weeks from the date these conditions take effect (when employed in a social work role) and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.

13. You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019), and provide a written reflection to Social Work England 9 months after these conditions take effect, focusing on how your conduct, specifically,

- dishonesty in an assessment, and

- not completing work within timescales,

was below the accepted standard of a social worker, outlining what you should have done differently.

14. You must not undertake any agency, locum, out-of-hours or on-call duties.

15. 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 (14), 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 (at time of application).

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.

## Response from the social worker

The social worker responded on 15 October 2026, stating:

"I have read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide. I admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that my fitness to practise is impaired. I understand the terms of the proposed disposal of my fitness to practise case and accept them in full".

## Case examiners' response and final decision

The case examiners have reviewed the social worker's response. They have again considered the public interest in this matter and, as they have not been presented with any new evidence which may change their previous assessment, they remain satisfied that the public interest in this case may be fulfilled through the accepted disposal process.

The case examiners therefore direct that the regulator impose a conditions of practise order on the social worker's registration for a period of 18 months.