

**Nursing and Midwifery Council  
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing  
Tuesday 9 September 2025 – Wednesday 10 September 2025**

Virtual Hearing

<b>Name of Appellant:</b>	Adebimpe Mary Adekunle-Aroso
<b>Type of case:</b>	Registrations appeal
<b>Panel members:</b>	Sarah Hamilton (Chair, lay member) Nicola Harvey (Registrant member) Leon Jacobs (Lay member)
<b>Legal Assessor:</b>	Graeme Sampson
<b>Hearings Coordinator:</b>	Emma Norbury-Perrott
<b>Nursing and Midwifery Council:</b>	Represented by Uzma Khan, Case Presenter
<b>Ms Adekunle-Aroso:</b>	Present and represented by Gareth Waite, instructed by the Royal College of Nursing (RCN)
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>Appeal dismissed</b>

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel decided to dismiss your appeal against the decision of the Assistant Registrar of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC).

This appeal is made under Article 37(1)(a) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (the Order). You appealed the decision of the Assistant Registrar, dated 1 July 2024, that you did not meet the character requirements for registration to the NMC register.

## **Background**

On 16 March 2023, Pearson VUE, the NMC's computer-based test (CBT) provider, alerted it to unusual data relating to tests taken at Yunnik Technologies Ltd test centre in Ibadan, Nigeria (Yunnik). The CBT test is in two parts, numeracy and clinical. The data raised questions about whether some or all of the CBT results at Yunnik had been obtained through fraud and called into question the validity of all tests taken at Yunnik.

Following completion of the NMC's initial investigation into this issue it concluded that there was evidence of widespread fraud at the Yunnik centre, where a large number of candidates had allegedly fraudulently obtained their CBT. The NMC asked Pearson VUE to provide it with assurance that the data concerning tests taken at Yunnik were accurate, and not the result of a system error, cyber-attack, or other technical issue. Pearson VUE confirmed that, following a detailed investigation into the testing facility at Yunnik and review of the data, Pearson VUE were satisfied that there was no evidence of system error, cyber-attack, or other technical error and that the data was indicative of one or more proxy testers operating at the centre.

The NMC next asked an independent data analytics expert of OAC Limited (OAC), Witness 5 (Richard Steele), to provide the NMC with an objective analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE. OAC looked at the times in which CBT candidates at Yunnik took to achieve their CBT pass, compared with times taken by CBT candidates from other test centres in Nigeria and globally. Using this data, OAC then calculated the probability that each CBT candidate at Yunnik could achieve their CBT pass within the time it took

them to complete the test. OAC's analysis of the data supports Pearson VUE's conclusion that there may have been widespread fraudulent activity at Yunnik probably through a proxy tester acting on behalf of test candidates.

The data in relation to your CBT shows that you achieved a pass in your tests in the following times:

- Numeracy: 2.28 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes)
- Clinical: 7.88 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes)

Comparing the time to complete your tests with times taken by candidates globally, it was considered very unlikely by the NMC that you could have achieved a pass in the tests within the times it took you to complete them.

Taking into account the times in which your tests were taken, in a centre in which the NMC allege there to have been widespread fraudulent activity, it was considered by the NMC to be more likely than not that your CBT result was obtained fraudulently.

When considering your application to the register, the Assistant Registrar took into account the following documentation:

- Your completed application
- The 'evidence bundle' consisting of:
  - o Expert report by Witness 5, Head of Data Analytics at OAC
  - o Witness statement of Witness 3, Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE
  - o Witness statement of Witness 6, Executive Director of Professional Practice at the NMC
  - o Witness statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2
- Other test activity at Yunnik on the date you sat your test

In your correspondence you stated that you chose to sit your CBT at Yunnik because firstly, it was the closest centre introduced to you and secondly, because a suitable test date was available to fit in with your annual leave and exam schedule. You said that you were able to complete your test in the time stated because you prepared using practice tests and online materials which had the same format. In addition to this, you said that you joined CBT practice groups on WhatsApp, YouTube and telegram from 20 December 2022.

The Assistant Registrar considered your explanation. The Assistant Registrar was not satisfied that they had been presented with anything that changed the conclusion that you more likely than not obtained your CBT result fraudulently. The Assistant Registrar therefore determined that you did not meet the character requirements to be considered capable of safe and effective practice.

On 1 July 2024, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused your application onto the register. You appealed the decision on 28 July 2024, within the 28 day time limit.

## **Evidence**

The panel also took account of the written evidence and witness statements from the following witnesses on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 1: Band 5 nurse who made admissions to fraudulent test taking at Yunnik..
- Witness 2: Band 4 Pre-registration nurse in the UK who made admissions to fraudulent test taking at Yunnik.
- Witness 3: The Deputy Director for Business Transformation and a member of the

Executive Team for Professional Regulation at the NMC.

- Witness 4: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.
  
- Witness 5: An independent Data Analyst from Broadstone Ltd (formerly known as OAC Ltd) who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.
  
- Witness 6: Employed by the NMC as the Executive Director of Professional Practice.

You provided the panel with additional documentation to support this appeal including:

- Your defence bundle which included your CV, testimonials, certificates and practice materials
- Your witness statement dated 21 August 2025

## **Submissions**

Ms Khan outlined the background to the case and why your application to join the NMC register was refused by the Assistant Registrar. She submitted that a coordinated scheme of fraud was evident at the Yunnik test centre between 15 March 2019 and 31 March 2023. Further, she submitted that it was more likely than not your CBT was obtained through a proxy tester and your eligibility to join the register was obtained fraudulently. She referred the panel to the character requirements of a registered nurse as set out by the NMC.

Ms Khan outlined the CBT and what it entails, including how many questions are included in Part A and Part B, and how long candidates have to complete the test. Ms Khan submitted that fraudulent behaviour was responsible for the ultra-fast test completion times and unusually high pass rate at the Yunnik test centre. She referred the panel to Pearson VUE's data, which indicated that the test completion times at Yunnik were significantly faster than global benchmarks. She directed the panel to Witness 5's statistical analysis, which shows that there were considerable disparities between test times at Yunnik and those of candidates at other centres in Nigeria and globally. Additionally, Ms Khan referred to witness statements and admissions from other test takers, one of whom attended Yunnik on the same day as you and admitted to fraudulently obtaining their CBT results, which corroborated the existence of proxy test-taking at Yunnik.

Ms Khan submitted that the NMC's evidence, including rapid test times, high scores and admissions from other test takers, supported the conclusion that widespread fraud occurred at Yunnik. Ms Khan referred the panel to Witness 5's analysis of your test times and submitted that your completion times were exceptionally fast. She told the panel that there was a 1:58,123 chance of an individual completing Part A within the time that you completed it (2.28 minutes), and a 1:56,478 chance of an individual completing Part B within the time that you completed it (7.88 minutes). She submitted that based on the statistical analysis evidence, it was highly improbable that you completed the CBT without the assistance of a proficient proxy test-taker.

Ms Khan directed the panel to statistical data which showed that on the date you attended Yunnik, 20 January 2023, six candidates completed their CBT. Five of the six candidates presented with outlier results, including you. She referred to the statement of Witness 6 who explained that one of the candidates who attended on the same day as you has made admissions to using a proxy tester at Yunnik.

Ms Khan submitted that passing your CBT was important for you and [PRIVATE] yet, by your evidence, you did not go back to review your answers after completing the test and you could not recall ever knowing how long you took to complete the CBT. She submitted this was not demonstrative of how test-takers complete exams in genuine circumstances.

Ms Khan submitted that there was compelling evidence that you obtained your CBT result through fraud.

Ms Khan invited the panel to find that there was generic fraud at the Yunnik test centre and that it was more likely than not that you used a proxy test-taker, such that the CBT you provided as part of your application to enter the NMC register was obtained fraudulently.

You gave oral evidence under oath.

You told the panel you have been working as a Healthcare Assistant (HCA) since October 2023 and that you have worked very hard to achieve your goal of becoming a Registered Nurse. You told the panel that you have good working relationships with colleagues and patients and referred the panel to the testimonial provided by Nurse 1. You told the panel that you do not agree with the timings of your CBT which you took at the Yunnik centre, and you have no way of knowing if they are accurate. Further, you stated that you found the test easy as you prepared extensively for the test. You referred to the timings of your CBT resit, which were considerably longer than your original completion times at Yunnik (14 minutes for the numeracy test, and 44 minutes for the clinical test).

You stated that you experienced “*network issues*” when you began your CBT at Yunnik. You raised this with a person at the test centre who reassured you that it would resolve itself. You told the panel that you then completed your CBT alone and that you received no assistance from anyone else. You also told the panel that you did not go back to review your answers as you “*were against time*”.

You told the panel that you chose to sit your CBT at Yunnik because it was the closest centre to your university (where you were staying at the time) and because a suitable test date was available to fit in with your exam schedule. You said that you prepared extensively using practice tests and online materials which had the same format as the CBT. In addition to this, you said that you joined a CBT practice group on WhatsApp.

Mr Waite on your behalf, submitted that you have given clear and credible evidence throughout this process and at no point did you cheat or obtain your CBT result fraudulently by using a proxy tester. Mr Waite submitted that much of the evidence relied upon by the NMC is considered to be 'hearsay' and the facts have not been verified. Further, he submitted that there are possible errors within the data analysis evidence.

Mr Waite submitted that the NMC's evidence is generic in this case and therefore, the NMC has not discharged its burden of proof with the limited and generic evidence provided. Mr Waite submitted that the panel could be satisfied that your thorough preparation, experience as a nurse, and your confidence in taking the test, was a credible explanation as to how you were able to achieve your fast CBT completion times. He submitted that you did not use a proxy test-taker during your CBT and therefore invited the panel to allow your appeal.

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

### **Panel's decision**

In reaching its decision, the panel took into account the statement of agreed facts, all the oral and documentary evidence in this case, including the submissions of Ms Khan, your oral evidence and the submissions of Mr Waite. The panel took into account the fact that you are of good character which was supported by testimonials from healthcare professionals.

The panel first considered whether it had satisfactory evidence before it to determine on the balance of probabilities that there was evidence of fraud occurring at the Yunnik test centre at the time your test was taken.

The panel considered the witness statement of Witness 3, which set out specific evidence of potential fraud between 15 March 2019 and 31 March 2023, indicating patterns of suspicious behaviour uniquely evident at the Yunnik Centre when compared to other testing centres globally.



The panel took into account that Witness 3 noted several factors that suggest human interference rather than technical errors had occurred. Firstly, booking irregularities, as candidates frequently chose the Yunnik Centre over test centres closer to their residence, requiring long travel times to take their exams. Secondly, the speed of completion of exams was characteristic of a '*proficient proxy tester*' familiar with the exam content. Thirdly, the combination of low completion times and high scores implied that either an individual or a group, who is exceptionally proficient in taking the exams, completed them on the test taker's behalf.

The panel also considered the report by Witness 5, an independent expert in data analytics, who conducted an independent evaluation of Pearson VUE's CBT data at the request of the NMC. It found statistically significant evidence that exam completion times at Yunnik were considerably faster than those within other centres in Nigeria and globally.

The panel also considered that the histograms, contained within Witness 5's report, illustrated that the anomalies in test performance in the clinical CBT were unique to Yunnik test centre when compared to other centres in Nigeria and globally.

The panel took into account the evidence of Witness 6 in which she stated that sixteen individuals had made admissions to using a proxy tester at Yunnik test centre.

The panel also considered the respective witness statements of Witnesses 1 and 2, who both gave a detailed account of their respective experience in taking the CBT at the Yunnik Centre and how they were pressured into using a proxy tester to complete the exams. The panel accepted that this evidence was hearsay and could not be tested. However, it considered that these witnesses would have no reason to invent their accounts of their experiences at Yunnik. The panel also noted that one of the candidates who has admitted to fraud was present on the same date that you attended Yunnik to complete your CBT.

Having considered all the information before it, the panel determined, on the balance of probabilities, that there is evidence of widespread fraud and in all probability there was use of a proxy tester occurring at the Yunnik Centre during the period 15 March 2019 to 31 March 2023.

The panel next considered whether it is more likely than not that you used a proxy test taker in obtaining a satisfactory test result from the Yunnik centre in Ibadan, Nigeria on 20 January 2023.

The panel took into account the documents you submitted and found no explanation as to how you completed Part A and Part B of the CBT so quickly, other than stating that you are experienced and that you prepared well. You claimed you performed at speed during the CBT due to your extensive knowledge and exam preparation. In oral evidence, you also stated that you “*were against time*”. However, the panel found it highly unlikely that it would be possible to perform at a level where, on average, you completed each question in Part A of the CBT in an average of around 9 seconds per question, and each question in Part B of the CBT in an average of around 4/5 seconds per question. In the panel’s judgement, your evidence describing your level of preparation, and your academic achievements, does not sufficiently explain the exceptionally fast times you achieved when completing your CBT at Yunnik. The panel also had sight of your CBT resit times, dated 20 November 2023, which showed completion times that were 5/6 times longer than your original CBT times. You told the panel during oral evidence that you did not review your answers during your resit CBT.

The panel also considered whether there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate that you were an exceptional student capable of completing the CBT in an exceptionally fast time. It considered your certificates of education and testimonials which did not provide any evidence of being an exceptional student (you gained B and C grades in the majority of your exams).

The panel considered the same day data that four other candidates who took the CBT on the same day as you at Yunnik, also had exceptionally fast times. One of these candidates made admissions to using a proxy tester. The panel determined that given its findings that there was generic fraud in the Yunnik centre, and the admissions of one of the candidates, it was reasonable to infer that other candidates who also recorded exceptionally fast test times, fraudulently obtained their CBT results and in all likelihood used a proxy tester on the date in question. In the panel’s judgement, it was highly unlikely that five CBT test

takers with outlier results obtained their test results under genuine CBT conditions on this day.

The panel considered your evidence that you did not check through your answers in your CBT, and your resit CBT. You stated you were confident that you did not need to due to your preparation and knowledge of nursing. The panel found it implausible that given the importance of passing the CBT, you would not use any of the lengthy remaining time to check your answers.

The panel also considered that your evidence of describing the process at Yunnik test centre, and the process when you logged onto the computer, was not clear or consistent. In addition, you could not recall going through the pages on the screen before the actual test, such as the NDA screen, which would indicate that it was, in fact, a proxy who took the test rather than you. In light of this, the panel could not conclude that your evidence was credible or reliable.

Having considered the above factors and in the absence of any plausible explanation for your exceptionally fast CBT times, the panel determined that it was more likely than not that you fraudulently obtained your CBT result from the Yunnik centre in Ibadan, Nigeria.

Finally, the panel went on to determine whether you meet the character requirements for admission to the NMC register. The panel had regard to the NMC guidance on health and character, in particular 'Factors that we take into account when considering character cases', last updated on 5 September 2024. The panel was aware that it was for you to satisfy the panel that you meet the character requirements for successful admission on the register.

The panel, having found that you fraudulently obtained your CBT result, could not be satisfied that you are of good character. The panel had regard to 'the Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives (2015)', in particular paragraph 20, which sets out that registered nurses are expected to uphold the reputation of the profession.

The panel was of the view that honesty and integrity are fundamental tenets of the nursing profession. The panel determined that your conduct in obtaining your CBT result fraudulently is a breach of the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and public confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if you were admitted to the register. The panel therefore concluded that, in all the circumstances of your case, you are not able to demonstrate this standard and therefore not able to demonstrate good character.

The panel therefore decided to dismiss your appeal, to uphold the decision of the Assistant Registrar, thereby refusing your application to the NMC register.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you appeal the decision, you must submit your appeal to the county court within 21 days of this decision.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.