

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Thursday, 9 April 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant: Karen Faith Campbell

NMC PIN: 90D0317E

Part(s) of the register: Nursing, Sub part 1
RN1, Registered Nurse – Adult
19 September 1998

Nursing, Sub part 2
RN2, Registered Nurse – Adult
2 June 1992

Relevant Location: East Cheshire

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: Phil Lowe (Chair, Lay member)
Hellen Horton (Registrant member)
Roseann Kane (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Elisa Hopley

Hearings Coordinator: Petra Bernard

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Lindsey McFarlane

Miss Campbell: Not present and not represented

Order being reviewed: Suspension order (5 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Suspension order (5 months) to come into effect
on 17 May 2026 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 Campbell was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Miss Campbell's registered email address by secure email 11 March 2026.

Ms McFarlane, 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 Campbell'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 Campbell 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 Campbell

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Miss Campbell. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms McFarlane who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Miss Campbell. She submitted that Miss Campbell has voluntarily absented herself.

Ms McFarlane submitted that there had been no engagement at all by Miss Campbell with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.

Ms McFarlane referred the panel to the NMC documentation relating to several attempts made by a Monitoring and Compliance Officer, by telephone and email, to contact Miss Campbell to ascertain her attendance at this hearing. She submitted that Miss Campbell has not responded to any correspondence or attempts to contact her since the last substantive order review hearing of 15 December 2025. She submitted that Miss Campbell has voluntarily absented herself and invited the panel to proceed in her absence.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Miss Campbell. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms McFarlane and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to any relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- The panel has found effective service of the Notice of Hearing;
- No application for an adjournment has been made by Miss Campbell;
- Miss Campbell has not engaged with the NMC since the last review and has not responded to any of the communications to her about this hearing;
- 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 Campbell.

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

At the outset of the hearing, Ms McFarlane made a request that this case be held partly in private, on the basis that proper exploration of Miss Campbell's case involves reference to her health and private life. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19

of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel determined go into private session in connection with Miss Campbell's health and personal life as and when such issues are raised in order to protect her right to privacy.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to confirm the current suspension order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 17 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the third effective review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed on 17 May 2024 at a substantive meeting for a period of 12 months. This was reviewed on 2 June 2025 when the panel imposed a 6 month suspension order. A hearing on 6 November 2025 to review the order was adjourned. The order was last reviewed 15 December 2025 when the suspension order was extended for a further 5 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 17 May 2026.

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:

'That you, a registered nurse:

1. *On 1 August 2022 failed to ensure Patient A's safety in that you:*
 - a. *Failed to carry out clinical observations during your initial visit;*
 - b. *Failed to promptly call the co-ordinator for assistance or advice during your initial or subsequent visit;*
 - c. *Failed to manage/ escalate the care of Patient A in that you failed to:*
 - i. *Promptly inform Colleague A of Patient A's deterioration when you returned to the office/during handover, following your initial visit;*
 - ii. *Promptly call a GP during or following your visit/s;*
 - iii. *Promptly call an ambulance during or following your visit/s;*
 - d. *Failed to 'ACT NOW' in accordance with the NEWS2 guidelines.*

2. *On 1 August 2022, you failed to make a clear and accurate record of your visits to Patient A on EMIS, in that you recorded:*
 - a. *one visit when you had made two visits;*
 - b. *that you had taken observations at 12.30 when you had not;*
 - c. *that you had left Patient A in the care of his father at 12.30 when you had not;*
 - d. *that you had called 999 at 12.30 when you had not.*

3. *Your actions as specified at any of the charges at 2a. – 2d. above were dishonest, in that you intended to mislead others to believe that you:*
 - a. *had carried out one visit to Patient A when you knew that you had carried out two visits;*
 - b. *That you had carried out observations at 12.30 when you knew that you had not;*
 - c. *That you had left Patient A in the care of his father at 12.30 when you knew you had not;*
 - d. *That you had called 999 at 12.30 when you knew you had not.*

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

The second reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that you had insufficient insight. At this hearing you apologised to this panel for your misconduct and showed genuine remorse for your failings. However, when questioned during the course of this hearing about how you would handle the situation differently in the future, you were unable to provide sufficiently detailed answers and therefore it determined your insight was still developing.

In its consideration of whether you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, the panel took into account the additional online learning courses you have undertaken, which included: Duty of Candour, Self-Care and Personal Wellbeing, Record Keeping and Mental Capacity. The panel noted that these four learning courses were all completed on 9 December 2025. The panel also had sight of the reflective piece written by you dated 11 December 2025 addressing the findings of the original panel. The panel noted these positive steps to addressing your previous failings. However, the panel considered that the online courses, albeit relevant, were short and only completed shortly before this hearing today. The panel noted that you said you felt you were in a better position as of June 2025, yet the panel had limited evidence of efforts to strengthen your practice during much of this period. The panel also noted that there was no updated letter from your [PRIVATE] before the panel outlining the current status of [PRIVATE]. Accordingly, the panel concluded that there remained a real risk of repetition and subsequent risk of harm.

The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

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

For these reasons, the panel finds that your fitness to practise remains impaired.'

The second reviewing panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be relevant, proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel considered the limited insight and insufficient strengthened practice before it. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel also considered that there is no updated information from the [PRIVATE] addressing your current [PRIVATE]. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice at this stage that would adequately address the concerns relating to your misconduct.

The panel considered a further extension of the current suspension order. It was of the view that a further period of suspension would allow you more time to fully reflect on your previous failings. It considered that, whilst progress has been made you still need to gain a better understanding of how the dishonesty of one nurse can impact upon the nursing profession as a whole and not just the organisation that the individual nurse is working for. The panel concluded that a further extension of the current suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford you adequate time to further develop your insight and take steps to strengthen your practice. It would also give you an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals and/or work colleagues to attest to your honesty and integrity.

Having regard to the circumstances of this case, including your personal circumstances, the panel considered that a striking-off order would be inappropriate and disproportionate at this stage.

The panel determined therefore that a further extension of the current suspension order is the appropriate order which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to extend the current suspension order by a period of 5 months to provide you with a further opportunity to engage with the NMC, strengthen your practice and address the identified risks. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate order available.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Campbell's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to practise as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms McFarlane on behalf of the NMC.

Ms McFarlane outlined the brief background and procedural history of the case; she referred the panel to the hearing bundle.

Ms McFarlane submitted that there has been nothing new before this panel to demonstrate remediation or that Miss Campbell is currently fit to practise. She referred the panel to NMC guidance REV-2A 'Standard reviews of substantive orders before they expire'.

She submitted that Miss Campbell did not engage with the fitness to practise investigation in a meaningful way and the case consequently was heard at a substantive order review meeting.

Ms McFarlane submitted that having reviewed the case management system early on in the case, Miss Campbell did mention [PRIVATE] which are referred to in the substantive order review hearing that she attended. She submitted that as this is a misconduct case, [PRIVATE] may be a contextual factor and it is a matter for the panel to determine what extent they consider this might have affected Miss Campbell's fitness to practise.

However, she submitted that any [PRIVATE] considerations, even at the material time, would be less relevant when looking at the misconduct in relation to charges two and three, namely attitudinal concerns relating to dishonest record entries.

Ms McFarlane submitted that, as Miss Campbell has not engaged since the last substantial review hearing, her [PRIVATE] is currently unknown.

Ms McFarlane invited the panel to find that Miss Campbell remains currently impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds.

Ms McFarlane submitted that any sanction imposed must be appropriate and proportionate. She submitted that any sanction not restricting Miss Campbell's practice would not suitably address the public protection and public interest risks due to the lack of remediation demonstrated thus far. She submitted that conditions of practice would not be suitable due to Miss Campbell's sporadic engagement and the fact that she has not recently engaged with the fitness to practise process.

Ms McFarlane submitted that it is a matter for the panel today, given their powers outlined in REV-2A, whether it determines that a further period of suspension may result in Miss Campbell re-engaging with the fitness to practise process and developing her insight and reflection.

However, she submitted that the panel may wish to consider the guidance under REV-2H 'Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place', which details the ways a registrant can leave the register while impaired. Ms McFarlane submitted that Miss Campbell has disengaged and the limited remediation demonstrated previously, particularly given the dishonesty charges and the limited insight and reflection demonstrated into her behaviour regarding those.

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 Campbell's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the previous reviewing panel found that Miss Campbell had demonstrated limited insight into her misconduct and concluded that a further extension of the current suspension would afford her adequate time to further develop her insight.

At this hearing the panel determined that there has been no engagement by Miss Campbell since the last review hearing. The panel is aware of Miss Campbell's [PRIVATE] however it appears that her engagement is inconsistent and at odds with the process from being engaged to suddenly disengaging altogether with the NMC.

Miss Campbell has not demonstrated an understanding of how her actions put the patient at risk of harm.

In its consideration of whether Miss Campbell has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that there is nothing new before it to show that she has taken any steps to strengthen her practice, undertaken any additional relevant training or provided a reflective piece addressing her misconduct.

The last reviewing panel determined that there remained a real risk of repetition of the kind found proved. Today's panel has noted that given the lack of engagement by Miss Campbell with these proceedings, it determined that the risk of repetition remains high. In light of this, this panel determined that Miss Campbell is still liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing 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 continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Campbell'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.

It 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 Campbell'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, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again.'* The

panel considered that Miss Campbell'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 conditions of practice on Miss Campbell'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 bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Miss Campbell's misconduct.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Miss Campbell further time to fully reflect on her previous misconduct. It considered that Miss Campbell needs to demonstrate a full understanding of how the dishonesty of one nurse can impact upon the nursing profession as a whole and not just the organisation that the individual nurse is working for. The panel concluded that a further five months' suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Miss Campbell adequate time to further develop her insight and take steps to strengthen her practice. It would also give Miss Campbell an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest to her honesty and integrity in any workplace since the substantive hearing.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of five months would provide Miss Campbell with an opportunity to engage with the NMC, or to establish that she has no interest in doing so. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

In the panel's sanction consideration, it deliberated on the imposition of a striking-off order. However, primarily due to the lack of information into Miss Campbell's

[PRIVATE], it decided that, on balance, it would not be appropriate to impose a striking-off order absent of information about her [PRIVATE].

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 17 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order, or it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Miss Campbell's explanation of why she has disengaged from the process and, if it is a [PRIVATE], provision of a [PRIVATE]
- A [PRIVATE] in any event
- A reflective piece and insight to demonstrate an understanding of Miss Campbell's clinical failings and dishonesty
- Evidence of any training and testimonials
- Miss Campbell's engagement with the NMC process to indicate her professional intentions and response to her need for remediation in her case.

This will be confirmed to Miss Campbell in writing.

That concludes this determination.