



Notice of Decision of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council's Fitness to Practise Committee

Name: Peter William James Gorman

SCR No: 6033113

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **08 May 2024**, made the following decision about your registration with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council:

The Committee found the facts proved;

The Committee found that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your Caution and your inclusion on the barred lists maintained by the Disclosure and Barring Service;

The Committee decided to make an Order for removal of your registration from the Register ('a Removal Order').

Particulars of the Allegation:

That, whilst being registered as a social care worker under the Health and Personal Social Services Act (Northern Ireland) 2001 (as amended), and whilst employed at Potens Domiciliary Care Agency as a domiciliary outreach worker:	
1.	On 3 rd March 2021, you accepted an adult caution in the United Kingdom for the following offences:
(a)	Distributing Indecent Photo/Pseudo Image Making of Indecent Photo/Pseudo Image Summary of method: Forwarded Indecent video to work colleague on 27 th November 2017
2.	On 11 May 2022, the Disclosure and Barring Service included your name in the Children's Barred List using barring powers as defined in Schedule 1, Paragraph 2 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups (Northern Ireland) Order 2007 (SVGO);
3.	On 11 May 2022, the Disclosure and Barring Service included your name in the Adults' Barred List using barring powers as defined Schedule 1, Paragraph 8 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups (Northern Ireland) Order 2007 (SVGO).

And your action as set out in 1 above show that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence as per Rule 4 (1) (d) of the Fitness to Practise (Amendment) Rules 2019.

And on the basis of the decisions of the Disclosure and Barring Service, as set out at 2 and 3 above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your inclusion on the barred lists maintained by the Disclosure and Barring Service as per Rule 4(1)(f) of the Fitness to Practise (Amendment) Rules 2019.

Procedure

The hearing was held under the fitness to practise procedure.

Preliminary Issues

The fitness to practise hearing was held remotely by way of video-link. The Registrant was not in attendance, nor was he represented. The Council was represented by Ms Sinead Owens, Solicitor, Directorate of Legal Services.

Declarations of Conflict of Interest

The Chair confirmed with the Committee that none of the Members had any conflict of interest with this case.

Service

Ms Owens told the Committee that the Notice of Hearing and hearing bundle were emailed to the Registrant's registered email address on 28 March 2024. An electronic delivery receipt was received on the same day.

The Committee received legal advice from the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the requirements as set out in the Northern Ireland Social Care Council's Fitness to Practise (Amendment) Rules 2019 ('the Rules') and, in particular, Rule 3 which states that proof of service shall be treated as being effected on the day after it was properly sent.

The Committee, in all of the circumstances of the case, was satisfied that the Notice of Hearing had been served in accordance with Rule 3 and Paragraph 5 of Schedule 2 of the Rules.

Proceeding in the Absence of the Registrant

Ms Owens made an application to proceed in the absence of the Registrant, under Paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and submitted that the Committee should hear and determine the case in the Registrant's absence. Ms Owens invited the Committee to conclude that the Registrant's absence was a voluntary waiver of his right to attend. Ms Owens stated that, on 07 May 2024, the Committee Clerk had telephoned the Registrant and left a voicemail message, asking him to confirm if he would be attending the fitness to practise hearing. Later on 07 May 2024, the Registrant returned the telephone call and confirmed that he would not be in attendance at the hearing.

Ms Owens submitted that there had been no request for an adjournment or for representation to be arranged. She said that, in all of the circumstances, it was fair to proceed with the hearing in the Registrant's absence. Ms Owens further submitted that proceeding in the absence of the Registrant was in the public interest, and also was justified to ensure the expeditious disposal of the hearing.

The Committee was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of the Registrant should only be exercised with the utmost care and caution. In considering the application, the Committee sought to satisfy itself that all reasonable efforts had been made to notify the Registrant of the hearing, and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the cases of R v Jones and GMC v Adeogba. He reminded the Committee that in exercising its discretion to proceed in the Registrant's absence, it must have regard to all of the circumstances, with fairness to the Registrant being of prime consideration, although fairness to the Council and the public interest must also be taken into account. He reminded the Committee to avoid reaching any improper conclusion about the Registrant's absence, and not to accept it as an admission in any way.

In considering the application to proceed in the absence of the Registrant, the Committee noted the telephone call with the Registrant as set out above and his confirmation that he would not be in attendance at the fitness to practise hearing. Taking account of all of the circumstances, the Committee concluded that the Registrant had voluntarily absented himself from attending the hearing. There was no reason to suppose that an adjournment of the hearing would secure the Registrant's attendance at a later date, nor was there any request for such an adjournment or indication that the Registrant was seeking legal representation. In addition, the Committee noted the serious nature of the Particulars of the Allegation faced by the Registrant, and concluded that the public interest was strongly engaged in this case.

For these reasons, the Committee considered that it was fair and appropriate to proceed in the absence of the Registrant.

Application to Admit Hearing Bundle

The Committee accepted the hearing bundle of documents into evidence, and marked it as Exhibit 1.

Background

On 30 November 2020, the Council received an Employer Referral Form ('ERF') from Area Manager of Potens Domiciliary Care Agency, Mr Dean McMorris. It was reported to management of that organisation that the Registrant, on 27 November 2017, had sent an inappropriate video clip by WhatsApp from his mobile phone to the mobile phone of a fellow worker who was upset and concerned regarding its contents. This fellow worker reported the video clip to the police on 29 November 2017. The clip was described as being 10 - 12 seconds long. It was alleged that while most of the video clip was un-concerning, the last couple of seconds were alleged to show a young boy who appeared to be masturbating. It was unclear if the video clip was an actual or manipulated video. The purpose of the video, either for humorous or sexual purposes, was also unclear.

The Registrant was interviewed under caution by police on 21 January 2018 for the offences of making and / or distributing an indecent image or pseudo image of a child. The Registrant stated that he had received the video clip from a friend while he was at work, and had showed it to a fellow worker when the fellow worker requested to view it. The Registrant denied sending the video clip to another work colleague, and speculated that the video clip was sent without his knowledge or permission when his phone was left unattended. He suggested that the video clip could have been forwarded on by a work colleague.

Subsequently, the Council received a Certificate of Caution, dated 03 March 2021, signed by the Registrant. The Caution specified that it had been administered to the Registrant at the direction of the Public Prosecution Service ('PPS') in respect of the following offences: making and / or distributing an indecent image or pseudo image of a child. The Caution further specified that it had been issued on the basis that the Registrant had forwarded the video clip to a work colleague.

Correspondence, dated 01 June 2022, to the Council from the Disclosure and Barring Service ('DBS') confirmed that, with effect from 11 May 2022, the Registrant had been placed on the Children's and Adults' barred lists.

Evidence and Submission on the Facts

Ms Owens referred the Committee to the Certificate of Caution and the structured outline of the case, as provided by the PSNI. She noted that the structured outline of the case provided details around the incident, which occurred on 27 November 2017 and was reported to the police on 29 November 2017. She noted that, according to this outline, on 27 November 2017 the Registrant had sent an inappropriate video clip to a co-worker, and that his acceptance of criminal liability was entirely related to the fact that the Registrant had failed to immediately delete the video sent to him on the WhatsApp forum. Ms Owens also noted that the Registrant denied forwarding the video to a colleague.

Ms Owens also highlighted the letter received from the DBS, informing the Council that the Registrant had been barred from working with children and vulnerable adults as of 11 May 2022.

Ms Owens referred the Committee to Paragraph 12 of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and submitted that the Registrant had not provided any evidence as set out at Paragraph 12 (7) to prove that he was not the person named in the Certificate of Caution or the correspondence from the DBS.

Ms Owens submitted that the Certificate of Caution was conclusive proof of the facts set out. She further submitted that the correspondence from the DBS should be regarded as *prima facie* evidence with regards to the Registrant's current DBS status. Ms Owens, therefore, invited the Committee to find that the facts had been proved on the balance of probabilities in relation to the Particulars of the Allegation.

Findings of Fact

The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He reminded the Committee that it must apply the standard of proof as applicable in civil proceedings, which is the balance of probabilities. He further referred the Committee to the fact that the burden of proof rested upon the Council.

The Committee reminded itself that the burden is on the Council to prove the facts as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation, and that to find the facts proved the Committee must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities. This means that for any fact to be found proved, the Committee must be satisfied that it is more likely than not to have occurred.

The Committee took into account the submissions from Ms Owens, on behalf of the Council, and had careful regard to all of the documentary evidence submitted, in particular the Certificate of Caution, the PSNI structured outline of the case and the correspondence as noted above from the DBS.

The Committee noted that the Registrant had signed the Certificate of Caution and had not disputed any of the supporting information contained in the outline of the case.

Taking into account Paragraph 12 (5) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, the Committee was satisfied to the required standard that the Certificate of Caution against the Registrant proved the facts therein.

The Committee accepted, as *prima facie* evidence, the written notification from the DBS, set out in its correspondence to the Council, of the Registrant's current barred status. The Committee had no evidence that the Registrant was not the individual referred to by the DBS. It noted that the Registrant had appealed the decision of the DBS to include him in the applicable barred lists to the Care Tribunal, but that he subsequently withdrew his appeal. Taking into account Paragraph 12 (6) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, the Committee was satisfied that the correspondence from the DBS proved the facts therein.

The Committee therefore found that, on the balance of probabilities, the facts contained in the Particulars of the Allegations had been proved.

Fitness to Practise

The Committee proceeded to consider if the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired. The Committee heard submissions from Ms Owens, who advised that there were no formal admissions from the Registrant in relation to the Particulars of the Allegation, nor to the question as to whether he admitted that his fitness to practise was currently impaired.

Ms Owens submitted that the Registrant's Caution and current DBS status call into question his ability to work in social care services and to remain on the Register without restriction, or to be registered at all. Ms Owens directed the Committee to the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers ('the Standards'), and invited the Committee to determine that the Registrant's Caution and the actions which led to his inclusion on the DBS barred lists were in breach of the following Standards: 5, 5.8 and 5.9.

Ms Owens submitted that the Registrant's Caution is a relatively recent event as he received it in March 2021, but that the incident occurred in November 2017. She submitted that the Registrant's inclusion on the DBS Children's Barred List and Adults' Barred List showed that there was a clear and fundamental impairment of his fitness to practise. By being placed on those lists, the Registrant has been deemed to be no longer fit to work with either children or vulnerable adults by another regulatory body.

Ms Owens told the Committee that the Registrant's Caution and DBS barring fall far below the minimum standard expected of a registered social care worker, and call into question his fitness to practise. She said that there was nothing to persuade the Committee that the Registrant's behaviour would not be repeated in the future. There was also no evidence from the Registrant that he had remediated his behaviour. She said that there was limited evidence of regret or remorse from the Registrant, nor was there information to suggest that he would act differently in the future. Ms Owens accepted that the Registrant did co-operate with the police investigation and accepted a Caution but, in the circumstances, Ms Owens submitted that there remained a future risk of harm to others if the Registrant was allowed to practise without restriction.

Ms Owens submitted that the public interest and confidence in the social care profession would be undermined if a finding of current impairment was not made in these particular circumstances.

The Committee considered the submissions from Ms Owens on behalf of the Council, and had regard to all of the evidence in the case. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers, and advised it to adopt a sequential approach when considering this issue. In particular, he asked it to take into account the nature and content of the Caution against the Registrant, and the reasons for his inclusion on the barred lists. He reminded the Committee that it was being asked to determine whether the Registrant's fitness to practise was impaired because of this Caution and current DBS status. He referred the Committee to Paragraph 24 of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and the requirements as set out in the case of the GMC v Cohen. He further referred the Committee to the findings of Dame Janet Smith in the Fifth Shipman Report as regards the potential causes of impairment. He also referred the Committee to the cases of GMC v Meadows and CHRE v NMC & Grant.

The Committee considered whether the Registrant's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of his Caution and inclusion on lists maintained by the DBS, as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation.

The Committee, in considering the issue of impairment of fitness to practise, took account of Paragraph 24 (3) of Schedule 2 of the Rules which states that it should have regard to:

- (a) whether it is satisfied as to the reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise;
- (b) the Standards of Conduct and Practice issued by the Council under Section 9 of the Act;
- (c) whether the impairment is capable of remediation;
- (d) whether the impairment has been remediated;
- (e) the risk of repetition; and
- (f) the public interest.

The Committee had regard to the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers and the Council guidance entitled 'Making a Determination of Impaired Fitness to Practise: Guidance for Committees on Remediation'. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant's actions breached the following Standards of Conduct:

Standard 5: As a social care worker, you must uphold public trust and confidence in social care services. In particular you must not:

- 5.8 Behave in a way, in work or outside work, which would call into question your suitability to work in social care services; or
- 5.9 Use social media or social networking sites or other forms of electronic communication in a way that contravenes professional boundaries, organisational guidelines or NISCC standards.

The Committee first considered whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of his Caution for the offences set out. In principle, with appropriate evidence of insight and remediation, the Committee accepted that the Registrant's conduct was capable of remediation. The Committee next considered whether, in fact, the Registrant had remedied the conduct which had resulted in his Caution. In order to receive a Caution, the Registrant was required to unequivocally accept his guilt in relation to the offences for which the Caution was administered. The Certificate of Caution before the Committee contained a paragraph above the Registrant's signature which confirmed that he admitted the offences, that he had not signed the Caution in order to receive a non-court disposal and that he understood the consequences of accepting the Caution. In an email from the Council to the Registrant, dated 19 January 2024, it records that the Registrant chose the option of accepting the Caution to minimise the impact on himself and on his family. This suggested to the Committee that while the Registrant had some insight into the seriousness of his offending, it was limited and partial. This view was reinforced when the Committee considered the transcript of the under-caution interview conducted between the Registrant and the PSNI. In that transcript, the Registrant confirmed that he 'chuckled' when he viewed the video clip and afterwards 'went on with my business'. In the interview, the Registrant was also recorded as having accepted that he ought to have deleted the video clip straight away, before observing 'But like they say hindsight is a great thing'. The Committee had regard to the particular nature of the Registrant's employment at the time and was aware that, as a domiciliary outreach worker, the Registrant would be expected to work autonomously providing care to vulnerable service users. The Committee concluded that there was, in light of the Registrant's limited and partial insight, a risk of harm to vulnerable service users and colleagues and a risk of repetition. Accordingly, in relation to the Registrant's Caution, the Committee decided that a finding of current impairment in relation to the Registrant's fitness to practise was required on public interest grounds.

With regard to the decision by the DBS to include the Registrant on applicable barred lists, the Committee noted that the Registrant had no control over this decision. Accordingly, the Committee decided that there was no basis upon which to make a finding of current impairment of the Registrant's fitness to practise on public protection grounds on account of his inclusion of the DBS barred lists.

With regard to the Registrant's Caution and his inclusion on the DBS barred lists, the Committee was satisfied that, in respect of both these matters, it was necessary to make a finding of current impairment of the Registrant's fitness to practise on public interest grounds. Having regard to the underlying facts, the Committee

was of the view that not to make a finding of current impairment would fail to declare proper standards of conduct and seriously undermine the public's trust and confidence in the social care workforce.

Accordingly, with regard to the Registrant's Caution, the Committee finds that, on public protection grounds, the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired. In addition, with regard to the Registrant's Caution and his inclusion on the DBS barred lists, the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired on public interest grounds.

Sanction

In reaching its decision on sanction, the Committee considered the submission of Ms Owens on behalf of the Council, and had regard to all of the evidence in this case. Ms Owens referred the Committee to mitigating factors which included the fact that the Registrant had no previous referrals to the Council, he had co-operated with the police and regulatory investigations and there was no evidence of harm having been caused to service users.

As regards aggravating factors, Ms Owens highlighted that the Registrant had not provided substantive evidence of insight, and that his barred status means that he is unable to work in regulated activity in respect of vulnerable adults and children.

Ms Owens referred the Committee to paragraphs 5.6 – 5.9 of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council Indicative Sanctions and Use of Interim Orders: Guidance Fitness to Practise Committees ('the Guidance'), and submitted that the sanction of a Removal Order was the only appropriate and proportionate response to the findings made by the Committee.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the Guidance, and reminded the Committee to consider the question of sanction in ascending order of severity, paying particular attention to the issue of proportionality.

He referred the Committee to Paragraph 26 of Schedule 2 of the Rules which provides that, upon a finding of impairment of fitness to practise, the Committee may:

- (a) impose no sanction; or
- (b) warn the Registrant and direct that a record of the warning should be placed on the Registrant's entry in the Register for a specified period of up to 5 years; or
- (c) make a Conditions of Practice Order for a specified period not exceeding 3 years; or
- (d) make an Order suspending the Registrant's registration for a specified period not exceeding 2 years (a 'Suspension Order'); or
- (e) make an Order for removal of the Registrant's registration from the Register ('a Removal Order').

He further reminded the Committee that in deciding which sanction to impose, the Committee should take into account:

- (a) the seriousness of the Particulars of the Allegation;
- (b) the degree to which the Registrant has fallen short of any expected standards;
- (c) the protection of the public;
- (d) the public interest in maintaining confidence in social care services; and
- (e) the issue of proportionality.

The Committee applied the principles of fairness and proportionality, weighing the public interest with the Registrant's interests, and taking into account any aggravating and mitigating factors in the case. The public interest included the protection of members of the public including service users, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour within the profession. The Committee took into account its powers under Paragraph 26 of Schedule 2 of the Rules in relation to the sanctions available to it, and also had regard to the Guidance, bearing in mind that the decision on sanction is one for its own independent judgement.

The Committee recognised that the purpose of sanction was not to be punitive, although a sanction may have a punitive effect. The Committee considered the aggravating and mitigating factors in this case.

The Committee considered the mitigating factors to be:

- Previous good history;
- Engagement with the police and regulatory investigations;
- Isolated incident; and
- No evidence of harm having been caused to service users.

The Committee considered the aggravating factors to be:

- Limited insight; and
- Risk of repetition.

The Committee previously found that the Registrant's Caution and inclusion on the DBS barred lists were a breach of the standards which could be expected of a registered social care worker, and were serious.

Having balanced the aggravating and mitigating factors, and taken into account the interests of public protection and the public interest, the Committee proceeded to consider which sanction to apply in this case.

No sanction - the Committee had no doubt that it would be entirely inappropriate to impose no sanction in this case. To impose no sanction would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case, and would not protect the public or address the public interest.

Warning – the Committee considered whether to impose a Warning. Having regard to its previous findings, the Committee considered that such a step would be inadequate to protect the public and would fail to uphold the public interest. The Committee considered that the Registrant's Caution and inclusion on the DBS barred lists is not at the lower end of the spectrum, and that a Warning would not address the risk of repetition identified.

Conditions of Practice Order – the Committee next considered a Conditions of Practice Order. The Committee considered that such an Order was unworkable in practice because of the Registrant's inclusion in the DBS barred lists. As a result of his inclusion, the Registrant is prohibited from working in regulated activity with vulnerable adults and children. In addition, the Committee's view was that the allegations found proved were so serious that a Conditions of Practice Order would fail to adequately protect the public and would be insufficient to uphold the public interest.

Suspension Order – the Committee next considered a Suspension Order. The Committee noted that it had made findings that the Caution in this case was very serious and fell far below the standards to be expected of a registered social care worker. The Committee also noted that the Registrant is on the DBS barred lists, preventing him from working with children or vulnerable adults.

The Committee carefully considered the issue of proportionality, and whether suspension would address the concerns which it had identified. The Committee noted paragraph 4.19 of the Guidance, which states:

4.19 Suspension from the Register may be an appropriate sanction for impairment which while very serious, is not so serious as to justify removal from the Register; for example, where there has been an acknowledgment of failings and where a Committee is satisfied that the behaviour is unlikely to be repeated, and the Registrant has no psychological or other difficulties preventing them from understanding and seeking to remedy the failings and the failings are realistically capable of being remedied, then suspension may be appropriate.

The Committee has found that the Registrant demonstrated limited insight and has provided no evidence of remediation. The Committee had earlier determined that there was a risk of repetition in the future. The Registrant chose not to participate in the hearing and did not provide evidence that he would be willing, during the period of suspension, to address failings and shortcomings in his conduct which had resulted in his Caution and inclusion on the DBS barred lists.

The Committee also concluded that, given the seriousness of the Registrant's conduct, a Suspension Order would be insufficient to protect the public and protect the public interest.

Removal Order – the Committee, therefore, decided to impose a Removal Order. The Committee took into account the Guidance at Paragraphs 4.26 – 4.28. In particular, the Committee paid careful regard to Paragraph 4.26 which states:

This is the most serious sanction which a Committee can impose. A Removal Order is likely to be appropriate when the Registrant's behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a social care worker. Removal should be used where there is no other way to protect the public, for example, where there is a lack of insight, continuing problems and a pattern of unacceptable behaviour or denial, where there is no evidence that there is likely to be satisfactory remediation and where confidence in the social care profession would be undermined by allowing the Registrant to remain on the Register.

The Committee also took into account paragraphs 5.6 – 5.9 of the Guidance and, in particular, that part of the Guidance which states that any conviction for an offence involving child abuse images and being subject to notification requirements is ‘a serious matter which will undermine trust in a registrant and the profession. It is highly likely that in such a case, the only proportionate sanction will be removal from the Register’.

The Committee concluded that, given the seriousness of the Registrant’s Caution and inclusion on the DBS barred lists, a Removal Order was the only appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the social care profession and the Council as its regulator. The Registrant’s actions constituted a very serious departure from the professional standards as set out in the Standards. The Committee determined that the Registrant’s criminal behaviour, and his inclusion on the DBS barred lists, renders him as being unfit to be a member of a caring and responsible profession.

The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant’s Caution for making and / or distributing an indecent image or pseudo image of a child is so serious that it is fundamentally incompatible with continued registration. Public confidence in the Council, and in social care services, would be undermined if a social care worker who received a Caution for such serious offences, and by reason of his Caution had been included in DBS barred lists, was permitted to remain on the Register. The Committee considered that a sanction short of a Removal Order would fail to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

The Committee did take into account the Registrant’s previous good work history and the other mitigating factors identified. However, balancing all of the factors in this case and after taking into account all the evidence, the Committee determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a Removal Order. Having regard to the effect of the Registrant’s actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public’s view of how a registered social care worker should conduct himself, the Committee concluded that nothing short of this sanction would be sufficient or appropriate.

The Committee decided, in order to protect the public and in the public interest, to make a Removal Order, with immediate effect, in respect of the Registrant’s registration. The Committee further decided that the Interim Suspension Order which was imposed in respect of the Registrant’s registration be revoked with immediate effect.

You have the right to appeal this decision to the Care Tribunal. Any appeal must be lodged in writing within 28 days from the date of this Notice of Decision.

You should note that the Fitness to Practise Committee’s decision takes effect from the date upon which it was made.

The effect of this decision is that your entry in the Register has been removed.

You are prohibited from working as a social care worker in any of the following positions:

1. A member of care staff at a:

- a.) Children's home;
 - b.) Residential care home;
 - c.) Nursing home;
 - d.) Day care setting;
 - e.) Residential family centre.
2. A person who is supplied by a domiciliary care agency to provide personal care in their own homes for persons who by reason of illness, infirmity or disability are unable to provide it for themselves without assistance.
3. A manager of a:
- a.) Residential care home;
 - b.) Day care setting;
 - c.) Residential family care centre; or
 - d.) Domiciliary care agency.

It is **compulsory** for the above social care workers to be registered with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council in order to work. This is pursuant to the Northern Ireland Social Care Council (Social Care Workers Prohibition) and Fitness of Workers Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2013 and the Northern Ireland Social Care Council (Social Care Workers Prohibition) and Fitness of Workers (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2017.

In accordance with Schedule 3, Paragraph 9 of the NISCC Fitness to Practise Rules, you may not apply to be restored to the Register within five years from the date of removal. This does not affect your right to appeal the Committee's decision to the Care Tribunal. You are prohibited from working in a social care role until a successful application for restoration onto the Register has been made to the Council.



13 May 2024

Hearings Officer
(Clerk to the Fitness to Practise Committee)

Date