



Case Examiner Decision  
Ellie Chadwick – SW131706  
FTPS-19931

## 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 .....	17
Accepted disposal .....	19

## 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	20 May 2024
	Removal order
Final outcome	23 July 2024
	Accepted disposal – removal order

### Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

In respect of regulatory concerns 1,2, and 3, the case examiners determine that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding these proven.

There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1,2 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.

There is no realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1,2 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory grounds of lack of competence or capability, and these concerns have therefore been closed at the grounds stage.

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

As such, the case examiners requested that the social worker was notified of their intention to resolve the case with a removal order. The social worker notified the regulator that they accepted their removal from the register. The case examiners

revisited the public interest in the case. The case examiners determined that an accepted disposal, in this case a removal order was the most appropriate outcome in this case.

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. This content will be redacted in the complainant's copy of this decision, and the social worker will be advised that text highlighted in a different colour has been redacted.

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

In accordance with Social Work England's fitness to practise proceedings and registration appeals publications policy, the case examiners have anonymised the names of individuals to maintain privacy. A schedule of anonymity is provided below for the social worker and complainant and will be redacted if this decision is published.

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] employer 1
	[REDACTED] Employer 2

## The complaint and our regulatory concerns

### The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer, ██████████
Date the complaint was received	14 October 2021
Complaint summary	The regulatory concerns as drafted accurately reflect the issues raised in respect of the social worker's alleged practice failures.

### Regulatory concerns / Regulatory concerns and concerns recommended for closure

*Whilst registered as a social worker, on/or between 11 May 2021 and 21 September 2021, you;*

1. *Failed to complete statutory visits in a timely manner in relation to:*
  - I. *Family K*
  - II. *Carer 1*
  - III. *Carer 2*
  - IV. *Carer 3*
2. *Falsified case records in relation to Regulatory Concern 1.*
3. *Your conduct at Regulatory Concern (2) above was dishonest.*

*The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct and/or lack of competence or capability*

*Your fitness to practise as a social worker is impaired by reason of your misconduct and/or lack of competence or capability.*

## 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"/>

Requests for further information or submissions, or any other preliminary issues that have arisen

No preliminary issues have been identified.

## 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

The case examiners have determined that there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1,2, and 3 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

### Reasoning

#### Facts

The social worker's alleged practice failures took place whilst they were undertaking their Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE) with Employer 1. The ASYE commenced in August 2020. The ASYE is a 12-month, employer led and employment-based programme of support and assessment for newly qualified social workers. The social worker was initially based in the safeguarding service. In May 2021, the social worker was allocated to the Looked After Children's team.

***Whilst registered as a social worker, on/or between 11 May 2021 and 21 September 2021, you;***

- Failed to complete statutory visits in a timely manner in relation to:***

**I. Family K****II. Carer 1****III. Carer 2****IV. Carer 3**

1. As part of the social worker's core tasks, there was an expectation that they undertake statutory visits. The purpose of statutory visits is to allow the social worker to do the following: -

- Assess stability and review suitability of placement.
- Observe how a/the child(ren) engages with the carer.
- Note carer issues.
- Assess contact arrangements

The evidence provided in respect of regulatory concern 1 (i), would suggest that the social worker failed to undertake the statutory visits that were expected of them.

With regards to Family K, the employers were alerted to the social worker not undertaking statutory visits when they received a complaint from Family K. The employers checked the system and three statutory visits were recorded. When they made further enquiries with Family K, it was noted that the social worker could not have visited on one of the dates the social worker recorded, as Family K was abroad on holiday.

In respect of regulatory concern 1 (ii, iii, iv) employers undertook further enquiries and noted in the cases of Carers 1,2 and 3, the social worker recorded visits that had not taken place. The case examiners have seen statements from foster carers and case records which indicate that visits were not undertaken in line with statutory guidance and therefore may not have been completed in a timely manner.

- ***Falsified case records in relation to Regulatory Concern 1.***

The evidence indicates that the social worker recorded statutory visits that did not take place. The case examiners have seen evidence to support this regulatory concern from foster carers, supervising social workers and records completed by the social worker.

**2. Your conduct at Regulatory Concern (2) above was dishonest.**

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 not received submissions from the social worker regarding what their belief was at the time of these events. The social worker's submissions focus on the challenges they experienced whilst working for Employer 1 and their (social worker's) belief that they were unsupported by managers.

The concerns originally came to light through information from foster carer K who said that statutory visits had not been carried out on 26 July 2021 and 20 September 2021. The case examiners have seen the social worker's case records on these dates, the entry for 26 July 2021 includes details of how they were 'greeted at the door' and how the children were 'well presented, clean and appropriately dressed.' On 20 September 2021, the case record has similar detail, despite the foster carer confirming that they were out of the county on this date. The case examiners consider that the social worker would have known at the time of writing these records that these observations were misrepresentations of what had happened and as such they knew that they had not been 'greeted at the door' or seen the children to describe their presentation.

The evidence from the complainant suggests that when the social worker was initially challenged regarding the falsification of records, they were not honest with their employer at the earliest opportunity. The social worker eventually accepted that they had fabricated records and suggested that they were experiencing some difficult personal circumstances at that time. The case examiners take the view that had the social worker been forthcoming about the falsification of records that they would have availed themselves the opportunity to receive support around this issue. Furthermore, the case examiners take the view that it is reasonable to conclude that the social worker would have been aware of Professional Standard 6.6, which requires the social worker to declare "*anything that might affect my ability to do my job competently or may affect my fitness to practise.*"

The case examiners consider that the ordinary, decent people may consider the social worker's actions to be dishonest.

**Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of concerns 1, 2 and 3, being found proven by adjudicators**

#### Grounds

This case has been presented to the case examiners to consider the facts capable of proof amounting to impairment by reason of misconduct and/or a lack of competence or

capability. The case examiners' guidance encourages them to (where possible) identify the appropriate statutory ground to proceed on, as this provides clarity as to the basis of Social Work England's case against the social worker. The case examiners are reminded, however, that in some cases they may not always be in the best position to identify one ground over another. The case examiners will consider each in turn.

#### **Lack of competence or capability**

- The case examiners note their guidance which sets out that *“usually, lack of competence or capability must be demonstrated over a fair sample of a social worker's work.”* The evidence provided in respect of regulatory concerns 1,2 and 3 applies to four service users. The evidence provided by Employer 1 indicates that the social worker was allocated 24 children and young people to work with. The case examiners also note that the identified deficits in practice took place over a period of five months. During that time, the social worker received supervision. The case examiners have reviewed a sample of supervision notes during which the social worker discusses case issues with their manager.
- The case examiners take the view that the sample of cases they have seen does not represent a fair sample of work over a period of time. The case examiner guidance suggests that a lack of competence or capability suggests a standard of professional performance which is unacceptably low. In this instance, the evidence would suggest that the social worker has the necessary knowledge and skills to practice as a social worker, and that their conduct is more clearly aligned to a departure from the standards and what would be expected of a social worker in terms of professional integrity.

**Given the above the case examiners consider there is no realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the social worker to be impaired by reason of lack of competence or capability.**

#### **Misconduct**

- The case examiners take the view that the statutory grounds of misconduct may have been engaged by regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3.
- The case examiners are aware that there is no legal definition of misconduct. However, misconduct would generally 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 person 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: -

- With regards to regulatory concern 1, the social worker undertook some of the required visits and falsified others. This would suggest that the social worker understood what was expected of them with regards to maintaining contact with service users. The case examiners have reviewed the content of these recorded visits and note that they are quite detailed which could lead the reader to conclude that the contents of the record were an accurate reflection of conversations and observations they had made. Accurate case recording is essential as other members of the team use them to underpin their decision making. If records are inaccurate then inappropriate decisions could be made which may negatively impact vulnerable individuals.
- Regulatory concerns 2 and 3 refer to matters of dishonesty. The case examiners are of the view that any dishonesty from a social worker should be viewed as significant and serious. They note the sanctions guidance (December 2022) which states *“social workers hold privileged positions of trust. ....It is essential to the effective delivery of social work that the public can trust social workers implicitly.”* It could be considered that the social worker did not act in a trustworthy manner when they falsified case records.

The evidence would suggest that the social worker did not align their conduct to a number of Social Work England professional standards which state: -

As a social worker I will: -

- 2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair
- 2.4 Practise in ways that demonstrate empathy, perseverance, authority, professional confidence and capability, working with people to enable full participation in discussions and decision making
- 3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately
- 3.8 Clarify where the accountability lies for delegated work and fulfil that responsibility when it lies with me
- 3.13 Provide, or support people to access advice and services tailored to meet their needs, based on evidence, negotiating and challenging other professionals and organisations, as required

- 5.2 I will not 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 I will not falsify records or condone this by others.

**The case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators establishing the statutory grounds of misconduct in respect of regulatory concerns 1,2 and 3.**

### Impairment

In assessing matters of impairment, the case examiners have considered the test set out in the Case Examiner's Guidance (December 2022). The case examiners have reminded themselves that the purpose of regulation is not to punish a social worker for past mistakes. Rather, the regulatory process seeks to establish whether a social worker is safe and fit to practise today and in the future. Case examiners are of the view that isolated mistakes are unlikely to be repeated if a social worker recognises what went wrong and takes action to make sure it doesn't happen again.

Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:

- The personal element, established via an assessment of the risk of repetition.
- 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

- It may be considered that the social worker's conduct in respect of regulatory concern 1 can in principle be remediated. Remediation can take many forms and can include a social worker undertaking training, reflecting and understanding what went wrong.

- However, case examiners note that the allegations also include matters pertaining to dishonesty. The case examiner guidance is clear that it is more difficult to evidence remediation that has reformed character.

#### Insight and remediation

1. The social worker has provided submissions and testimonials. The testimonials are positive. The case examiners note, however, that these testimonials do not appear to address the issues raised by these regulatory concerns, i.e. the social worker failing to follow statutory guidance, failing to discharge the local authority's statutory duty as a corporate parent and the social worker being dishonest. Consequently, the case examiners have not placed a great deal of weight on the content of these testimonials as part of their consideration of the social worker's alleged practice failures.
- The social worker has provided lengthy submissions and a reflective piece which references their period of employment with the complainant. The social worker states *"It would never ever be my intention to place a child at risk of harm.... My additional research into the importance of the social work career has allowed me to reflect on my actions and learn from my mistakes. ... I would be willing to do any additional training to guide me to improve my practice... Reflecting back... I now ensure .... I am asking the questions that I need the answers too, I have a supportive team manager, mentor and team, but if they are uncontactable who else can I go to when there is crisis and I need support"*. The social worker asserts that *"no children where (sics) subject to any harm."* The case examiners are unsure how the social worker formed this view, given that they tendered their resignation from Employer 1, before the disciplinary investigation could be concluded.

#### Risk of repetition

- Although these concerns were raised by employer 1, the case examiners are aware that the social worker subsequently secured employment within another social work department (employer 2). The case examiners have had sight of evidence from the social worker, the complainant (employer 1) and employer 2.
- The case examiners consider that the social worker has not thought about the impact of their actions on public confidence in the profession or service users. The case examiners have been provided with evidence from the social worker's most recent employer (employer 2) dated 5.9.2023, they state the following, *"I have had families sharing concerns regarding her honesty as she has made claims to families and professionals about tasks being completed when they had not been and her not*

*turning up to meetings or visits*". This evidence would suggest that the social worker has not been able to utilise the support of their manager and mentor to improve their practice. Additionally, the evidence provided by Employer 2, would indicate that the social worker has repeated the behaviour that led to these regulatory concerns.

- The case examiners have therefore determined that insight is limited, despite the social worker's assertion that they have learned from their mistakes and therefore the risk of repetition remains high.

### **Public element**

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

The case examiners have 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 it relevant to note that it is perhaps by good fortune that vulnerable individuals were not harmed, as a result of the social worker's conduct. The case examiner's guidance states that any risk of harm is as serious as actual harm caused. The social worker was employed to support vulnerable children, whom they did not visit in line with expectations and where they may have falsely reported on the children's presentation and their interactions with them. The case examiners consider it likely that the social worker's actions could have increased risk to children who are already vulnerable by virtue of their 'looked after' status.

The social worker's reflective piece fails to appreciate that harm can also mean that that vulnerable children/carers could lose confidence in social workers and this could impact on their willingness to engage in the future which can lead to unmanaged risk/harm. The case examiners take the view that the social worker's conduct represents a serious departure from the standards expected of social workers. The case examiners consider that the evidence of poor practice combined with the social worker's dishonesty is so serious that a finding of impairment is required. This finding would serve to uphold public confidence in the regulator and make it clear that social workers are being held to account for breaching the professional standards and undermining public confidence in the profession.

**Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the social worker's fitness to practise to be impaired**

## 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

Case examiner guidance states that if the case examiners have found there is no public interest in the case being referred to a hearing, they may then consider whether an accepted disposal may be appropriate (paragraph 181). The guidance states that for a case to be concluded through accepted disposal, the social worker must accept the key facts and that their fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In this instance:

- There is no conflict in evidence in this case
- The social worker has provided a lot of mitigation but broadly accepts the facts.
- The social worker is clear that they accept that their conduct fell short of the standards expected of them.
- The case examiners are of the view that the risk of repetition can be managed, and they have several sanctions available to them to satisfy the public that this risk is being managed without the need for this to be examined within a public hearing.

- The case examiners are also of the view that the public would be satisfied to see the regulator take prompt, firm 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.

Furthermore, the case examiners have concluded that:

- Although the public interest is engaged, and the concerns in this case are serious, the case examiners are satisfied that public confidence in the profession and the professional standards for social workers can be upheld by the proposed outcome, and the decision being published on Social Work England’s public register.
- The public would support efforts made by the case examiners to resolve this case in a timely and proportionate manner, without the need to refer to a hearing.

**Consequently, the case examiners have determined that accepted disposal is the appropriate outcome in this case.**

### 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"/>

### Interim order

Not applicable

## Accepted disposal

Case outcome		
Proposed outcome	No further action	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Advice	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Warning order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Conditions of practice order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Suspension order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Removal order	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Proposed duration	Where a social worker is removed from the register, there is no defined end to the finding of impairment. A social worker that has been removed from the register may only apply to be restored to the register <b>five</b> years after the date the removal order took effect. The adjudicators will decide whether to restore a person to the register.	

## Reasoning

The case examiners have reviewed the evidence that has been provided by all relevant parties. This includes a request by the social worker for Voluntary Removal from the Social Work England Register of Social Workers. The case examiners have used this evidence/information in determining the most appropriate outcome. Additionally, the case examiners have noted advice contained in Social Work England's Sanctions Guidance (December 2022). The case examiners are aware that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker. Sanctions serve to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The case examiners have considered mitigating and aggravating factors in this case: -

## Mitigating

- The social worker has broadly accepted all the relevant facts and expressed remorse for their alleged conduct.
- There were some acknowledged difficulties during the social worker's ASYE whilst working for Employer 1

### Aggravating

- The social worker appears to have not been able to take the required remedial action to improve their alleged practice failures. The evidence from Employer 2 suggest that the social worker's practice has not been aligned to the professional standards.
- The alleged conduct involves dishonesty where the evidence suggests that this was persistent and concealed, as the social worker is alleged to have falsified visits, not engaged with the regulator and have shown no willingness to remediate their practice.

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

### No further action, advice, or warning

The case examiners note the content in the regulator's sanctions guidance (referenced above). The case examiners are advised that in cases where a risk of repetition remains, the outcomes of no further action, advice or warning are not appropriate as they will not restrict the social worker's practice. Whilst the guidance advises that these outcomes may be considered where there are mitigating factors, the case examiners are satisfied that in this case, given the social worker's alleged dishonesty, such outcomes remain inappropriate.

### Conditions of practice order

With regards to a conditions of practice order. The case examiners note the contents of paragraph 114 of the guidance. This states conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where all of the following listed below apply:

- 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 in light of the social worker's alleged dishonesty, there are no appropriate, proportionate, or workable conditions that could be put in place.

Furthermore, the case examiners considered that the public interest in this case would require a more serious sanction, so that public confidence could be maintained.

#### Suspension order

The case examiners have considered a suspension order. The case examiners note the sanctions guidance which indicates that such an order may be appropriate in cases where there has been a serious breach of the professional standards. The social worker has demonstrated some insight and has reflected on their conduct. However, there is little tangible evidence that the social worker can take remedial steps to improve their practice at this time. Furthermore, the social worker has indicated that they no longer want to practice or retain their registration as a social worker. Consequently, the case examiners have concluded that this case does not meet the requirements for a suspension order.

#### Removal order

Having discounted the other sanctions as noted above, the case examiners have turned their minds to the imposition of a removal order. The case examiners note that removal orders are imposed in cases where the social worker requires a level of restriction that cannot be achieved with the imposition of the other orders detailed above. The case examiners consider that a removal order is the only appropriate course action in this matter. A core function of regulation is to: -

- protect the public,
- maintain confidence in the profession,
- and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England

The case examiners consider that in light of the social worker's persistent dishonesty, there is no other outcome available to them that would provide the level of assurance needed in respect of these three criteria. In the case examiners' view, a removal order is the only sanction available that will safeguard public confidence. To conclude, the case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a removal order. 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.

## Response from the social worker

On 9 July 2024 the social worker confirmed by way of email and return of their completed accepted disposal response form, that they had read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide. The social worker stated that there were amendments they wished to provide in respect of this matter. The case examiners note that the social worker has not been explicit about the amendments they suggest. However, they have provided some additional context regarding their tenure with employers 1 and 2. The case examiners have noted the additional information, which provides context around the social worker's commute to and from their place of employment, the period of notice they were required to give and that they went "*above and beyond*" to prove themselves whilst working for employer 2. The social worker has not provided any evidence of factual inaccuracies with regards to the allegations pertaining to their practice failures.

The social worker has stated that they no longer wish to practice and that they understand the terms of the proposed disposal of their fitness to practise case and accepted them in full.

## Case examiners' response and final decision

The case examiners have reviewed their decision, paying particular regard to the overarching objectives of Social Work England:

- The protection of the public
- Maintaining confidence in the social work profession
- The maintenance of professional standards.

The case examiners remain satisfied that an accepted disposal removal order is a fair and proportionate way to conclude this matter and is the minimum sanction required to protect the public and the wider public interest.