

Social worker: Ann Hartill
Registration number: SW48576
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of hearing: 09 July 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:

Conditions of practice order (expiring 20 August 2026)

Hearing outcome:

Revoke the conditions of practice order with immediate effect

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a panel of adjudicators on 09 January 2025.
2. Ms Hartill attended and was represented by Ms Laura Sheridan from BASW (British Association of Social Workers).
3. Social Work England was represented by its case presenter Mr Jonathon McCarthy.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Gill Murgatroyd	Chair
Glenys Ozanne-Turk	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Lauryn Green	Hearings officer
Anne Briggs	Hearings support officer
Sarfraz Ahmad	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel note that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Hartill and her representative by email on 3 June 2026. Ms Sheridan submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
6. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 3 June 2026 and addressed to Ms Hartill at her email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 3 June 2026 detailing Ms Hartill’s registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 3 June 2026, the writer sent by electronic mail to Ms Hartill at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
7. Having had regard to Rules 16, 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (‘the rules’) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Hartill in accordance with the Rules.

Review of the current order:

8. This final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
9. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire on 20 August 2026. The order subject to review is a conditions of practice order, the conditions of which are as follows:
 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 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. The reporter could be the same person as the workplace supervisor.*
b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.
 4. *You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 3 months and at least 14 days prior to any review and Social Work England will make these reports available to any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions on request.*
 5. *You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.*
 6. *You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.*
 7. *You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment/self employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.*
 8. *You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant*

authority within 7 days of the date of application [for future registration] or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect [for existing registration].

9.

- a. At any time you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England; you must place yourself and remain under the supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by you, and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register. The workplace supervisor could be the same person as the reporter.*
- b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.*

10. You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 3 months and at least 14 days prior to any review, and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.

11. You must not supervise or be responsible for the work of any other social worker or student social worker.

12. 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 11, 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.*

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

13. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 12, to any person requesting information about your registration status

**Supervised*

The social worker's day-to-day work must be supervised by a person who is registered with and approved by Social Work England. The supervisor does not have to work at the same premises as the social worker but must make themselves available for advice or assistance within a reasonable time period if needed.

The social worker's practice must be reviewed at least once every two weeks by the supervisor in one-to-one meetings and case-management supervision. These fortnightly meetings must be focused on all areas of the concerns identified in the conditions.

The allegations found proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

"Whilst registered as a social worker and in your role as a Service Manager at Cloverleaf Advocacy:

- 1. You disclosed information that had been shared with you in connection with your role as a social worker and/or manager without a legitimate or professional reason to do so.*
- 2. Your behaviour towards colleagues and in the workplace was inappropriate.*

In its determination the final order panel stated that it was mindful of the words used in the allegation and "found that there was a distinct lack of particularisation in the allegations which made its assessment of the evidence difficult" and "Only where the panel were confident that incidents and issues were properly understood by Mrs Hartill and where the evidence was sufficiently clear and cogent about specific incidents were the panel able to make appropriate and robust findings of fact."

In finding allegation 1 proved the final order panel "concluded that Mrs Hartill had:

- shared information with LK and PR about the health of colleague TD;*
- shared information with PR and HC about the health of LK's mother;*
- shared information about PR's sister's health condition with SA;*
- made comments to LK and PR about OA's sexuality.*

The panel also found that these matters were a clear breach of Cloverleaf's Confidentiality Policy.

The final order panel stated that it "found that these amount, together and individually, to a sharing of information that had been shared with Mrs Hartill in connection with her role as a social worker and/or manager without a legitimate or professional reason to do so. The panel accordingly found particular 1 proved to the extent of the behaviours detailed above."

In respect of particular 2, the final order panel stated that:

“Having considered all the evidence of these witnesses in the round, the panel concluded that Mrs Hartill’s behaviour in the work place was inappropriate in the following respects: -

- The use of negative facial expressions, grimacing, tone of voice, expressions of distaste about colleagues indicating who was in or out of favour, who was in the “bad books”*
- Swearing, unpredictable and erratic behaviour toward staff*
- Describing colleague SA as fat, pushy and aggressive*
- Belittling PR, OA and HC*
- Her comments about PR’s sister health condition*
- Her comments about OA’s sexuality*
- Her repeated conduct of supervisions in the open office, and in cafés and pubs.”*

The previous final order review panel on 09 January 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

“In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the final order panel and the documents submitted by Mrs Harthill prior to today’s hearing. These included her PDP, reflective piece and list of training and development activities submitted in November 2024 and her further submissions and details of befriending roles with peer supervision which she submitted in December 2024. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Mr Batch on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr McIntyre on behalf of Mrs Harthill. However, the panel has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’ (updated 19 Dec 2022). [...]

The panel noted the extensive work which Mrs Harthill has done since the final order hearing. It considered that her personal development plan and her reflective pieces addressed the specific failings and issues identified in the previous decision.

The panel noted the steps which Mrs Harthill had taken to improve her practice, focusing on the professional standards which she was found to have failed to comply with, including her work in a befriending role. It noted her learning and reflections in relation to communicating effectively, managing boundaries, and how this links to treating everyone with dignity and respect. The panel noted her

apologies and her remorse and considered that she has now demonstrated strong insight into her previous misconduct, identifying how and when she fell short of the behaviours expected and how she would act differently in the future. The panel noted that Mrs Harthill still feels she has something to offer to social work and would like to be able to contribute, in a part time position, without responsibility for managing staff and with support and guidance.

Having considered all the information before it the panel considered that Mrs Harthill's training and development work, her reflection on what had gone wrong and what must be done in the future and her befriending work was a credit to her and sought to address the issues identified by the final order panel. However, the panel was concerned that she had not worked as a social worker since 2019 and there was no objective evidence to assure the panel that, if Mrs Harthill returned to practice, she would be able to put her learning and reflection successfully into practice. The panel concluded that without any objective assessment or testing of successful implementation there remained a real risk to the public and that Mrs Harthill's fitness to practise remains currently impaired.

In respect of the wider public interest, the panel considered that the current suspension order of one year sent a clear message to the public and the profession about the seriousness of Mrs Harthill's misconduct and was sufficient to uphold public confidence in the profession and maintain proper professional standards. The panel therefore considered that the wider public interest had been satisfied by the existing suspension order."

The previous final order review panel on 09 January 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

"The panel first considered whether to take no action or issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that none of these outcomes would restrict Mrs Harthill's ability to practise and would not address the potential risk to service users were she permitted to practise without restriction. Therefore, the panel concluded that no action or issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and insufficient to protect the public.

The panel went on to consider a conditions of practice order. It noted that Mrs Harthill agreed with Social Work England's submission that a conditions of practice order was appropriate and that she would indeed welcome such an order. The panel considered that Mrs Harthill has now shown good insight and has sought to address the issues identified by the final order panel. However, the panel was concerned by the lack of objective evidence to assure the panel that if Mrs Harthill returned to practice, she would be able to successfully put her learning and reflection into practice, particularly as she has not practiced for five years.

Given the extent of Mrs Harthill's previous engagement and remedial work, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Harthill would comply with any conditions imposed and that public protection can be delivered by a conditions of practice order. [...]

The panel considered the length of such order, recognising that Mrs Harthill wishes to work part time and has first to find a social work position, and then requires sufficient time to demonstrate that she has put her remediation successfully into practice. For these reasons the panel decided that a period of 18 months was an appropriate period, recognising that an early review can be held if there is new evidence available and the relevant circumstances are met."

Social Work England submissions:

10. The panel heard submissions from Mr McCarthy as to the background and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanctions.

11. They emphasised the following:

"Social Work England invites the panel to find that the Social Worker's fitness to practise remains impaired and to extend the Conditions of Practice Order for a further 12-months

The previous reviewing panel, when considering the public element of impairment, determined that the imposition a 12-month suspension by the Final Hearing panel sent a clear message to the public and the profession regarding the seriousness of the Social Worker's misconduct and had the effect of satisfying the wider public interest. When considering the personal element of impairment and the appropriate sanction to impose, the previous reviewing panel was concerned that, while the Social Worker had shown good insight and has sought to address the issues addressed by the Final Hearing panel, there was no objective evidence before it which could assure the panel that, if the Social Worker returned to practice, they would be able to successfully put their learning and training into practice, particularly as they had not, at the time, practised for five years. The previous reviewing panel therefore concluded that the Social Worker remained impaired on the personal element.

On the basis of the Social Worker's ongoing engagement at the time and evidence of insight and learning, the previous review Panel determined to replace the existing Final Suspension Order with that of Conditions. In doing so, the Panel took into consideration the Social Worker's own wishes to work part-time within a social work role. The Panel, when considering the appropriate length of a Final Conditions of Practice Order, acknowledged that the Social Worker would first require time in which to find a social work role, then would require a further period of time to demonstrate that they had put their remediation successfully into practice.

No evidence has been provided which suggests that the Social Worker has sought employment or is currently employed within a social work role since the

Final Suspension Order was replaced with a Final Conditions of Practice Order. As such, the conditions imposed have not come into substantive effect. The Social Worker continues to engage with Social Work England's Case Review Team but has not provided further objective evidence of remediation during the current review cycle. The Social Worker has communicated to Social Work England, during the current review cycle, that they intend to submit evidence for consideration at the upcoming review. However, to date, no additional evidence has been submitted which indicates that the Social Worker has done this during the current review cycle. It is, therefore, submitted that the Social Worker remains impaired for the same reasons identified by the previous review Panel. It is submitted that an extension of the current Final Conditions of Practice Order for a period of 12-months is appropriate and sufficient to allow the Social Worker an additional opportunity to evidence their remediation, should they wish to do so.

The Social Worker continues to engage with Social Work England's Case Review Team but has not provided further objective evidence of remediation during the current review cycle. The Social Worker has communicated to Social Work England, during the current review cycle, that they intend to submit evidence for consideration at the upcoming review. However, to date, no additional evidence has been submitted.

Social Work England submits that a removal order at this stage, given the Social Worker's positive engagement and previous evidence of insight and learning, would be inappropriate.

Should the Social Worker submit evidence in advance of the review hearing scheduled for 9 July 2026, Social Work England will review its position."

12. Social Work England provided an update to their position on 2 July 2026 as follows:

"Further to Social Work England's written submissions contained within the Notice of Hearing served on the social worker on 3 June 2026, we have reviewed our position in light of evidence submitted by the social worker via their representative on 8 June 2026 and provide the following update:

Social Work England will invite the Panel at the upcoming Final Order Review to consider whether, based on the social worker's ongoing engagement and evidence of insight and reflection, their fitness to practise remains impaired. Social Work England submits that the concerns which gave rise to the finding of impaired fitness to practise were serious, wide-ranging, spanned a significant period of time and, in some instances, impacted the wellbeing of their colleagues.

It is submitted that the previous reviewing Panel, when considering the public element of impairment, determined that, while the social worker had shown good insight and has sought to address the issues identified by the Final Hearing

Panel, there was no objective evidence before it which could assure the Panel that, if the social worker returned to practice, they would be able to successfully put their learning and training into practice, particularly as they had not, at the time, practised for five years. The previous reviewing Panel therefore concluded that the social worker remained impaired on the personal element only.

On the basis of the social worker's ongoing engagement at the time and evidence of insight and learning, the previous review Panel determined to replace the existing Final Suspension Order with that of an 18-months Conditions of Practice order. In doing so, the Panel took into consideration the Social Worker's own wishes to work part-time within a social work role. The Panel, when considering the appropriate length of a Final Conditions of Practice Order, acknowledged that the social worker would first require time in which to find a social work role, then would require a further period of time to demonstrate that they had put their remediation successfully into practice.

The social worker, within their written reflective statement submitted to Social Work England on 8 June 2026, has stated that since the previous Final Order Review, they have applied for some part-time jobs with agencies, but did not receive responses. The social worker states that because they applied for these jobs online, they are unable to provide supporting evidence of this. This constitutes a breach of condition 12 of their Conditions of Practice order. The social worker has stated that they believe their difficulties in obtaining employment in line with the recommendations of the previous reviewing Panel stems from the current Conditions of Practice Order placing too great a burden on prospective employers. However, there is no objective evidence available which attests to this being the reason the social worker has been unable to obtain employment within a social work role. At present, the social worker has not provided evidence that they have been able to successfully test their insight and targeted training in their practice.

Upon the Panel's consideration of the evidence submitted by the social worker for the purpose of this review, should they consider that the social worker remains impaired, Social Work England will invite the Panel to extend the current Conditions of Practice for a further 12-months to allow the social worker a further opportunity to demonstrate their ability to translate their insight, training and remedial efforts into evidence of safe social work practice. However, should the Panel consider that the social worker has now remediated the original misconduct and that their fitness to practise is no longer impaired, the Panel are invited to revoke the current Order."

Social worker submissions:

13. In advance of the hearing, Ms Hartill had sent in the following for the panel to consider:

A personal development plan, a reflective statement and list of training and development activities completed, written submissions and an addendum reflective statement providing details of befriending roles with peer supervision.

14. The panel also took note of Ms Hartill's personal statement as follows:

"[...]I can only say I really do not know what got into me I was wrong to treat people in such a way. The impact that my failings in practice on people was very poor and intolerable I am so ashamed and regret everything I was accused of, I will be more accountable for my actions in the future. [...]"

I needed to have been in more control of my behaviour at work. I have focussed on the needs of all the individuals that have been affected by my adverse behaviours I have on numerous occasions apologised both to Cloverleaf and individuals for my failings. I am also aware that findings of negative conduct can impact on the reputation of the social work profession (I was registered with SWE) which in turn can cause service users and the public to lose confidence in the profession. Negative conduct can reinforce misconceptions and may lead to the reliability of social workers recommendations being questioned. In extreme cases negative conduct may cause direct harm to individuals. [...]"

I have kept up to date on reading relevant material pertaining to social work. Listening to podcasts, training with organisation like SWE, BASW, Department of Health and Social Care, Local Authorities and NHS organisations, and government guidance and academic journals and not so academic journals I have quoted throughout articles from The Guardian, Yorkshire Post, local press, The Big Issue and church newsletters. My learning also comes through listening to the news and supervision. [...]"

The training I have undertaken which has been on line or through reading has also mainly been focused on the areas that I was found to need remediation in although there have also been elements of general CPD as well. Topics have included supervision; confidentiality; safe working practices; domestic violence; gender inequalities; independent supported living and management of change. [...]"

The combination of CPD and the training I have undertaken means I have far more insight into how I need to respond to the sorts of situations that arose and will be able to act in an appropriate professional manner in the future. [...]"

During the two and a half years since the initial hearing as part of the CPD, training and remediation I have undertaken I have had many opportunities to reflect on my practice, where I made mistakes and how I need to respond in the future. Reflection on what I have and am learning is an integral part of all the CPD I am doing."

15. Ms Sheridan confirmed that Ms Hartill had applied for roles through a recruitment website (Indeed) and LinkedIn by uploading her CV, and as a result, was not able to access any further evidence of the jobs applied for. She had checked her emails but was unable to locate any further information regarding the applications. She had

applied for a prison service charity role, and a research role. In addition, she had considered applying for a recycling centre role, but on disclosing that she was subject to conditions of practice, the manager had dissuaded her from doing so. She was currently volunteering with Hull and Riding interfaith group in a signposting role only, which did not require her to use her social work qualification, knowledge, or skills. She had also spoken with previous colleagues who advised that she was unlikely to be recruited for any social work roles with conditions of practice in place. Ms Sheridan contended that there was no requirement to disclose any conditions at the point of application, she has no history of dishonesty and had not applied for any social work roles.

16. Ms Sheridan asked the panel to consider the full previous history in this case, Ms Hartill's unblemished career, the testimonials provided which were also available to the last panel, her current insight and remediation and that there was a very low likelihood of any future repetition of the past misconduct. Ms Hartill had demonstrated a full understanding of her past behaviours, had taken many steps to remediate and wished to find part time work in the future.

17. Ms Sheridan asked the panel to find that Ms Hartill had fully complied with the conditions of practice order and that her fitness to practise was no longer impaired. She invited the panel to therefore revoke the current conditions of practice final order so that she could return to unrestricted practice as a social worker.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

18. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.

19. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the previous panel and all the documentation in the current hearing bundles and documents provided by Ms Hartill which included a reflective statement, a number of references and training certificates. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Mr McCarthy on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Ms Sheridan on behalf of Ms Hartill.

20. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser including reference to the case of *Abrahaem v GMC* [2008] EWHC 183 (Admin) which confirms that there is a persuasive burden on a registrant at a review hearing to demonstrate that previous concerns have been sufficiently addressed. The panel was also mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession.

21. In *Cohen v GMC* (2008) EWHC 581 (Admin), it established that regulatory tribunals must evaluate a practitioner's fitness to practise in the present tense, rather than exclusively

focusing on past misconduct. The case established the three stage test namely 1) Is the conduct leading to the charge easily remediable 2) Has it in fact been remedied 3) Is it highly unlikely to be repeated in the future.

22. The panel first considered whether Ms Hartill's fitness to practise remained impaired.
23. The panel noted that Ms Hartill had remained engaged with the review process by being in touch with the Social Work England Case Review team since the last review, by providing evidence to demonstrate her compliance with the conditions of practice order, by engaging in further training and personal development and by attending and fully participating in today's hearing.
24. The panel considered that the evidence provided by Ms Sheridan indicated that Ms Hartill had made considerable efforts to ensure compliance with the conditions of practice. The panel considered that the training courses undertaken were appropriately targeted.
25. The panel carefully considered the reflection statements provided by Ms Hartill. The panel considered that they demonstrated insight into her past misconduct and compliance with conditions. Ms Hartill also accepted the findings of the substantive panel as to her failings, had developed substantial insight into those failings and their impact, and that had undertaken relevant steps to strengthen her practice in the relevant areas.
26. The panel noted that Ms Hartill had made efforts to find work since the conditions of practice order was imposed. The panel heard submissions in relation to the potential breach of condition 12 and concluded that none of the roles applied for required social work qualifications, knowledge or skills and in effect, anyone could have applied for those roles. On the balance of probabilities, the panel therefore find that condition 12 had not been breached.
27. The panel noted that almost two and a half years had passed since the substantive hearing in relation to the regulatory concerns, and that there had been no reports or evidence of any further concerns being raised in relation to Ms Hartill in that time, nor any evidence of repetition of the misconduct although the panel accepts that Ms Hartill has not been employed as a social worker since that time.
28. Given Ms Hartill's engagement with Social Work England and substantial progress in terms of insight and remediation, and the fact that there had been no repetition of the misconduct or any similar concerns, the panel considered that it was now highly unlikely that the misconduct found proved would be repeated. The risk of repetition was now very low. Furthermore, given the evidence that Ms Hartill had provided in relation to training courses undertaken and insight developed, the panel was satisfied that she had kept her knowledge and skills up to date.
29. Taking all of these matters into account, the panel therefore concluded that a finding of current impairment was no longer necessary in terms of public protection.

30. The panel also considered the wider public interest and whether a finding of impairment was nevertheless necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold proper professional standards. The panel considered that the public, fully informed of the nature and seriousness of the misconduct found proved and of Ms Hartill's level of engagement, insight and remediation, would not consider that a finding of current impairment was necessary to maintain standards and confidence. Accordingly, the panel found that Ms Hartill's fitness to practice was not currently impaired on public interest grounds.
31. Given the panel's finding that Ms Hartill's fitness to practise was no longer impaired, it then considered the need for further sanctions. The panel did consider whether advice or a warning may be needed as they did not find any impairment, but felt that it would be disproportionate given the circumstances. As there was no impaired fitness to practice, it was no longer appropriate that there should be any restriction on Ms Hartill's registration as a social worker, and so the panel decided to revoke the current conditions of practice order with immediate effect.

Revoke the conditions of practice order with effect immediately

32. The panel concluded that the conditions of practice final order should be revoked with immediate effect.

The Professional Standards Authority

33. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a review 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>