



Case Examiner Decision
Aine Walsh – SW106064
FTPS-22617

Contents

The role of the case examiners	3
Decision summary	4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns.....	6
Preliminary issues	7
The realistic prospect test.....	8
The public interest.....	16
Accepted disposal	18

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	
Preliminary outcome	14 November 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed - warning order (3 years duration)
Final outcome	24 November 2025
	Accepted disposal - warning order (3 years duration)

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 2 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 2 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1 and 2, 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 considered 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 warning order of 3 years' duration.

The social worker was advised that if they did not agree to this proposal, or if the case examiners revised their determination, the matter would proceed to a hearing.

The social worker accepted this proposal and the terms in full on 20 November 2025.

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 social worker

Person A

Colleague A

Colleague B

Colleague C

Newly qualified social worker A

Newly qualified social worker B

Social work assistant



The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer (hereafter referred to as 'the local authority').
Date the complaint was received	14 September 2023
Complaint summary	The social worker is alleged to have shared a video with work colleagues which included racially discriminatory language. Further, it is alleged that the social worker neglected to respond to concerns about racist comments made by a service user during a visit.

Regulatory concerns

The regulatory concerns for this case are as follows:

Regulatory concern 1

Whilst registered as a social worker on 19 May 2023:

1. You shared a video which contained offensive content, including racially discriminatory language

Regulatory concern 2

Whilst registered as a social worker on or around 23 May 2023:

2. You did not appropriately respond to concerns about a service user making racist comments to another worker during a visit

Grounds of impairment:

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1 and/or 2 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Preliminary issues

Investigation		
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has been notified of the grounds for investigation?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 and 2 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory ground of misconduct and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found to be currently impaired.

Reasoning

Facts

Regulatory concern 1

Whilst registered as a social worker on 19 May 2023:

1. You shared a video which contained offensive content, including racially discriminatory language

The case examiners have been provided with the relevant local authority's policies and procedures, which they have considered.

The social worker was employed as a team manager of a children's social work team within the local authority. The local authority's referral states that, in August 2023, a senior practitioner (colleague A) shared a screenshot of a video link with a senior manager during a wider conversation with higher management.

This Instagram video link was shared in a WhatsApp work group chat by the social worker from their personal phone on the evening of 19 May 2023, which colleague A found offensive.

The local authority commenced an investigation into the matter and noted the video included racially discriminatory language with the repeated use of a derogatory name directed at black people. In addition, the content may be found offensive on the grounds of religion and/or belief.

Screenshots of the WhatsApp group chat have been provided; these evidence that the social worker shared the Instagram link at 21:54 hours on Friday 19 May 2023, followed by two messages which were deleted the next morning.

The screenshots show that on 20 May 2023 at 11:01 hours, the social worker sent the following message, *“Apologies, sent to the wrong group chat! Only just realised.”* Colleague B, a team member responds at 11:03 hours saying, *“I thought you did! Which I why I didn’t reply... [redacted]” (sic)*

The case examiners have been provided with a copy of the Instagram video in question, which they have viewed. The video depicts a white pastor rapping and a white female singing the phrase [redacted]. This slur is repeated three more times during the duration of the video, which is approximately 50 seconds in length.

Within colleague A’s statement they report being shocked about the language used in the video and it made them feel angry and uncomfortable. They had expected that the social worker would apologise upon returning to work after the weekend however, neither the social worker, nor other team members, mentioned it.

There are local investigation statements from colleague A, a senior practitioner (colleague B) and two newly qualified social workers and a social work assistant; all are clear that the WhatsApp group was intended as a team ‘*safety check-in*’ but acknowledge that it was sometimes used for social chat. Most witnesses cannot recall the video or state that they did not access the link upon realising it had been sent in the wrong group chat.

The social worker cites that they sent the video link in error, as they intended to send it to a friends’ WhatsApp group that included Person A. They offer an explanation that, on the said evening, they were watching both TV and scrolling on Instagram with the volume off when the video began to play, following which they turned up the volume and part watched the video which they found amusing. The social worker

states that they then shared the video without watching it until the end and inadvertently sent the link to the wrong WhatsApp group chat.

The social worker says, *“I had viewed the exert as a spoof into outreach by an American church group, I shared because of [REDACTED] (person A’s) upbringing in various mega churches and on the basis that [REDACTED] would have not found it offensive, and with no intention to cause offence.”* The social worker states that they deleted two messages the following day when they realised that they had been sent to the work group chat, but they could not work out how to delete the video link.

The social worker has been consistent in their account in that whilst they accept sending the video link to the work-group chat, they assert that they had not viewed or heard the full content prior to doing so. The social worker states that they only viewed the video in full when the concern was raised later and wholly accepts that the content was completely inappropriate and offensive; they would not have shared if it they had heard the language used. The social worker says that the video does not reflect their views and is ashamed.

Accordingly, the case examiners are therefore satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the facts at regulatory concern 1 proven.

Regulatory concern 2

Whilst registered as a social worker on or around 23 May 2023:

2. You did not appropriately respond to concerns about a service user making racist comments to another worker during a visit

The case examiners consider that the concern should be amended to read the service user’s **relative**. They consider this is not a material change and as such does not require an adjournment.

The matters at regulatory concern 2 came to light during colleague A’s conversation with a senior manager about the video link addressed at regulatory concern 1.

Colleague A states that during a joint home visit with a professional observer, a service user’s father asked if they could tell a joke, as follows: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Colleague A informs that they did not respond and that following the incident the professional observer apologised for not challenging the father at the time. When later reporting this to the social worker (their manager), colleague A believed that the social worker appeared to minimise the father’s comment, and they did not address this further.

The case examiners have considered what the social worker should have done in the circumstances, as described above.

The local authority state that it would have expected the social worker, as the team manager, to have offered a safe space and/or supervision to discuss the incident and ascertain what impact or support was needed and consider what actions colleague A would like to have been taken; there is no evidence that this was done.

Within the social worker's response to the local investigation, they describe not being fully aware of the details of the father's comment. When they asked colleague A what had happened, colleague A replied that it was a poorly judged joke, which was not funny but not made to offend them. The social worker states that they provided some support at the time, and reinforced the good work that colleague A had completed with the family.

The social worker explains that they were then on leave and upon return the incident was raised again; the social worker agreed to contact the service user's father to address it. However, the next week they were ill and worked from home and had then had further leave. The social worker accepts that this action was neglected but that they discussed it with their line manager who agreed that colleague A's new manager would follow this up.

Accordingly, the case examiners are therefore satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the facts at regulatory concern 2 proven

Grounds

The case examiners are aware that there is no statutory 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. This can include conduct that takes place in the exercise of professional practice and conduct which occurs outside the exercise of professional practice but calls into question the suitability of the colleague to work as a social worker.

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:

1.5 Recognise differences across diverse communities and challenge the impact of disadvantage and discrimination on people and their families and communities.

1.6 Promote social justice, helping to confront and resolve issues of inequality and inclusion.

4.8 Reflect on my own values and challenge the impact they have on my practice.

As a social worker, I will not:

5.1 Abuse, neglect, discriminate, exploit or harm anyone, or condone this by others.

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.

5.6 Use technology, social media or other forms of electronic communication unlawfully, unethically, or in a way that brings the profession into disrepute.

In relation to regulatory concern 1, the case examiners are satisfied that adjudicators may consider that sharing a link to a video, with what is likely to be considered racially offensive and religious discriminatory content, to be a significant departure from the standards expected of social workers.

In relation to regulatory concern 2, the case examiners are satisfied that adjudicators may consider a team manager who neglected to ensure that a team member, subject to a racial 'joke' during a home visit, was adequately supported and failed to promptly address the behaviour, to be a departure from the standards expected of social workers.

The case examiners consider that anti-discriminatory practice and promoting equality, diversity and inclusion are fundamental values of the social work profession. The social worker has consistently stated that the video link was sent in error, and, in the social worker's view, it is mitigation that they had not heard the full content, that is the racial slur or derogatory content, before sharing the link.

However, the case examiners take the view that even if this was the case (although noting that the video is very short in length), given the evident discriminatory and satirical nature of the content at the outset, they are concerned about the social worker's lapse in judgement. Similarly, the social worker did not sufficiently give regard to the incident in which colleague A was subject to a racist 'joke' and they neglected to respond appropriately or ensure that colleague A's views and wishes were considered.

The social worker was the team manager within a children's team. The case examiners are concerned that a team manager sharing a highly offensive video link and failing to deal with a racial slur towards team member, may suggest an inherent attitudinal bias and/or a potential to stereotype a particular religious group. The case examiners note that the social worker reports that due to their religious beliefs they

did not find the video offensive. The case examiners considers that such poor judgement does not align with the social work values and standards rooted in social justice, equality and inclusion.

As such, the case examiners consider that the social worker's alleged conduct was serious and a significant breach of the required standards; this had the potential to create an offensive and discriminatory environment for colleagues, even if this effect was not intended.

Whilst there has been no suggestion that service users were exposed to the video; by sharing the video link and not apologising at the first opportunity and ensuring the video was deleted, the social worker's action appears to have reinforced a negative experience for colleague A at regulatory concern 2, which left them feeling angry and uncomfortable. The case examiners take the view that the social worker may have failed to promote the necessary anti-racist practice to maintain an inclusive working environment.

Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied that adjudicators may consider the social worker's conduct to be a significant departure from the standards expected of social workers, and as such, the grounds of misconduct may be engaged.

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

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

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

The case examiners are of the view that misconduct involving racially, or religious discriminatory conduct may be difficult to remediate. However, they do consider it possible for the social worker to attempt remediation through demonstration of

insight and meaningful reflection together with evidence of continuing professional development.

The case examiners understand that the social worker is not currently in professional practice, but their current role is within educational inclusion and support.

Insight and remediation

The social worker's explanation for how they came to share the video link has been outlined at regulatory concern 1. The social worker has expressed regret the impact of sharing the video link has had, particularly those from, "*a BME background.*" The social worker cites that they have always strived to champion equality and diversity and to protect and represent their team, regardless of their background.

They have reflected on the intrinsic link between their personal and social work identity and accepts that the conduct should not have happened. The social worker apologises to those affected by their actions.

The social worker is regretful that they did not take action to mitigate sharing the video and explains how they could not work out how to delete the video link. They have not said that they asked for assistance to delete the video. They say that at the time, they were intoxicated and were embarrassed to admit this to the team.

In relation to regulatory concern 2, the social worker is again regretful that they did not deal with the incident appropriately, despite it being their intention to do so. The social worker comments that they have since reflected and wished they had addressed this matter more proactively. In addition, the social worker reflects on the impact the accusation of racism has had on their own wellbeing.

When assessing further remediation, the social worker informs that their current employer is aware of the fitness to practise case and dismissal from the local authority. They state that they continue to work within the parameters of a risk assessment within the new role, and there have been no further concerns of a similar nature.

The social worker informs that they have completed diversity and inclusion training and have completed independent research into the impact of racism in social work and the wider workforce. They indicate that they have created relevant tutorials in relation to race riots, hate crime and used their anonymised experience as a learning tool with students who have shared offensive material.

The case examiners have carefully considered the social worker's reflections and remediation and are reassured by the evidence of developing insight.

Risk of repetition

The case examiners note that the social worker did not provide full submissions and did not sufficiently address the impact which their alleged conduct may have had on the wider team and or wider public.

While the case examiners have determined there to be some risk of repetition, they do not consider it to be 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.

Public interest includes the need to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and the need to maintain public's trust and confidence in the profession.

The case examiners have considered the seriousness of the allegations, and the evidence of emotional distress caused to colleague A and the potential impact on other team members of the group chat. Further, the case examiners consider that the alleged actions have the potential to have a negative impact on trust and confidence in the social work profession.

If the concerns were found proven, the case examiners consider that a fully informed member of the public would expect a finding of impairment.

The case examiners conclude that there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would make a finding of current impairment in this case.

The public interest

Decision summary

Is there a public interest in referring the case to a hearing?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Referral criteria

Is there a conflict in the evidence that must be resolved at a hearing?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the social worker dispute any or all of the key facts of the case?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is a hearing necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession, and/or to uphold the professional standards of social workers?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional reasoning

The case examiners have carefully considered whether a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest. The case examiners have noted the following:

- The case examiners guidance reminds them that “*wherever possible and appropriate, case examiners will seek to resolve cases through accepted disposal. This is quicker and more efficient than preparing and presenting a case to a fitness to practise panel*”.
- The social worker accepts the concerns but does not directly indicate whether they consider their current fitness to practise to be currently impaired. The case examiners are of the view that the social worker should be afforded the opportunity of an accepted disposal proposal to consider the case examiners’ assessment of the evidence presented to them, and to reflect on whether they do accept the case examiners’ findings in relation to the facts.

- The accepted disposal process will also provide the social worker with the opportunity to review the case examiners reasoning on grounds and impairment and reflect on whether they do 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 reject the case examiners finding on facts and grounds or explore the question of impairment in more detail.
- The case examiners are aware that a case cannot be concluded through an accepted disposal process where a social worker does not accept the facts and does not agree that they are currently impaired. At this stage, however, the case examiners' proposal for an accepted disposal process does not mark the conclusion of the case, as that requires a response from the social worker for the case examiners' consideration. It is also subject to a final review of the case by the case examiners, who may still determine to send the matter to a public hearing, following any response received.

Interim order

An interim order may be necessary for protection of members of the public	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
An interim order may be necessary in the best interests of the social worker	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Accepted disposal

Case outcome

Proposed outcome	No further action	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Advice	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Warning order	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Conditions of practice order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Suspension order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Removal order	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed duration	Warning order - 3 years' duration	

Reasoning

Having found that a realistic prospect the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the case examiners then considered what, if any, sanction they should propose in this case. The case examiners have taken into account the Sanctions Guidance published by Social Work England. They are reminded that a sanction is not intended to be punitive but may have a punitive effect and have borne in mind the principle of proportionality and fairness in determining the appropriate sanction.

The case examiners are also mindful that the purpose of any sanction is to protect the public which includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

The case examiners have considered each available sanction, in ascending order of severity.

In considering a sanction, the case examiners have considered mitigating and aggravating factors in this case:

Mitigating

- The social worker has accepted the core facts of the regulatory concerns.
- There is no previous adverse fitness to practise history.

Aggravating

- The social worker has not fully remediated.
- The case examiners consider there is a real prospect of adjudicators finding current impairment, and the risk of repetition remains.

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

No Action

The case examiners conclude that given the nature and seriousness of the social worker's alleged conduct and in the absence of exceptional circumstances, it would be inappropriate to take no action. Furthermore, it would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession.

Advice

The case examiners next considered whether offering advice would be appropriate. 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 social worker's alleged conduct. Furthermore, it would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession.

Warning

The case examiners then considered a warning order. The case examiners had regard to their guidance, which states a warning order is likely to be appropriate where (all the following):

- The fitness to practise issues is isolated or limited
- There is a low risk of repetition
- The social worker has demonstrated insight

The case examiners note there is no previous adverse fitness to practise history. The case examiners acknowledge the passage of time since the concerns were first raised. To date, there is no known repeat of the alleged conduct, although the social

worker is not currently practising in a qualified role, their current role aligns with the social work values and standards.

The case examiners are encouraged to see that the social worker has demonstrated some insight and some meaningful reflections and remediation. However, as stated, the social worker has not provided final submissions, and they have not sufficiently addressed the impact their alleged conduct may have had on team and/or wider public. While the case examiners have determined there to be some risk of repetition, they do not consider it to be high.

A warning order implies a clear expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct, and the case examiners conclude that a warning order is the appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case; and represents the minimum sanction necessary to uphold the public's confidence.

Having concluded that a warning order is the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners went on to consider the length of time for the order. When considering a warning order, case examiners can direct that a warning order will stay on the social worker's register entry for periods of one, three or five years.

According to the case examiner guidance, a one year warning may be appropriate for an isolated incident of relatively low seriousness where the primary objective is to send a message about the professional standards expected of social workers; three years might be appropriate for more serious concerns to maintain public confidence and to send a message about the professional standards expected of social workers; and five-years might be appropriate for serious cases that have fallen only marginally short of requiring restriction of registration, to maintain confidence in the profession and where it is necessary to send a clear signal about the standards expected.

The case examiners consider that a three-year warning order would be a proportionate response in this instance. The case examiners view the concerns to be serious and although the alleged conduct was limited to two incidents of poor judgement, a one-year warning would not be appropriate. They have taken into consideration the social worker's previous good character, developing insight and remediation together with the time passed since the concerns occurred. Since then, the social worker has undertaken relevant equality and diversity training and continuing professional development which, they report, has better informed their knowledge and practice.

The case examiners do not consider this to be a case that has fallen only marginally short of requiring restriction of registration, and as such, consider that a five-year warning would be disproportionately long.

The case examiners have also considered whether the next sanctions, conditions of practice and suspension, are more appropriate in this case. The social worker is an experienced practitioner, and the case examiners consider a condition of practice order would not be necessary in this case; they note from their guidance that conditions are more commonly suited to cases relating to health, competence or capability. The case examiners have already acknowledged that the social worker is committed to undertaking relevant training and continuing professional development to effectively perform the role; they do not therefore consider that conditions of practice are necessary.

The case examiners again note that that this is not a case that has fallen only marginally short of requiring removal, and as such consider that suspension from the register would be a disproportionate and punitive outcome.

To conclude, the case examiners have proposed a warning order of three-years 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 warning

The case examiners formally warn the social worker as follows:

The sharing of a racial discriminatory and offensive video is a serious matter. Your decision to share such a video within a WhatsApp group chat, even if not intended, demonstrates a serious lack of judgement. As does, failing to act upon concerns raised about racist comments to a colleague.

Your alleged conduct does not align with the required Social Work England professional standards, and you are warned to comply with these in the future. Specifically in relation to the following standards:

As a social worker, I will:

- 1.5 Recognise differences across diverse communities and challenge the impact of disadvantage and discrimination on people and their families and communities.*
- 1.6 Promote social justice, helping to confront and resolve issues of inequality and inclusion.*
- 4.8 Reflect on my own values and challenge the impact they have on my practice.*

As a social worker, I will not:

- 5.1 Abuse, neglect, discriminate, exploit or harm anyone, or condone this by others.*
- 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.*
- 5.6 Use technology, social media or other forms of electronic communication unlawfully, unethically, or in a way that brings the profession into disrepute.*

Your conduct could have an adverse effect on the public's confidence in you as a social worker. It may also damage the reputation of the social work profession. This conduct should not be repeated. Any further matters brought to the attention of the regulator are likely to result in a more serious outcome.

Response from the social worker

The social worker provided a response on 20 November 2025 and confirmed *"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."*

"I confirm this is my formal response to the case examiners."

Case examiners' response and final decision

The case examiners concluded on 14 November 2025 that the social worker's fitness to practise was likely to be found impaired but that the public interest could be met through a prompt conclusion with a proposed accepted disposal rather than through a public hearing. They proposed a warning order with a duration of three years which the social worker has accepted.

In light of the social worker's acceptance of the warning order of three years duration, the case examiners have considered again whether there would be a public interest in referring this matter to a public hearing. They remain of the view that this is unnecessary for the reasons set out earlier in the decision.

Having been advised of the social worker's response, the case examiners have again turned their minds as to whether a warning order of three years duration remains the most appropriate means of disposal for this case. They have reviewed their decision, paying regard to the overarching objectives of Social Work England, i.e. protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the social work profession, and the maintenance of proper standards.

Having done so, they remain of the view that an accepted disposal by way of a warning order of three years duration a fair and proportionate disposal and is the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.