



Case Examiner Decision
Julieth Chitando – SW141445
FTPS-23771

Contents

The role of the case examiners	3
Decision summary	4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns.....	7
Preliminary issues	9
The realistic prospect test.....	10
The public interest.....	21
Accepted disposal	23

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	9 April 2026
	Accepted disposal proposed - conditions of practice order (2 year duration)
Final outcome	6 May 2026
	Accepted disposal - conditions of practice order (2 year duration)

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 being found proven by the adjudicators. [REDACTED]
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 being found to amount to the statutory grounds of lack of competence or capability.
3. For regulatory concerns 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8, 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 two years'





duration. The social worker accepted this proposal and the case examiners remained satisfied it is the most appropriate outcome.

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.

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.

Family A	
Family B	
Family C	
Family D	

Family E	[Redacted]
Child H	[Redacted]
Child I	[Redacted]

[REDACTED]

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1 amount to the statutory ground of lack of competence or capability [REDACTED].

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of lack of competence or capability [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

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 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory grounds of lack of competence or capability, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

Reasoning

Facts

1. On or between October 2022 and July 2024, you failed to safeguard service users in that you;

1.1 showed lack of detail and/or analysis within Child and Family Assessments

The case examiners have been provided with evidence relating to several children/families for whom the social worker wrote child and family assessments. The evidence includes the assessments written by the social worker and the comments/requested amendments of their line manager, as well as supervision notes and an email from a family member detailing factual inaccuracies and incorrect people linked to the assessment.

The social worker, in their submissions, appears to accept that they struggled with assessment writing at the beginning of their employment but states that they had

made significant improvements. The case examiners acknowledge that there appears to have been some improvement during the time period stated, however there is also evidence that concerns remained about their performance in this area until the social worker left this employment.

For example, in a supervision record dated 12 January 2024, discussion was held about extensive amendments which had been required. The record states that the line manager *“has rewritten a large chunk of the assessment due to issues that the assessment was disjointed and contradictory, despite many discussions taking place about the content and how the assessment needed to be written”*.

Additionally, an assessment dated March 2024 for Family A has been provided which contains a number of comments from management requiring clarity and amendments before it could be authorised. A management summary of the social worker’s assessments also notes *“the assessment was lacking consideration of mother’s ability/lack of ability to safeguard the children given she doesn’t believe partners offences and wishes to remain in a relationship and wishes for him to have family time with her children”*.

In relation to the overarching concern, the case examiners note that many of the assessments were for children and families who were at risk of or experiencing harm. Inadequate assessments may lead to insufficient intervention or support being put in place, which could result in harm. The case examiners are of the view that adjudicators may consider a lack of detail and analysis in assessments to represent a failure to safeguard.

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

1.2 failed to review prior information to make informed decisions on Child and Family assessments

The case examiners have been provided with a Stage 2 capability letter which reports that for Family A, *“whilst you had previously undertaken a C&F assessment for the same family, and were aware that there had been CFW support between the previous assessment and the current assessment, there was no evidence within the assessment that you had contacted/reviewed the CFW involvement to inform your assessment”*.

The case examiners recognise they have been provided with limited primary evidence in relation to this concern. However, they are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence in the form of a recorded assessment by the social worker’s line manager who had sight of the social worker’s practice; this indicates that the social worker

may have failed to review prior information required to inform current Child and Family Assessments.

In relation to the overarching concern, previous history of intervention from social care may suggest patterns of concern that can impact directly upon the outcomes of assessments. Failure to review this information may lead to an inadequate assessment and case examiners have set out above their view that adjudicators may consider inadequate assessments to represent a failure to safeguard.

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.

1.3 failed to recognise risk when considering service users' Continuum of need

The case examiners have been provided with the continuum of needs policy which explains when children may need specialist intervention and how to assess this. The evidence suggests that the social worker was provided with this document and that it was discussed with the social worker on several occasions

In a supervision record dated 20 December 2023, it states the social worker has attended training on the continuum of needs process but struggles to apply it. There is also a comment relating to a specific child, stating that the social worker “*has not addressed the risk posed by dad towards mum and the children*” with the social worker recording within the assessment that the father was not a risk, despite indicators of substance misuse and domestic abuse being present.

Another example is the assessment of Family A, where the social worker recommends level 3 intervention which is universal services, not specific social work intervention, despite the children’s stepfather being convicted of sexual assault of a child and the mother wanting family time with the stepfather to continue.

Considering the overarching concern, case examiners are of the view that a failure to recognise risk directly represents a potential failure to safeguard.

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.

1.4 failed to review a child arrangement order to make an informed decision on child and family assessment

The case examiners have been provided with an email dated February 2024 regarding the assessment for Child I. The email is from the practice development manager supporting the social worker and records several issues including missing information. The email sets out that the social worker is recommending no ongoing

social care involvement, but has provided no analysis or comment on the fact that the mother must have supervised contact with her older children due to mental health concerns, as per the child arrangement order.

Considering the overarching concern, the case examiners note that the failure to review the child arrangement order suggests the social worker missed the significance of information which directly related to the risks to Child I. Without intervention from the senior colleague, Child I may have been left in an unsafe home without sufficient oversight to mitigate the risks posed by their parents.

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.

1.6 caused delays in completing child and family assessments:

The case examiners have been provided with evidence for this concern relating to several families/children which includes, but is not limited to, the following examples.

In relation to Child H, the case examiners have been provided with a document written by the social worker's manager (referred to as Appendix 29) which states that the social worker's assessment had to be sent back 3 times with amendments required. These amendments included missing information from other agencies that had contributed to the assessment and no plan of support outlined. It is recorded that ultimately, the team manager had to complete the assessment as it had reached the 45 day deadline and the family were waiting for support.

In relation to Family C, the case examiners have been provided with the assessment written by the social worker and some of the required amendments requested by their manager. The summary of concerns (Appendix 29) states “*The assessment was sent back a total of 5 times between 1st December 2023 and 11th January 2024*”.

In respect of the overarching concern, the case examiners consider that delays in finalising the assessments may have delayed support and intervention for vulnerable children, some of whom the evidence suggests were at significant risk of harm. The case examiners consider it likely that adjudicators would view this as a failure to safeguard.

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.

1.7 failed to recognise and/or respond to risk by failing report sexual assault

The case examiners have been provided with evidence relating to Family D, where the social worker writes in their assessment about allegations of sexual assaults made by one of the siblings. It appears that the social worker’s line manager was not aware of these allegations until reading about them in the assessment, and there is reported to be a lack of clarity around how many allegations have been made and who they were reported to.

The social worker accepts in their submissions that they “*misjudged the urgency based on unclear information*”.

By not reporting or escalating these allegations, the social worker may have failed to safeguard the children, including that interventions would not have been in place to prevent repetition.

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.

1.8 failed to make a detailed and/or updated section 47 enquiry by copy and pasting previous work

The case examiners have been provided with documents relating to family E including the strategy discussion record and subsequent safeguarding investigation (‘section 47 enquiry’). The documents indicate that following a referral about the children’s mother being too intoxicated to look after them, the strategy discussion outcome was that a section 47 enquiry should commence, to gather information and assess the children’s needs going forward.

It appears that the social worker was tasked to complete this enquiry but the record of this suggests they cut and pasted the record of the strategy discussion rather than gathering and collating up to date information which could then inform further planning. Without accurate and up to date information, any subsequent intervention and/or decisions may have been inadequate to protect the children. The case examiners consider it likely that adjudicators would consider the alleged conduct represents a failure to safeguard.



The social worker indicates that they admit this concern, *although their comments are limited to them stating that they “acknowledge referencing previous work to maintain consistency”*.


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

This case has been presented on the grounds of  a lack of competence or capability. 



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 guidance also explains that single episodes or incidents do not normally suggest a social worker lacks the knowledge or skills to be competent. However, in exceptional circumstances, a single episode or incident could happen because of a lack of knowledge or competence in a fundamental principle of social work. This may raise concerns for public safety.

The case examiners have been provided with capability documents from the former employer which suggests that the social worker's caseload was consistently below an average caseload volume throughout the period of employment. The evidence provided to the case examiners suggests that there were concerns about the social worker's practice with many of the families allocated to them and that these concerns persisted throughout the 19 months of their employment. Whilst some improvements were reported, the social worker's practice was considered by their

employer to remain below the performance standards required by them. The case examiners are satisfied that they have been provided with a fair sample of the social worker's caseload.

The case examiners have set out in their consideration of facts that the social worker's conduct is likely to amount to a failure to safeguard. As a social worker in a duty children and families team, this was a core element of their work and repeated failures to undertake their tasks to a high standard may suggest that the social worker lacked the competence or capability for the role.

The case examiners have considered the context in which the social worker was practising. They had been employed as part of a recruitment drive from the local authority for overseas social workers to practice in the UK. The social worker's submissions and the evidence from the former employer both speak to the difficulties experienced by the social worker in terms of the cultural transition and the expectations of a different service. These included the social worker adapting to a computer system when they had previously used paper records, a lack of confidence in driving in England and some language barriers potentially due to dialect.

The evidence suggests that the former employer acknowledged that they had expected the social worker to have more experience in related work and that additional support was required above the 4-week induction provided to all international practitioners.

The social worker submits that they did not receive sufficient support and states their difficulties were caused by "*inadequate induction, poor supervision, cultural transition challenges, and a lack of institutional understanding*". The case examiners recognise that the cultural transition was likely to have been challenging and, whilst the former employer appears to have tried to understand the needs of the social worker, they may have been unprepared for the level of support required.

However, the evidence provided to the case examiners suggests that the social worker did receive regular and supportive supervision; they were given many opportunities to shadow and co-work and they appear to have been provided with intensive support from their line manager and a practice development manager. The feedback provided to the social worker appears to be clear and constructive and it seems that significant time was spent with them attempting to overcome transitional difficulties. The case examiners conclude that the support evidenced appears to have been similar to what may be provided to a newly qualified social worker, despite them recruiting the social worker believing they had extensive relevant experience. This support appears to have been provided over 19 months, much longer than the year of support provided to a newly qualified social worker.

The case examiners recognise that the social worker had qualified and practiced previously in another country, however the evidence before the case examiners suggests that the social worker did not perform to the required standard during the period of employment relevant to these concerns.

Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the statutory grounds of lack of competence or capability 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

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 are of the view that the social worker could potentially evidence remediation through insight into what led to the concerns, the completion of relevant training and/or learning, and reflecting on how they have strengthened their practice and evidence of current practice.

Insight and remediation

The social worker has provided submissions in which they admit to some of the concerns but state that they have subsequently learnt from and improved their practice. Whilst there is some evidence of improvement in their performance over the period of employment, the case examiners have noted evidence indicating that the social worker may have lacked competence and capability. It appears the social worker has not practiced since leaving their former employer, so it is difficult for the social worker to evidence their claims of current effective practice.

As previously noted, the social worker submits that many of their difficulties were attributed to a lack of support. The case examiners have found evidence of clear feedback and support provided. The social worker submits *“While I recognise that organisational support was limited, I also acknowledge my responsibility to seek further guidance and escalate concerns more assertively. This insight has helped me develop greater confidence in advocating for both service users and my own professional support needs”*. The case examiners recognise this is a positive reflection, but it is not supported by evidence. The case examiners are of the view that the social worker’s insight remains limited, despite the capability process with their employer and the regulatory process to date.

The social worker has provided evidence of training completed, but the case examiners note that the certificates are for one hour e-learning activities across a number of practice areas that are not directly relevant to the performance issues identified in this case. Whilst the case examiners note the social worker’s commitment to ongoing learning and development, the topics studied do not evidence that the social worker has improved their safeguarding and assessment practice.

The social worker has provided some reading material which relates to section 47 enquiries, public law processes and assessment work. This evidences that they have read related material but while unsupported by current practice, they do not

demonstrate that the social worker is able to put the knowledge gained from their reading into practice.

Risk of repetition

In the absence of sufficient demonstrated insight and remediation, the case examiners are of the view that the risk of repetition is 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 public expect the regulator to ensure that all social workers on the register are capable of safe and effective practice. If a finding of impairment was not made it would undermine a key regulatory function, that is protection of the public.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding 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	<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 concluded that the public interest in this case is engaged. However, they are satisfied that this interest may be appropriately fulfilled by virtue of the accepted disposal process.

Whilst the matter is serious, the case examiners are not of the view that it is so serious that a hearing might be necessary to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in Social Work England's maintenance of the standards expected of social workers.

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. It appears that they may not consider it to be impaired as they suggest that their practice has improved and point to systemic failures being responsible for many of the alleged conduct. 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:

- Whilst the social worker does not wholly accept all the concerns, it may assist the social worker to consider the rationale of the case examiners' decision in relation to facts and grounds and how they have considered these alongside the mitigation put forward.
- The case examiners recognise that not all professionals will have a clear understanding of how and when the public interest may be engaged, or how exactly this might impact upon findings concerning current fitness to practise.
- The accepted disposal process will provide to 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, 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.

Interim order

An interim conditions of practice order is already in effect.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Suspension order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Removal order	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed duration	2 years	

Reasoning

The case examiners have identified the following mitigating and aggravating factors in this case;

Mitigating

- The social worker faced a significant cultural transition.

Aggravating

- There was a pattern of omissions over a significant period.
- The social worker has not demonstrated a good level of insight or remediation.

In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's sanctions guidance (December 2022) and reminded themselves that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker, but to protect the public.

The case examiners have decided that it is not in the public interest to refer this matter to a final hearing and have chosen the least restrictive sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest. They have started at the lowest possible sanction and worked up, testing the appropriateness of each sanction and the next sanction above it to confirm their decision is proportionate.

The case examiners have already determined that 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 and therefore 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.

In order to provide the necessary oversight and protection, the case examiners have decided to suggest a conditions of practice order to the social worker that they must comply with. This will afford the social worker further opportunity to evidence any reflection and insight they may have gained and to evidence remediation, so the regulator can be assured that the risk of repetition is reduced. A conditions of practice order will provide structure and support to enable the social worker to evidence that they can practise safely.

The case examiners also considered whether the concerns before them require a sanction of suspension; however, they are of the view that this would be disproportionate given the developing insight demonstrated and the mitigating factor identified.

The case examiners consider the appropriate duration of the conditions of practice order to be a period two years. This timescale provides sufficient time for the social worker to reflect adequately, particularly given that the case examiners are of the view that the social worker has not evidenced sufficient insight in the intervening two years since their alleged conduct occurred. The social worker also requires time to gain employment and sufficient time to evidence that they are capable of consistently safe practice. The case examiners have also borne in mind, in setting this time period, the serious nature of the concerns raised, and their role in upholding professional standards and sending a message to the profession as a whole. Given that the case examiners have identified that there is some developing insight, they are of the view that a longer period of conditions is unnecessary and would be disproportionate.

The case examiners have therefore decided to propose to the social worker a conditions of practice order of two year's 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

1. You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.
2. You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.
- 3(a). At any time you are 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).
- 3(b). You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.
4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 4 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 any future registration) or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect (for any existing registration).

9. 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:

- Recognising thresholds of concern and risk and the categories of support or need
- Responding appropriately and timely to identified risks;
- Providing detailed analysis within recordings/assessments;
- Use of computer-based systems.

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

11(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 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).

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

12. You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 4 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.

13. 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 (12), 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 the 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

On 6 May 2026 the social worker responded by email, agreeing with the following statements: “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 considered the public interest in this matter and, as they have not been presented with any new evidence that might change their previous assessment, they are satisfied that it remains to be the case that the public interest in this case may be fulfilled through the accepted disposal process. The case examiners therefore direct that the regulator enact a conditions of practice order of 2 years’ duration.