

Social worker: Adenike Pedro-Ayandokun

Registration number: SW113962

Fitness to Practise

Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 22 June 2026 to 24 June 2026, and 29 June 2026

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome:

Fitness to practise impaired, warning order 5 years

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”).
2. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun attended and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Mr Edwards instructed by Capsticks LLP.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this hearing (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Rachel Cook	Chair
Jacob (Jake) Salifu Pantia	Social worker adjudicator
Jane Dalton	Lay adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Paul Harris	Hearings officer
Raegan Kirkland	Hearings support officer
Dido Ofei-Kwatia	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel was satisfied that service had been complied with in accordance with the Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended), (“the rules”).

Preliminary matters:

Documents

6. The panel checked and it was confirmed that all parties had the same bundle of documents, which comprised of the following :
 - Hearing timetable – 3 pages
 - Statement of case – 11 pages
 - Statements bundle – 5 pages
 - Exhibits bundle – 62 pages
 - Social worker’s response bundle – 33 pages
 - Service and supplementary bundle including the case management meeting decision of 17 March 2026 – 49 pages
 - Timing email – 2 pages

Hearing availability

7. The panel noted the directions made at the case management meeting, namely that the hearing would be relisted over four days to accommodate Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's availability, but that the hearing time will remain from 9am to 5pm each day.
8. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun indicated that she would have to leave each day of the hearing at 2pm due to **[PRIVATE]**. She explained that she was not seeking an adjournment and that the hearing can proceed in her absence. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun also indicated that a 9:30am start is the most appropriate time for the hearing to commence in the mornings, as this will enable her to carry out her **[PRIVATE]**.

Background:

9. On 7 December 2020, Social Work England received a referral from its Registrations Team regarding Ms Pedro-Ayandokun.
10. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun was first registered with the Health and Care Professions Council ('HCPC'), then governing the registration of social workers, in December 2016.
11. On 25 January 2017, at Wellingborough Magistrates' Court, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun was convicted of fraud by false representation, contrary to sections 1 and 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, arising from failing to notify the Council of a tenancy agreement after declaring homelessness, intending to make a gain. She received a community order with a curfew for four months, monitored electronically, and ordered to pay a £1,000 fine, which was completed in May 2017.
12. There is no record that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun declared the conviction to the HCPC, including at the December 2018 renewal. On 23 November 2020, she declared the conviction in her Social Work England renewal application, which prompted a fitness to practise referral.

Allegations:

13. The allegation arising out of the regulatory concerns referred by the Case Examiners on 18 July 2022 is:

While registered as a social worker:

1. *On 25 January 2017 you were convicted at Wellingborough Magistrates' Court of fraud by false representation pursuant to sections 1-2 of the Fraud Act 2006, after you failed to inform the local authority of a tenancy agreement you signed in 2014, after you had declared yourself homeless in 2012 and before you had secured a council property on 8 June 2015;*

2. *You failed to notify your regulator of your charge and/or conviction set out at paragraph 1 as soon as possible;*
3. *Your conduct at paragraph 2 above was dishonest.*

Admissions:

14. Rule 32c(i)(aa) Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the 'Rules') states:
Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved.
15. Following the reading of the allegations the panel Chair asked Ms Pedro-Ayandokun whether she admitted or denied any of the allegations.
16. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun informed the panel that she admitted allegations 1 and 2.
17. The panel therefore found allegations 1 and 2 proved by way of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's admissions.
18. The panel noted that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun denied allegation 3.
19. In line with Rule 32c(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel then went on to determine the disputed facts.

Summary of evidence:

Social Work England

20. The panel read all the relevant documents including and not limited to the statement of case, statements bundle, exhibit bundle and social worker's response bundle.
21. Mr Edwards opened on behalf of Social Work England by summarising the statement of case. Oral evidence was given by the one Social Work England witness who confirmed her witness statement and various exhibits.
22. Ms Bentham-Hill is the Head of Registration and Advice at Social Work England.
23. Ms Bentham-Hill explained said that she has been in her role since 3 March 2025 and that her role is to ensure that all social workers in England are registered in accordance with the professional standards, and to oversee the administrative and operational aspects of the registration process. Ms Bentham-Hill was not in post during the material period in question. The panel defined the material period to be from the date of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conviction, 25 January 2017, to 23 November 2020 when Ms Pedro-Ayandokun declared this conviction to Social Work England.
24. Ms Bentham-Hill says that she searched Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's records that are held on file, which pre-date the transfer of regulator to Social Work England from the HCPC. The documents transferred from the HCPC to Social Work England on 20 November

2019 and did not contain any declarations regarding any conviction or charges against Ms Pedro-Ayandokun.

25. In response to questions from the panel about her exhibit of the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics (2016) with specific reference to paragraph 9.5 ('important information about your conduct and competence'), Ms Bentham-Hill was unable to confirm that this 2016 document was in place at the time of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's registration in 2018. She was unable to confirm if there had been any updates to the HCPC Standards since 2016.
26. Additionally, in relation to her exhibit entitled 'HCPC Guidance on declaring convictions and cautions' updated 14 June 2018, Ms Bentham-Hill confirmed that she did not print the document and she was unable to comment on how the document was created.
27. In re-examination Ms Bentham-Hill confirmed that she inherited the witness statement and exhibits from the previous head of service (her predecessor) and that the documents were provided to her by Capsticks, solicitors. She explained that she had checked the information with her predecessor but was unable to explain why the witness statement of her predecessor was not included in the bundle for the panel's consideration.

Ms Pedro-Ayandokun

28. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun confirmed that she would not be giving evidence as she did not wish to do so. The panel provided a break to enable the legal adviser to re-explain to the parties the difference between giving evidence and submissions. Following this, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun maintained that she did not wish to give evidence, and relied upon her written reflections dated 9 August 2021, 10 February 2022, 13 June 2022, 11 August 2025 and 1 June 2026. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun confirmed that she was willing to answer any questions from the panel.
29. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun explained that she applied for council housing in 2012 and did not secure a bid for council housing until 2015, she had been homeless for about 2 years. She said that she signed a tenancy agreement **[PRIVATE]** to help secure private accommodation but retained the council flat because it was her primary residence. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun stated that the private rental agency had been adamant that she also had to sign the tenancy agreement even if she only stayed at **[PRIVATE]** accommodation occasionally. In 2016 Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said she was informed by the 'county office' that because she did not disclose that she had signed a tenancy agreement she had committed fraud under section 1 and 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
30. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun renewed her HCPC registration in December 2018 and she did not disclose her conviction. She explained that there was nothing in the HCPC renewal process that prompted her to disclose the conviction. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has repeatedly denied that she was dishonest in her conduct.

31. In response to questions from the panel Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said she remembered that she renewed her social work registration with the HCPC in 2018 but that she did not remember the details required when filling the form out. She said she believed it was an online renewal and that registration lasted for a year and then had to be renewed yearly. She said that reminders would be sent out but she cannot really remember.
32. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said Social Work England took over from the HCPC sometime in 2020 or 2019 during the lockdown. The panel referred Ms Pedro-Ayandokun to the witness statement of Ms Bentham-Hill which states that Social Work England took over as the regulator for social workers in England in 2019. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun agreed with this. She said she believed that she was up to date with her renewal. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said she declared her conviction with Social Work England but that she was not clear of what was needed by the HCPC. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun did not speak with anyone from the HCPC and does not remember if the renewal form contained a declaration section.
33. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said that she thought telling her employer about her conviction and declaring it under the 'Disclosure and Barring Service' ("DBS") was sufficient. She said that it was not until after her Social Work England renewal in 2020 that she became aware that she needed to disclose to the HCPC.
34. The panel asked Ms Pedro-Ayandokun about the 3 DBS certificates within the exhibits bundle dated 13 September 2017 (Liquid Personnel), 15 September 2017 (St Andrews Health Care) and 27 October 2017 (Sanctuary). Ms Pedro-Ayandokun explained that within 2017 she registered with two social work agencies, and each of these agencies required a completed DBS form. These forms explicitly required her to declare any convictions, which she said she did, including her then employer, St Andrews Health Care.
35. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun was asked by the panel about the following sentence within her written reflection dated 1 June 2026 – 'I now accept that the HCPC re-registration process contained a declaration section and that I should have recognised that the conviction was a matter requiring disclosure.' She explained that she did not know those things at the material period as she was a newly qualified social worker and did not understand what was expected of her. She said that after receiving the bundles from Social Work England, and having read the relevant guidance, she now understands that these are the expectations that were in place during the material period.
36. Both Mr Edwards and Ms Pedro-Ayandokun made closing submissions on the evidence. Mr Edwards referred the panel to the Social Work England statement of case which states that HCPC standard 9.5 was in effect up to 1 December 2019.

Finding and reasons on facts:

37. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser, who reminded it where facts have been admitted they are to be found proved. Where facts are in dispute the panel is required to go on to decide those facts. The burden to prove each allegation rests with Social Work England and the panel must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities.
38. In reaching its decision the panel was reminded to consider all of the documentary evidence before it and the evidence from the live witnesses. In relation to dishonesty, the panel was advised to apply the test as set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos (2017) UKSC 67* and in so doing to first determine Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts at the relevant time, and then to consider whether the conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

Particular 1

Whilst registered as a social worker: On 25 January 2017 you were convicted at Wellingborough Magistrates' Court of fraud by false representation pursuant to sections 1-2 of the Fraud Act 2006, after you failed to inform the local authority of a tenancy agreement you signed in 2014, after you had declared yourself homeless in 2012 and before you had secured a council property on 8 June 2015.

39. The panel found this allegation proved under Rule 32 of 'the rules' by virtue of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's admission.

Particular 2

Whilst registered as a social worker: You failed to notify your regulator of your charge and/or conviction set out at paragraph 1 as soon as possible.

40. The panel found this allegation proved under Rule 32 of 'the rules' by virtue of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's admission.

Particular 3

Whilst registered as a social worker: Your conduct at paragraph 2 above was dishonest.

41. In approaching the allegation of dishonesty, the panel first considered Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's knowledge or belief as to the facts at the time and then decided the question of whether Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct was dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people.
42. The panel took note that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun became registered with the HCPC at the end of 2016. On 25 January 2017 she was convicted of fraud by false representation and received a community order with a curfew for 4 months, monitored electronically, and a £1,000 fine, which was completed in May 2017.
43. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun is understood to have started employment with Dauntless Project Limited (Dauntless) on 2 March 2017. The panel had sight of an email from Dauntless

dated 8 November 2021 which states ‘Adenike made the company aware of her conviction on the 2nd March 2017’. The panel also took note of the 3 DBS certificates as exhibited dated 13 September 2017, 15 September 2017 and 27 October 2017. All of these bore the details of the conviction.

44. The panel took note that in December 2018 Ms Pedro-Ayandokun renewed her registration with the HCPC and it considered Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s written account as follows; *“Following the conviction, I immediately informed my employer and sought advice regarding the impact of the conviction on my ability to practise as a social worker. I was advised that, having completed the sentence imposed by the court, the conviction would not prevent me from working provided I continued to practise safely and competently. From March 2017 until July 2021, I worked as an Associate School Social Worker through a consultancy that supported schools with safeguarding and family support services. My role involved undertaking early help assessments, direct intervention work with children and families, supporting attendance and educational engagement, and assisting children during key transition periods. Prior to joining the organisation, I disclosed my conviction to my employer. Throughout my employment, I worked across several schools and carried out my duties professionally and safely. Whenever I have applied for employment since the conviction, I have disclosed it through the appropriate recruitment processes. I have also declared the conviction on all Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) applications. At no point have I attempted to conceal the conviction from employers. In relation to my professional registration, I did not notify HCPC of the conviction between 2017 and 2020. At the time, I genuinely believed that by disclosing the conviction to my employers and through DBS processes, I had met my disclosure obligations. As a newly qualified practitioner, I did not fully understand my separate responsibility to notify my regulator directly of the conviction”*.
45. Additionally, the panel noted that on 23 November 2020, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun appropriately and proactively declared the conviction in her Social Work England renewal application.
46. The panel considered the evidence of Ms Betham-Hill and the three exhibited HCPC documents; 1 – HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (2016); 2 – Guidance on health and character; 3 – Guidance on declaring convictions and cautions.
47. The panel noted that there was no clear evidence before it that Standard 9.5 of the HCPC Standard of conduct, performance and ethics, which states: *“You must tell us as soon as possible if: you accept a caution from the police or you have been charged with, or found guilty of, a criminal offence...”*, was in force at the material period. Ms Betham-Hill was unable to confirm that Standard 9.5 was in place at the time of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s registration in 2018 and was further unable to confirm if there had been any updates to the Standard 9.5. Mr Edwards referred the panel to the statement of case which states that HCPC standard 9.5 was in effect up to 1 December 2019. However, the panel considered this was unsupported by any documentary evidence.

48. Additionally, Ms Betham-Hill in relation to her exhibit HCPC Guidance on Health and Character said in her evidence “I am unable to comment as to whether this document was in place in 2017 as it is an HCPC document”. The panel also noted that this document was undated.
49. In relation to her exhibit ‘HCPC Guidance on declaring convictions and cautions’ Ms Betham-Hill stated in evidence that she did not know how the document had been produced. The panel also noted that the date at the top of the document read 12 August 2025, whilst at the foot of the document it stated, “*Page updated on 14/06/2018*”.
50. Ms Betham-Hill stated in her witness statement that “*I cannot explicitly comment on what information was available to the Social Worker at the time, but the Social Worker would have been made aware of the guidance as a regulated and registered profession at the point of joining the register*”.
51. The panel also took note that Social Work England had not provided Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s completed 2018 registration form or an example of the registration form to assist it in determining the information that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun was expected to have provided.

Panel’s evaluation

52. The panel took into account that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun did not give evidence, and as a result Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s evidence was not tested during the hearing by way of cross examination. However, when undertaking its overall assessment of the evidence, the panel placed weight upon Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s written evidence and oral submissions because of the following;
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has provided 5 written responses (dated 9 August 2021, 10 February 2022, 13 June 2022, 11 August 2025 and 1 June 2026.) The panel noted the consistency in Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s 5 written accounts dating back to 2021;
 - the panel were able to cross refer Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s account with contemporaneous evidence, namely the 2017 DBS certificates contained within the Social Work England exhibits bundle;
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun answered all the questions posed from the panel.
53. Having considered the HCPC documentation referred to above and the oral evidence of Ms Bentham-Hill, the panel was satisfied that there was a lack of clarity in Social Work England’s evidence around what was expected of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun at the material period. The panel concluded that Social Work England had failed to discharge its duty and provide enough evidence to satisfy it on balance that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had been dishonest.

54. In relation to the 'HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics', and in particular Standard 9.5, the panel concluded that there was insufficient evidence to establish that this standard was in place at the material time. Ms Bentham-Hill was unable to confirm this point, and the panel did not consider a statement of case to be evidence. The panel placed limited weight upon the 'HCPC guidance on health and character' and 'HCPC Guidance on declaring convictions and cautions', because Social Work England were unable to confirm that these documents were in existence at the material time.
55. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the panel accepted the submissions of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun who stated that she did not remember there being the requirement for her to make a declaration as part of the 2018 renewal process. As stated, the panel was never provided with a copy of the HCPC renewal form.
56. The panel concluded that there was no evidence that there had been a concerted effort by Ms Pedro-Ayandokun to hide the conviction. In making this conclusion, the panel took into account the following evidence;
- Ms Pedro-Ayandokun alerted her employer, Dauntless, to her conviction on 2 March 2017;
 - the three DBS certificates all dated 2017 that detail the conviction and the dates coincide with the material period;
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had declared the conviction to Social Work England in November 2020.
57. Taking into account all of the above and the contemporaneous 2017 documentation, the panel was satisfied that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had a genuinely held belief that she was acting appropriately at the material time. Further, the panel found Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's action in 2020 as additional support for her genuinely held belief. This is because she declared her conviction to Social Work England when prompted to do so.
58. The panel decided that in December 2018 as a newly qualified social worker, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun did not have a full understanding of regulatory requirements expected of her and as such she misunderstood the responsibility to inform the regulator.
59. The panel concluded that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's actions were not dishonest, as an ordinary person would accept that her conduct in informing her employer at the outset, declaring the conviction in her DBS forms and declaring the conviction to Social Work England when clearly asked to do so, are not consistent with the actions of an individual that is deliberately attempting to withhold information or avoid a clear duty to disclose the conviction to the Regulator.
60. The panel decided that ordinary decent people would not consider that a professional acting in the manner as set out above as a result of her genuinely held belief, was doing so dishonestly. This is because an ordinary person would not expect Ms Pedro-Ayandokun to do something that she was genuinely not aware she was required to do.

The panel therefore found allegation 3 not proved.

Finding and reasons on grounds:

61. Mr Edwards made submissions as outlined in Social Work England's statement of case and addressed the panel on the professional standards it believed Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had breached.
62. Mr Edwards also referred to paragraph 54 of the panel's decision on facts in which it had determined "*In relation to the 'HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics', and in particular Standard 9.5, the panel concluded that there was insufficient evidence to establish that this standard was in place at the material time. Ms Bentham-Hill was unable to confirm this point, and the panel did not consider a statement of case to be evidence*". Mr Edwards submitted that as per the statement of case, the Standard was in force at the material period and that this matter ought to have been accepted by the panel as a matter of Law or Regulation and not as a matter of fact that that required proof. He also added that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's admission to Allegation 2 meant that there must have been a requirement to notify, and as such the panel's finding raised an inconsistency.
63. Mr Edwards also submitted that the conviction for Fraud means that there has been a finding of dishonesty in the criminal proceedings which the panel cannot go behind. However, he said that the panel must consider the dishonesty of the offence when settling the question of impairment.
64. The panel was invited to find that the matters outlined in Allegation 1 amounted to the statutory ground of a conviction in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence. In relation to Allegation 2, it was submitted that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct was serious in nature and as such amounted to the statutory ground of misconduct.
65. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun relied on her most recent written submission dated 1 June 2026. She also answered questions from the panel in which she explained that if she was faced with the same circumstances again, she would advise people to be transparent with the Council in housing matters. Also, if she was advising a colleague she would tell them they need to read and understand all fine print that they are presented with. She added that if she was not sure of anything in relation to declaring to her professional regulator, she would contact the Regulator. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun also said that in hindsight she should have spoken to a more experienced social worker for advice and that if she was ever in doubt she would speak to someone else. She explained that if she sought advice she would also take a note of advice given so that she can refer back to it if necessary.
66. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun stated that she now knows that a declaration needs to be made every year and also CPD. She also said that she is aware that there is an obligation in the Standards to declare convictions. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said she would not leave it

to the end of the year to declare a conviction in the future and that she would contact the Regulator immediately by phone or email.

67. She explained that the impact of her actions on the Regulator were that they were unable to act on her circumstances earlier, and could not offer her support or go through this fitness to practice process earlier. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said that if she had told the Regulator earlier it would have saved them time and resources. She also explained that the Regulator's primary objective is to set standards for professionals and rules to protect the public.
68. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun explained that she now understands that her employer and Regulator are separate and that their expectations differ. She said that she should have informed both as telling one and not the other does not suffice. She stated that it is her responsibility to meet the obligations to both.
69. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said that she was sorry for the fact that the conviction took place and that she had been informed that it was permanently going to be on her record. She also said that she was sorry that she had possibly taken the property and denied someone who was in more serious need than her. She also said that she is sorry to Social Work England.
70. She explained that the effect of her actions on the Regulator was that that they cannot confidently say in public that she had conducted herself in the way expected, because of the conviction. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun also said that a member of the public would not trust her and would be disappointed that a professional conducted themselves in that way. She also added that the public would also say that the Regulator had not done its job properly and could not be sure that their social worker had conducted themselves well. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun also said that a service user would feel distrust in a social worker that behaved as she did and that the service user would feel that she was not the best person to provide the right support, and so would be wary.
71. In regard to employment, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun confirmed that she was not in employment at present and last worked as a social worker in May 2024 despite still looking for work. She explained that she was up to date with her CPD and that she pays her renewal fee. To stay up to date Ms Pedro-Ayandokun said that she had been reading, doing volunteer work and helping out at Church. She also attends social work conferences during social work week and subscribes to various social work newsletters to keep up to date.
72. When asked about her earlier statement in relation to her offence that she had "inadvertently committed fraud", she said that the Court had found her guilty of fraud according to the rules and law as she made a false representation. She said she had nothing to add about the use of the word "inadvertently".
73. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun also confirmed that she had not supplied the panel with any 'remedial evidence' or of her CPD. She explained that she uploaded her CPD to Social Work England and so they have it and the only thing that was relevant to this hearing

was a reflective statement that she had also uploaded. She also confirmed that she had not approached Dauntless for an up to date reference and so relied on the 2021 documents as exhibited.

74. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel was reminded that the question of misconduct is a matter for its judgement and ‘that the standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a practitioner in the particular circumstances’ as per *Roylance v General Medical Council (No 2) 2000 1 AC 311*. In line with *Roylance* the panel was advised to decide for itself the professional standards it believed Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had breached.

75. The panel decided that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had breached the following Health and Care Professions Council standards (January 2016):

9.1: you must make sure that your conduct justifies the public’s trust and confidence in you and your profession.

9.5: You must tell us as soon as possible if you have been charged with, or found guilty of a criminal offence.

76. The panel noted the submission as made by Mr Edwards at paragraph 62 above. However, it remained satisfied that the position furthered by Mr Edwards did not affect its decision that, at the material period Ms Pedro-Ayandokun held a genuine belief and was not aware of the requirement to notify the HCPC of the conviction. The panel took the view that the ‘HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics’, and in particular Standard 9.5 formed a part of the entire evidence that Social Work England relied upon to make its case. In turn, the panel was satisfied that as per her oral submissions, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s admission in relation to Allegation 2 was made having considered the entirety of Social Work England’s case and on the qualified basis that whilst she now accepted there was a requirement to notify the HCPC independently of her employer, this was not known to her at the material period.

Conviction

77. The panel was satisfied that in accordance with 35A(1)(i) of the Rules that it had before it a memorandum of conviction as conclusive proof of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s conviction of fraud by false representation pursuant to sections 1-2 of the Fraud Act 2006. The panel was thus satisfied that the statutory ground of a conviction in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence in the United Kingdom had been made out as per section 25(2)(c) of the Social Worker’s Regulations 2018.

Misconduct

78. The panel decided that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s conduct in failing to notify the Regulator of the conviction as soon as possible was so serious that it called into question her observance of fundamental tenets of social work. The panel decided that a social

worker with a conviction for dishonesty who remained in practice without the Regulator being notified of the conviction was a risk to public confidence.

79. The panel also noted that in not notifying the HCPC, it was precluded from carrying out the necessary risk assessment on Ms Pedro-Ayandokun in light of her conviction. Effectively, the HCPC was unable to ensure that its duty of care to the service user, social work practitioners and the public was exercised appropriately and effectively.
80. The panel was satisfied that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct was a serious departure from the usual and accepted standards of social work practice. Further, in failing to notify the Regulator of the conviction as soon as possible Ms Pedro-Ayandokun acted contrary to the professional standards expected of a social worker.
81. The panel concluded that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun failed to observe the tenets of honesty and integrity, and as such the panel was satisfied that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct as assessed amounts to serious professional misconduct.

Finding and reasons on current impairment:

82. On the question of impairment, Mr Edwards submitted Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal and public grounds.
83. In relation to the conviction, he stated that offence itself involved a prolonged period of approximately 1 year in which Ms Pedro-Ayandokun knowingly withheld the fact she was party to a private tenancy agreement that would make her ineligible for the council property. He also said that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has not expressed a great deal of insight into the offending.
84. Mr Edwards then outlined the serious conduct in question and said that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conviction is inherently dishonest in nature and that she withheld the information of the conviction from Regulator for 4 years. He said that she lacked insight into her own dishonest conduct and that dishonesty is a character flaw that is understood to be harder to remediate than other types of misconduct.
85. Although it was acknowledged that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun admitted her conviction for fraud and the failure to alert the Regulator in a timely manner, Mr Edwards submitted that in breaking the law she had breached the trust given to social workers as they hold privileged positions of trust in society. He stated that she had brought the profession into disrepute and posed an unacceptable risk in terms of public protection and confidence in the profession, and as such the panel was asked to find that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's fitness to practise is currently impaired.
86. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser, who referenced Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) in that it should consider if the conduct is easily remediable, has already been remediated, and that it is highly unlikely to be repeated. Further, as per the case of Council for Healthcare and Regulatory Excellence v NMC

and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) the panel was reminded to consider the following questions; a) If Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or b) has Ms Pedro-Ayandokun in the past and/or is she liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute; and/or c) has Ms Pedro-Ayandokun in the past breached and/or is she liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the profession; and/or d) has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable in the future to act dishonestly. Finally, the panel was also reminded of Social Work England's Impairment and Sanctions Guidance ('the Guidance').

87. The panel considered Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's current fitness to practise firstly from the personal perspective and then from the wider public perspective. The panel also had regard to whether the conduct in this case is easily remediable, whether it has been remedied and whether it was likely to be repeated.
88. In deciding impairment, the panel considered whether:
 - a) Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has in the past and/or is liable in the future to place service users at unwarranted risk of harm.
 - b) Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute.
 - c) Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the profession.
 - d) Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.
89. The panel took note of paragraph 20 of the Guidance and was careful when assessing the actual harm caused by Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's actions and its impact on the seriousness of the case. It noted that whilst her actions had not appeared to have caused harm, they still represent an unacceptable risk of serious harm if repeated. The panel did not regard Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct as any less serious because no evidence of actual harm was presented to it.
90. The panel determined that based on the evidence before it, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has in the past placed service users at unwarranted risk of harm because she has been found to be dishonest (by virtue of the conviction). In addition, failing to notify her regulator of her conviction means that the regulator cannot make an assessment as to whether it is safe for Ms Pedro-Ayandokun to continue to practice. Therefore, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has acted in a way that could place service users at risk of harm.
91. In relation to the question of whether Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has in the past brought the profession into disrepute, the panel determined she had. A significant aspect of public interest is upholding proper standards of behaviour so as not to bring the profession into disrepute. The panel took the view that members of the public would be extremely concerned to learn that a registered social worker had a criminal conviction for fraud and had failed to notify her regulator about the conviction. The panel considered that

the conviction for fraud and her failure to notify the regulator was serious because it is an expectation of the profession that a social worker does not commit criminal fraud and notifies their regulator of any charges/convictions.

92. In finding that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had a previous conviction for fraud and failed to notify the conviction to her regulator, the panel determined that she had breached fundamental tenets of the social work profession. The panel considered that honesty and adherence to social work standards (timely disclosure of a criminal charge and conviction to the regulator) are fundamental tenets of social work and lie at the heart of social work practice.
93. The panel determined that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had in the past acted dishonestly, as confirmed by the 2017 conviction for fraud, and had done so for the period of approximately a year (2014 to 2015).
94. In deciding the question of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's current fitness to practise, the panel first considered the personal element of impairment. The panel considered the extent to which the misconduct in this case can be, and has been remediated by Ms Pedro-Ayandokun, and whether it is likely to be repeated.
95. The panel considered that character concerns, such as a criminal conviction for dishonesty, are often harder to remediate because it is more difficult to produce objective evidence of reformed character. Nonetheless, the panel did consider the statutory conviction and the misconduct were capable of being remedied providing that sufficient insight, remediation and reflection could be evidenced.
96. In relation to Allegation 1 and the criminal court's finding of fraud, the panel considered Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's written submissions and in particular her written reflective statement dated 1 June 2026 which states: *"Since the conviction, I have spent considerable time reflecting on the circumstances that led to my poor judgement. Through this reflection, I have gained a much deeper understanding of the importance of honesty, transparency, accountability and professional integrity. These values are fundamental to public trust in social workers and I recognise that my actions fell below the standards expected of both a citizen and a registered professional."*
97. Whilst the panel acknowledge that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has inappropriately referred to her criminal conviction as 'inadvertently' committing fraud, this comment was made within her written reflections dated 9 August 2021. Since then, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has evidenced strengthened insight and within her written representations dated June 2026 she accepts responsibility for her actions: *"Whilst these factors provide context, I fully accept that they do not excuse my actions. I acknowledge that I should have exercised better judgement and accept responsibility for the consequences of my conduct"*. The panel recognised that during oral submissions, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun did not expand upon her use of the word 'inadvertently', but the panel did not consider that this detracted from her June 2026 written submissions.

98. The panel gained further confidence in relation Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's strengthening insight from her answers to the panel's questions and in particular as detailed in paragraph 65 and 69 above.
99. In relation to Allegation 2 and the failure to notify her regulator of the conviction, the panel considers that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun demonstrates insight when she states within her written reflection dated 1 June 2026 as follows: *"I now accept that the HCPC re-registration process contained a declaration section and that I should have recognised that the conviction was a matter requiring disclosure... With the benefit of hindsight, I recognise that I should have sought clarification from HCPC if I was uncertain about my obligations. I fully accept responsibility for that failure."*
100. The panel noted that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun refers, within her written representations dated June 2026, to her remorse and regret regarding her actions: *"The conviction remains a matter of deep regret, but it was an isolated incident that occurred more than nine years ago."* The panel concluded that expressing regret for her actions is further evidence of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun accepting personal responsibility.
101. When assessing insight, the panel had regard to paragraph 34 of the Guidance which states: *"Decision-makers must take care to assess the quality of any insight. A social worker may accept they have acted wrongly. However, simply asserting this is unlikely to be enough to demonstrate genuine insight. Decision makers must carefully look for and assess any objective evidence that might confirm the social worker's insight. For example, reports from employment"*
102. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had not provided any recent references nor testimonials from her employer/voluntary work. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun told the panel that she has not been in employment since May 2024 and that her last employer was Dauntless.
103. The panel took note of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's testimonial evidence dated November 2021 from Dauntless, and in so doing considered the Guidance which states,
"Testimonials

52. Testimonials that provide up to date, credible information about the social worker's current practice can be relevant when exploring current impairment. The social worker will have an opportunity to provide any testimonials when responding to the regulatory concerns. Testimonials can be submitted by anyone. However, they are most helpful when they come from people with knowledge of the social worker's practice or character.

53. Testimonials should include (all of the following):
 - *what the author knows of the concerns that have been raised*
 - *an explanation of the author's relationship to the social worker*
 - *any declarations of conflict of interest*
 - *whether the author is willing to give evidence in-person in support of the testimonial*

54. *Decision makers should give little weight to testimonials from persons not aware of the fitness to practise proceedings or the actions behind them”.*

104. The Dauntless testimonial was dated 08 November 2021 and states “*We have had no concerns about Adenike's fitness to practice and neither has any concerns been reported to us about Adenike from any of our clients. She has been a very much valued member of the team. She has been very proactive and works very hard wherever she's been assigned. We have only received commendations regarding her practice and professionalism in dealing with clients and colleagues*”. The panel acknowledged that the testimonial was not up to date and that the author was not present to give evidence. However, it noted that it was written by her employer Dauntless at the material period who she had notified of her conviction on 02 March 2017. The testimonial was written with the fitness to practice proceedings in mind, from the view of an employer who had knowledge of her practice and character.
105. The panel placed weight upon this testimonial from Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s employer, Dauntless, because they were aware of her conviction and these fitness to practise proceedings at the date of this email (8 November 2021), Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had been employed by Dauntless at the time for a significant period, namely 4 years (2017 to 2021). Dauntless are specifically asked to comment upon ‘*Any relevant information about the social worker’s current fitness to practise, for example, whether any concerns have been raised with them, or alternatively whether there are no concerns about their current practice*’ and they do not refer to any concerns and comment positively upon her being proactive and professional.
106. The panel took note of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s conviction and the dishonesty it involved as she had misrepresented herself as being homeless. The panel considered paragraph 43 of the Guidance and that “*In some cases, the concerns may relate to the social worker’s character. If so, it can be more difficult to evidence remediation that has reformed their character. For example, if the concerns relate to dishonesty, breaches of trust or abuses of position*”. The panel noted that whilst matters of dishonesty may not be easily remediable, it considered that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s dishonesty in relation to the conviction was an isolated matter born out of personal difficulties surrounding her accommodation that she was experiencing at the time.
107. In relation to both the conviction and failing to notify the HCPC of the conviction, the panel noted that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had served her sentence without issue and that since 2017 when her sentence came to an end, she had practised social work without any further incidents of criminality. The panel further noted that the circumstances that led to Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s conviction were somewhat distinct in that they occurred when she was navigating personal difficulties.
108. The panel also noted that as per its findings above, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had held a genuine but mistaken belief about her actions at the material period, the panel was satisfied that her actions were not a deliberate attempt to conceal her conviction. The panel accepted Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s submissions that she now understood her

obligations and responsibilities to both her employer and Regulator, which are independent of each other. Also, that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun now understood the importance of seeking advice from senior colleagues and/or the Regulator if in doubt. Further, the panel was satisfied that there was no evidence to suggest Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had failed to notify her Regulator of her conviction since 2020.

109. Taking into account Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's 5 written representations, her answers to the panel and the email from Dauntless dated 8 November 2021, the panel concluded that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has demonstrated sufficient insight.
110. The panel then went on to consider remediation and whether Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has put right any deficiencies or shortfalls in the behaviour that led to the concerns. The Guidance reminds the panel that remediation is best shown by objective evidence: successful completion of education or training courses; satisfactory performance appraisals and /or other positive feedback in relation to their professional practice
111. Within written representations dated 11 August 2025, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun refers to 'Concrete Remedial Actions' and refers to completing Reflective Practice Training, attending Conflict Resolution Training, becoming a Mental Health First Aider and advising school staff on early crisis intervention, '*turning my mistake into a tool for prevention*' and embedding transparency by discussing '*my conviction openly in supervision as a teachable moment*'. However, the panel has not seen objective evidence of completion of these courses and therefore could only place limited weight upon this information.
112. The panel reminded itself that the key concerns were the 2017 conviction for fraud, the criminal court's finding of dishonesty and a failure to notify the regulator of a charge/conviction, and considered Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's evidence in light of this.
113. The panel took note of Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's evidence of remediation and noted that it was limited and that there was no documentary evidence of her training and CPD before the panel. The panel however noted the 5 reflective statements she had produced since the material period, addressed the difficulties that she had faced and expressed remorse. The panel noted that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's insight had developed over the years and this was evident from her oral submissions. The panel was satisfied that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct has been remediated and she has conducted an in-depth reflection on what went wrong, why, and the impact her actions had on others.
114. In relation to the conviction, the panel noted the sentence imposed by the criminal court (a community order with a curfew for four months and a £1,000 fine) were completed in May 2017. The panel considered it significant that was over 9 years ago and since 2017 there is no evidence of any subsequent convictions nor any subsequent dishonesty. As stated, Dauntless who were her employer from 2017 had no concerns (in 2021) in relation to Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's fitness to practice.
115. In relation to a failure to notify the regulator, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun appropriately and proactively notified Social Work England of her conviction in November 2020.

116. The panel is of the view that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has put right the deficiencies or shortfalls in the behaviour that led to the concerns, taking into account the following:
- the considerable period that has elapsed since the conviction in 2017 (9 years);
 - the sentence was served 9 years ago;
 - there have been no further convictions;
 - no further findings surrounding Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's honesty;
 - the positive comments from Dauntless;
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun declaring her conviction in 2020 to Social Work England,
117. The panel analysed whether there is risk of repetition (now or in the future). The panel considered the risk of repetition to be linked to Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's insight and remediation
118. Within Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's written representations dated 1 June 2026, she states as follows: *"I respectfully submit that there is a very low risk of repetition. The incident occurred over nine years ago and was isolated in nature. Since that time I have demonstrated sustained good character, openness, insight, reflection and professional commitment. I have learned significant lessons from this experience and have taken steps to ensure that such circumstances could not arise again."*
119. Although Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's past conviction for dishonest conduct is serious, the panel is of the view that it is capable of being remedied. As detailed above, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has served her sentence, and the panel is of the view that she has demonstrated insight and remediation. The panel therefore concluded that the risk of repetition is low. The panel's view was strengthened by noting that the behaviour that gave rise to the conviction occurred many years ago, in 2014 to 2015, and since then there has been no repetition by Ms Pedro-Ayandokun of the dishonest behaviour. Further, she has appropriately and proactively declared her conviction since 2020.
120. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's fitness to practise is not currently impaired from a personal perspective.
121. On the public element of current impairment, the panel decided that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun, in having a conviction for Fraud and failing to notify the Regulator, had brought the profession into disrepute. The panel was satisfied that the public are entitled to expect that social workers observe the position of trust that they hold and that they act with honesty and integrity in the course of their professional duties and personal lives.
122. The panel was satisfied an informed and reasonable member of the public would be concerned if there were no finding of impairment. The panel concluded that the finding of public impairment was necessary to maintain and declare the standards of the social work profession and uphold the public's confidence.
123. The panel concluded that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's acts and omissions brought the profession into disrepute and breached a fundamental tenet of the profession. A social

worker should act with honesty and integrity and comply with their regulatory professional standards. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct fell far below the standard expected of a registered social worker and the panel concluded that a finding of impairment is required to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel also concluded that public trust and confidence in the profession and the regulatory process would be seriously undermined if there was no finding of impairment.

124. The panel concluded that the public interest requires a finding that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

125. Mr Edwards made submissions on sanction and asked the panel to refer to the Guidance when coming to its decision. He said that Social Work England seeks a 12 month suspension order as this is the most appropriate sanction to protect the public and to maintain confidence in the profession and ensure professional standards are upheld.
126. In relation to aggravating factors, Mr Edwards stated Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conviction and the failure to notify were so serious that her conduct allowed her to practice unhindered without Regulatory intervention for 3 years. He also stated that the inherent dishonesty in her conviction is likely to threaten public confidence in the profession, and that dishonesty is harder to remediate.
127. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser who reminded it that the purpose of a sanction was not to punish Ms Pedro-Ayandokun but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The panel was reminded of the sanctions available and of the need to consider any aggravating and mitigating factors it sees fit. The panel was also asked to ensure that when considering sanctions it begins with the lowest sanction and moves through all the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness, before identifying the sanction it agrees is sufficient to protect the public and maintain confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards. The panel carefully considered the Guidance.
128. The panel noted the following mitigation;
- early admission of the facts to the Regulator in 2021
 - full engagement with investigations
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has apologised
 - efforts to prevent behaviour recurring through insight and remediation
 - the positive feedback in relation to Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's professional practice from Dauntless
 - in terms of personal mitigation, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's accommodation and [PRIVATE] at the time. The panel noted Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's position that [PRIVATE].

- absence of previous fitness to practise history
- the level of experience of the social worker at the time. The panel has concluded that in December 2018 as a newly qualified social worker, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun did not have a full understanding of regulatory requirements expected of her and as such she misunderstood the responsibility to inform the regulator.

129. The panel identified the following aggravating factors;

- conviction for Fraud
- practiced without proper Regulatory oversight for 3 years
- risk of harm to people who use social work services

130. The panel noted the seriousness of the Fraud conviction in itself and the imbedded dishonesty. The panel also decided that in not notifying the HCPC, it was precluded from carrying out the necessary risk assessment on Ms Pedro-Ayandokun in light of her conviction. Effectively, the HCPC was unable to ensure that its duty of care to the service user, social work practitioners and the public was exercised appropriately and effectively.

131. The panel considered paragraph 181 to 183 of the Guidance which reads;

“181. Dishonesty in a social worker’s private life will still likely undermine public confidence and trust in the social work profession. This is true even if people who use services are not directly affected. Examples might include criminal convictions for fraud or providing false statements.

182. Dishonesty is generally recognised as one of the most serious forms of misconduct. However, decision makers should consider that dishonest behaviour is nuanced and can take different forms. They should consider it on a scale of seriousness.

183. Factors that decision makers can consider when reviewing dishonesty include (all of the following):

- *the duration of any dishonesty*
- *whether the dishonesty was an isolated instance, or indicates a larger problem or pattern of behaviour*
- *whether the social worker admitted dishonest behaviour at an early opportunity, or if they tried to purposefully hide their dishonesty*
- *whether the dishonesty was for the social worker’s own personal gain*
- *any other relevant aggravating or mitigating factors”*

132. Applying the factors within paragraph 183 of the Guidance, the panel noted that the dishonesty was related to the conviction for Fraud, had lasted for a period of 1 year and was for personal gain. However, the panel balanced this against the following factors: the conviction for fraud in 2017 was an isolated incident, Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had informed her Regulator in 2020 and had not sought to hide matters from Dauntless and the DBS.

No further action and Advice

133. The panel decided that neither no further action or advice were appropriate as it had found Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had breached professional standards and this gave rise to public interest considerations. The panel concluded that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's fitness to practise is impaired on the public component of impairment only. The panel was satisfied that given her insight Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had demonstrated an understanding of the relevant steps that would ordinarily be required to avoid repeating the conduct that contributed to the concern, thus rendering the sanction of advice inappropriate and unnecessary.
134. In the circumstances it decided to exercise its discretion and move beyond the lower sanctions of no action and advice on this basis. It was satisfied that none of these outcomes would be sufficient to address the risk to the public and it would also send the wrong message about the seriousness of this misconduct and therefore not be in the public interest nor maintain public confidence in the profession or the fitness to practise process.

Warning

135. The panel took note of paragraphs 107 and 108 of the Guidance which reads;
- “A warning order shows clear disapproval of the social worker's conduct or performance. A warning order is a signal that the social worker is highly likely to receive a more severe sanction if they repeat the behaviour.*
- 108. A warning order is likely to be appropriate where (all of the following):*
- *the fitness to practise issue is isolated or limited*
 - *there is a low risk of repetition*
 - *the social worker has demonstrated insight*
- Decision-makers should consider issuing a warning order where (both of the following apply):*
- *they cannot formulate any appropriate or proportionate conditions of practice*
 - *a suspension order would be disproportionate”*

136. The panel considered Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's conduct to be an isolated matter set against the personal difficulties she was experiencing at the time. The panel concluded that the risk of repetition is low and she had demonstrated sufficient insight and remediation.

137. The panel decided a warning is the appropriate sanction given Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's breach of professional standards. It was satisfied that this accurately reflected the failings in Ms Pedro-Ayandokun's actions given the personal circumstances that prevailed at the time. This sanction also ensured the wider public interest considerations were met.

138. As per the Guidance the panel decided that a 5 year warning order is the most appropriate and proportionate duration. The panel noted that this is the most *“appropriate for serious cases that have fallen only marginally short of requiring*

restriction of practice. This helps to maintain public confidence and highlight the professional standards. A social worker should ensure there is no risk of repetition throughout this extended period. If successful, there will be no further fitness to practise findings (in relation to similar concerns)”.

Conditions of practice

139. The panel concluded that a conditions of practice order would be disproportionate in these circumstances. Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s conduct was isolated in nature as extensively ventilated above, and she continued to practise without issue for a period of 4 years after her conviction. During this period there were no further concerns.
140. The panel took the view Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s did not need any restriction on her ability to practise as there were no proportionate conditions that could be formulated. The panel noted that the concerns in this case had not exposed any specific practice deficits that need to be remedied by Ms Pedro-Ayandokun, nor do the concerns relate to her professional competence based day to day practice.
141. The panel was also satisfied that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had taken the necessary steps to remediate her fitness to practise, she has demonstrated sufficient insight and remedied her failings. The panel therefore concluded a conditions of practice order will not be appropriate.

Suspension order

142. The panel had regard to the Guidance which states that decision-makers should consider issuing a warning order where a suspension order would be disproportionate. The panel considered a suspension order to be disproportionate for the following reasons:
 - the Dauntless testimonial, dated 08 November 2021, upon which the panel placed weight refers positively to Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s professional practice. She is described as valued, proactive and a hard-working member of the team who received commendations regarding her practice and professionalism;
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s dishonesty in relation to the conviction was an isolated matter set against the personal difficulties surrounding her accommodation that she was experiencing at the time;
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun had served her sentence for the conviction without issue and that since May 2017, when her sentence came to an end, she had practised social work without any further incidents of criminality. The panel considered it significant that the conviction is dated January 2017, and that a substantially long period of time, namely over 9 years, has elapsed;
 - Ms Pedro-Ayandokun appropriately and proactively notified Social Work England of her conviction in November 2020;

- there have been no further findings surrounding Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s honesty;
- the panel has concluded that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun has demonstrated sufficient insight;
- the panel is satisfied that Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s conduct has been remediated and she has conducted an in-depth reflection on what went wrong, why, and the impact her actions had on others;
- Ms Pedro-Ayandokun’s fitness to practise is not currently impaired from a personal perspective;
- The Guidance confirms that the purpose of fitness to practice proceedings is not to punish for past mistakes or poor behaviour.

Order:

143. The panel therefore imposed a warning order for the duration of 5 years.

Right of appeal:

144. Under Paragraph 16(1)(a) of Schedule 2 of the regulations, the social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:
- a. the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under Paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order.
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
145. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of the regulations an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
146. Under Regulation 9(4) of the regulations this order may not be recorded until the expiry of the period within which an appeal against the order could be made, or where an appeal against the order has been made, before the appeal is withdrawn or otherwise finally disposed of.
147. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

148. Under Paragraph 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of the regulations:
- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry
 - 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker
 - 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5), and a final order does not have effect until after the expiry of that period
149. Under Rule 16(aa) of the rules a social worker requesting a review of a final order under Paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority:

150. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a final decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:
<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners>.