

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee**

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Friday 19 May 2023**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant: Loredana-Maria Ursaru

NMC PIN 13K0321C

Part(s) of the register: Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1
Adult Nursing – (November 2013)

Relevant Location: Newcastle

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: Jane Kilgannon (Chair, Lay member)
Amanda Revill (Registrant member)
Lisa Lezama (Registrant member)

Legal Assessor: David Swinstead

Hearings Coordinator: Charis Benefo

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Lucie Danti, Case Presenter

Miss Ursaru: Not present and unrepresented at the hearing

Order being reviewed: Conditions of practice order (18 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Conditions of practice order (12 months) to come into effect at the end of 29 June 2023 in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Ursaru was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Miss Ursaru's registered email address by secure email on 5 April 2023.

Further, the panel noted that the Notice of Hearing was to be sent to Miss Ursaru's representative at the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) on 5 April 2023.

Ms Danti, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the substantive order being reviewed, the time, date and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Miss Ursaru's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Ursaru has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Miss Ursaru

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Miss Ursaru. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Danti who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Miss Ursaru.

Ms Danti stated that Miss Ursaru did not attend the previous substantive hearing in November 2021 and that, until the written submissions from the RCN dated 18 May 2023, there had been no engagement from Miss Ursaru since the previous hearing. Ms Danti

said that there had been no application to adjourn from Miss Ursaru, and submitted that there was no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date.

Ms Danti submitted that an expeditious review of this case, without undue delay, would be in the public interest and that it would be disproportionate if the substantive review were not to proceed today.

Ms Danti referred the panel to the letter from Miss Ursaru's representative at the RCN dated 18 May 2023 which stated:

'Our member will not be attending the hearing nor will she be represented. No disrespect is intended by her non-attendance. Our member has received the notice of hearing and is happy for the hearing to proceed in her absence. She is keen to engage with the proceedings.'

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel decided to proceed in the absence of Miss Ursaru. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Danti, the written representations from the RCN on Miss Ursaru's behalf, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Miss Ursaru;
- Miss Ursaru did not attend the previous substantive hearing in November 2021;
- Miss Ursaru has informed the NMC via her representative that she has received the Notice of Hearing and confirmed she is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Miss Ursaru.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to impose a further conditions of practice order for the period of 12 months.

This order will come into effect at the end of 29 June 2023 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 30 November 2021.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 29 June 2023.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The charges found proved which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

'On 15 October 2018 you, a registered nurse:

- 1. Failed to respond in a timely manner when Resident A was showing signs of distress.*
- 2. When asked to assist Resident A you said to Colleague A "She's end of life, what do you expect" or words to that effect.*
- 3. Failed to document that Resident A had shown signs of distress in:*
 - a) The behaviour chart*
 - b) The night report*

c) *The daily statement of wellbeing*

AND in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.'

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel found limbs a) to c) of Grant to be engaged in this case.

The panel determined that Resident A was put at risk of harm as a result of Miss Ursaru's misconduct and it had particular regard to Witness 1's evidence that Resident A was distressed. Having breached multiple provisions of the Code, in particular 1.1, 1.4 and 2.6, the panel determined that Miss Ursaru's misconduct had breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and also brought its reputation into disrepute. The panel was satisfied that confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if its regulator did not find Miss Ursaru's actions to constitute serious misconduct.

The panel carefully considered the evidence before it in determining whether or not Miss Ursaru had strengthened her practice.

The panel considered that Miss Ursaru's misconduct is remediable but it had no evidence before it to demonstrate sufficient strengthening of practice. It noted that Miss Ursaru had been subject to performance improvement measures at the Home due to previous disciplinary action, yet the concerns before the panel had arisen despite this support.

The panel noted that, in the RCN's written submission, Miss Ursaru did not accept she had acted in the way detailed in the charges. Having now found all those charges proved, the panel considered that, in view of Miss Ursaru's denial of the facts, that she has not demonstrated sufficient insight into the concerns raised. Further, the concerns relating to the charges must be viewed in the context of earlier regulatory concerns and the issue of a formal written warning to Miss

Ursaru. The panel also noted with concern that Miss Ursaru's version of events appears to call into question the integrity of Witness 1, a CQC Inspector, who the panel found would have no reason to maliciously fabricate her evidence. The panel noted that Miss Ursaru's reflective piece focussed on the fact that no actual harm was caused. However, it considered that the risk of harm posed by her actions had not been addressed sufficiently.

The panel had regard to the certificates and references provided by Miss Ursaru but did not consider them to demonstrate sufficient strengthening of practice. It noted that none of the references before the panel appear to be from Miss Ursaru's manager or are dated more recently than 2019.

Due to previous similar concerns with Miss Ursaru's practice being raised, her insufficient insight and reflection, and there being no evidence of sufficient strengthening of practice, the panel considered that there is a high risk of Miss Ursaru's misconduct being repeated. The panel therefore determined that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel bore in mind the overarching objectives of the NMC; to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold and protect the wider public interest. This includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing and midwifery professions and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

The panel noted that the charges found proved are serious and involved the poor treatment of a vulnerable resident, inappropriate communication and record keeping concerns. It considered that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made in this case. The panel therefore also finds Miss Ursaru's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

Having regard to all of the above, in the panel's judgment, Miss Ursaru's fitness to practise is currently impaired.'

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel next considered whether placing conditions of practice on Miss Ursaru's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel was mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel has carefully considered the SG, in particular:

[...]

- No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- Identifiable areas of the nurse or midwife's practice in need of assessment and/or retraining;*
- Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- No evidence of general incompetence;*
- Potential and willingness to respond positively to retraining; and*
- Conditions can be created that can be monitored and assessed'*

Having determined that Miss Ursaru's misconduct is remediable, the panel considered that it was possible to formulate appropriate and practicable conditions which would address the issues identified in this case. It determined that patients would be protected by the imposition of conditions of practice which specifically address the shortfalls identified in Miss Ursaru's practice, namely providing timely care to dementia/vulnerable patients, record keeping and communication.

The panel had regard to the RCN's written submissions which stated that Mrs Ursaru '...fully intends to return to nursing practice in the United Kingdom in the future.' but that she 'does not currently know when she will return to the United Kingdom, however, she will continue to fully engage with the NMC process.'. It considered that, despite the uncertainty regarding when Miss Ursaru will return to the United Kingdom, a conditions of practice order would sufficiently protect the public when that time comes. The panel noted that this order will be subject to

review and that, should Miss Ursaru have not returned to the United Kingdom by the time the order is due to expire, a reviewing panel will assess the situation to ensure that the public remain protected and that the impairment found by this panel is addressed.

Having regard to the matters it has identified, the panel has concluded that a conditions of practice order would be an appropriate sanction. It considered that such an order would sufficiently protect the public as well as marking the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and sending to the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of practice required of a registered nurse.

The panel was of the view that to impose a suspension order would be disproportionate. It considered Miss Ursaru's misconduct to be remediable and that Miss Ursaru has demonstrated a willingness to strengthen her practice, therefore a suspension order would be unduly punitive. Further, it considered that a suspension order would not allow Miss Ursaru the opportunity to strengthen her practice and would deprive the public of an otherwise competent nurse.

The panel determined that the following conditions are appropriate and proportionate:

For the purposes of these conditions, 'employment' and 'work' mean any paid or unpaid post in a nursing, midwifery or nursing associate role. Also, 'course of study' and 'course' mean any course of educational study connected to nursing, midwifery or nursing associates.

- 1. You must not be the nurse in charge duty on any shift you work as a registered nurse.*
- 2. You must not work as a registered nurse on a nightshift.*

3. *You must ensure that you are supervised by a registered nurse of an equal or higher band than yourself at any time you are working as a registered nurse. Your supervision must consist of working at all times on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by, a registered nurse of an equal or higher band as yourself*

4. *You must work with your line manager to create a personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must address:*
 - a) *Caring for vulnerable patients*
 - b) *Communication*
 - c) *Record keeping*
 - d) *How you put into practice the learning from any course undertaken*

You must:

- *Meet with your line manager at least every two weeks to discuss your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP*
 - *Complete a recognised record keeping course*
 - *Refresh your Equality, Diversity and Dignity training (last completed in 2019)*
 - *Send your case officer a report from your line manager ahead of your next NMC review. This report must show your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP*
5. *You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are working by:*
 - a) *Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment*
 - b) *Giving your case officer your employer's contact details*

 6. *You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are studying by:*

- a) *Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study*
- b) *Giving your case officer the name and contact details of the organisation offering that course of study*

7. *You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:*

- a) *Any organisation or person you work for (as a registered nurse)*
- c) *Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application)*
- d) *Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study*

8. *You must tell your case officer, within seven days of your becoming aware of:*

- a) *Any clinical incident you are involved in*
- b) *Any investigation started against you*
- c) *Any disciplinary proceedings taken against you*

9. *You must allow your case officer to share, as necessary, details about your performance, your compliance with and / or progress under these conditions with:*

- a) *Any current or future employer*
- b) *Any educational establishment*
- c) *Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions*

The panel determined that a period of 18 months would allow Miss Ursaru sufficient time to return to the United Kingdom, if she so wishes, to find employment as a registered nurse and to demonstrate that she has sufficiently strengthened her practice.

Before the order expires, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well Miss Ursaru has complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order with another order.

This panel considered that any future panel reviewing this order may be assisted by the following:

- *Miss Ursaru's attendance at any review hearing*
- *Evidence of Miss Ursaru's compliance with the conditions of practice order above*
- *A reflective piece (using a recognised model) that addresses the impact of Miss Ursaru's misconduct on Resident A, her previous colleagues and the wider nursing profession*
- *Up to date references from any employment in a care giving setting, in Romania or the United Kingdom (or elsewhere)*
- *Evidence of any further training (online or in person) undertaken'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Ursaru's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register without restriction. In considering this case, the panel has carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it has noted the decision of the last panel, this panel has exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle and the written representations from the RCN.

The panel noted the written representations from Miss Ursaru's representative in the letter dated 18 May 2023, which stated:

'Submissions

We are instructed by our member that she has not worked as a nurse in the UK since the substantive hearing on 30 November 2021. She is currently abroad in Romania [PRIVATE]. Our member confirms that she intends to stay in Romania for the immediate future and will not be working.

In light of the above, it is our submission that our member has not [sic] opportunity to comply with conditions of the substantive order as she has not been employed in a nursing role, in the UK or in Romania. As the Registrant has not worked as a registered nurse since the imposition of the conditions of practice order, she readily accepts that her current fitness to practise remains impaired.

The registrant is still very much committed to the nursing profession, and is hoping to return to a nursing role, in a suitable role in the future. At this stage she is uncertain of when this will be, but it is not to be before the end this year.

Application

We respectfully request that the conditions of practice order be continued for a period of 12 months to allow the registrant time to reflect on her practice, and allow her time to meet her objective of returning to nursing in the future, whilst providing the appropriate level of support and protection.

We submit that it would be wholly disproportionate for the conditions of practice order to be replaced with a higher sanction at this stage. The panel are respectfully reminded that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive. We trust that this will be taken into consideration by the panel.

If you are not minded to agree with our submission then please adjourn this review for a hearing at the earliest available date to allow our member to attend and be represented.'

The panel then took account of the submissions made by Ms Danti on behalf of the NMC. She provided a background to the case and referred the panel to the decision and reasons of the previous substantive panel in November 2021.

Ms Danti referred to the case of *Abrahaem v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 183 and submitted that the onus was on Miss Ursaru to demonstrate that she is no longer impaired. Ms Danti stated that Miss Ursaru was not in attendance at this hearing, although her representative had confirmed that she is content for the hearing to proceed and that she is keen to engage with the proceedings. She reminded the panel that aside from the written representations from the RCN dated 18 May 2023, there had been no engagement from Miss Ursaru with the NMC since the previous hearing.

Ms Danti submitted that there was no evidence before the panel that Miss Ursaru has complied with the conditions of practice. She accepted that an explanation had been provided for this in the RCN's written representations, namely that Miss Ursaru is not working as a registered nurse [PRIVATE]. Ms Danti submitted that there was no evidence of any reflection, up to date references or further training from Miss Ursaru, all of which had been recommended by the previous panel, but that this could be explained by the fact that she is otherwise engaged at this time.

Ms Danti invited the panel to consider remediation, what the original impairment finding was based on, and what had changed since the previous hearing. She submitted that without compliance to the previous panel's recommendations or the conditions of practice order, remediation was unlikely to have taken place in the case.

Ms Danti also asked the panel to consider whether there has been any meaningful engagement from Miss Ursaru. Whilst there had been some correspondence with the RCN, there had been no correspondence between Miss Ursaru and the NMC. Ms Danti submitted that the limited engagement from Miss Ursaru was evidence that she is likely to still be impaired.

Ms Danti submitted that Miss Ursaru has readily accepted that her current fitness to practise remains impaired. She submitted that other than the change in Miss Ursaru's

personal circumstances, there was no evidence of any change to her practice since the previous substantive hearing.

Ms Danti submitted that if the panel were to find current impairment, then a caution order would not be appropriate in the circumstances.

Ms Danti submitted that in light of the written representations that Miss Ursaru would like to return to nursing practice, it would also not be appropriate to let the current conditions of practice order lapse. Ms Danti reminded the panel that Miss Ursaru's NMC registration fee expired on 30 November 2019, and that by allowing the current order to lapse, Miss Ursaru's entry on the NMC register would be removed, and she would not be able to practise. She stated that if the current order were to lapse, Miss Ursaru could apply for readmission to the NMC and the panel's decision as to whether she was still impaired when she was removed from the register would be taken into account by the Registrar.

In relation to replacing the current order with new conditions of practice, Ms Danti submitted that given the lack of engagement from Miss Ursaru, the panel may find this challenging in the circumstances as it is unclear what alternative conditions would be more effective or desirable.

Ms Danti submitted that extending the current conditions of practice order would continue to protect the public and meet the public interest. She highlighted that this was also Miss Ursaru's preferred option.

Ms Danti submitted that a suspension order or striking-off order would be disproportionate, although the panel may take the points raised, including Miss Ursaru's lack of engagement, into consideration.

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel considered whether Miss Ursaru's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Miss Ursaru had insufficient insight. At this hearing, the panel noted that up until the written representations from the RCN on 18 May 2023, Miss Ursaru had not engaged with the NMC since the previous substantive hearing. It took into account that Miss Ursaru has not practised as a registered nurse since the imposition of the current conditions of practice order due to her personal circumstances, and has therefore not had the opportunity to comply with the conditions.

The panel noted from the previous hearing that Miss Ursaru never accepted that she behaved in the way alleged. It considered that at present, there was no new information before it to indicate that Miss Ursaru has reflected and developed insight, that the concerns identified have been addressed or that she has taken steps to strengthen her practice. There were also no references from any employment in a care giving setting, in Romania or the United Kingdom, and no evidence that Miss Ursaru has undertaken further training.

The original panel determined that Miss Ursaru was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Notwithstanding the information about her current circumstances, today's panel had not received any new information from, or in respect of, Miss Ursaru to suggest that the risk of repetition had decreased. In light of this, this panel determined that there remains a risk of repetition of the conduct found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of current impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of current impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

For these reasons, the panel finds that Miss Ursaru's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Ursaru's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel noted that its powers are set out in Article 30 of the Order. The panel has also taken into account the 'NMC's Sanctions Guidance' (SG) and has borne in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, though any sanction imposed may have a punitive effect.

The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action. The panel considered Ms Danti's submissions in relation to allowing the current conditions of practice order to lapse. It decided that this would not be appropriate in light of Miss Ursaru's clear indication that she would like to return to nursing practice.

The panel then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Miss Ursaru's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.'* The panel considered that Miss Ursaru's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the issues identified. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether imposing a further conditions of practice order on Miss Ursaru's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable.

The panel determined that workable, appropriate and practical conditions would address the failings highlighted in this case. The panel accepted that Miss Ursaru has not yet been able to comply with the conditions of practice due to her current personal circumstances, but considered that she is willing to comply with the conditions when she returns to nursing practice in the United Kingdom.

The panel was of the view that a further conditions of practice order is sufficient to protect patients and the wider public interest, noting as the original panel did that Miss Ursaru's misconduct is remediable. In this case, the panel was satisfied that the conditions which had been formulated by the previous panel, would protect patients and specifically address the issues identified in Miss Ursaru's practice, namely providing timely care to dementia/vulnerable patients, record keeping and communication.

The panel was of the view that to impose a suspension order or a striking-off order would be wholly disproportionate and would not be a reasonable response in the circumstances of Miss Ursaru's case in view of the fact that Miss Ursaru's conduct is remediable and that she has demonstrated a willingness to return to nursing practice. The panel determined a suspension order would be unduly punitive, would not allow Miss Ursaru the opportunity to strengthen her practice and would deprive the public of an otherwise competent nurse.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of 12 months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 29 June 2023. It decided to impose the following conditions which it considered are appropriate and proportionate in this case:

For the purposes of these conditions, 'employment' and 'work' mean any paid or unpaid post in a nursing, midwifery or nursing associate role. Also, 'course of study' and 'course' mean any course of educational study connected to nursing, midwifery or nursing associates.

1. You must not be the nurse in charge duty on any shift you work as a registered nurse.
2. You must not work as a registered nurse on a nightshift.
3. You must ensure that you are supervised by a registered nurse of an equal or higher band than yourself at any time you are working as a registered nurse. Your supervision must consist of working at all

times on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by, a registered nurse of an equal or higher band as yourself.

4. You must work with your line manager to create a personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must address:
 - a) Caring for vulnerable patients
 - b) Communication
 - c) Record keeping
 - d) How you put into practice the learning from any course undertaken

You must:

- Meet with your line manager at least every two weeks to discuss your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP
- Complete a recognised record keeping course
- Refresh your Equality, Diversity and Dignity training (last completed in 2019)
- Send your case officer a report from your line manager ahead of your next NMC review. This report must show your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP

5. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are working by:
 - a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.
 - b) Giving your case officer your employer's contact details.

6. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are studying by:
 - a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study.
 - b) Giving your case officer the name and contact details of the organisation offering that course of study.

7. You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:

- a) Any organisation or person you work for (as a registered nurse).
 - b) Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).
 - c) Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.
8. You must tell your case officer, within seven days of your becoming aware of:
- a) Any clinical incident you are involved in.
 - b) Any investigation started against you.
 - c) Any disciplinary proceedings taken against you.
9. You must allow your case officer to share, as necessary, details about your performance, your compliance with and / or progress under these conditions with:
- a) Any current or future employer.
 - b) Any educational establishment.
 - c) Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.

The period of this order is for 12 months.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 29 June 2023 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of the order, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well Miss Ursaru has complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order for another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Miss Ursaru's attendance at any review hearing
- Evidence of Miss Ursaru's compliance with the conditions of practice order above
- A reflective piece that addresses the impact of Miss Ursaru's misconduct on Resident A, her previous colleagues and the wider nursing profession
- Up to date references from any employment in a care giving setting, in Romania or the United Kingdom (or elsewhere)
- Evidence of any further training (online or in person) undertaken

This will be confirmed to Miss Ursaru in writing.

That concludes this determination.