

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Tuesday, 7 April 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant: Kim Louise Ramsay

NMC PIN: 15I1079S

Part(s) of the register: RNA: Registered Nurse – Adult – 30
September 2018

Relevant Location: Ayrshire

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: Dave Lancaster (Chair, lay member)
Corinne Foy (Registrant member)
Fulata Lillian Shawa-Siyunyi (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: William Hoskins

Hearings Coordinator: Max Buadi

Order being reviewed: Conditions of practice order (36 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Striking-Off order to come into effect at the end of 2
May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the
'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001'**

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel noted at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Ms Ramsay's registered email address by secure email on 18 February 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review and that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 23 March 2026 and inviting Ms Ramsay to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Ms Ramsay has been served with notice of this meeting in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11A and 34 of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 (as amended) (the Rules).

The panel concluded that it was appropriate to proceed with the meeting in all the circumstances including the fact that Ms Ramsay had not requested a hearing despite being given opportunities to do so.

Decision and reasons on review of the current order

The panel decided to replace the conditions of practice order with a striking-off order. This order will come into effect at the end of 2 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the second review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 1 April 2022. This was reviewed on 23 March 2023 and the panel imposed another conditions of practice order for a period of 36 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 2 May 2026.

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

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

'That you, a registered nurse, whilst employed at Crossgate Care Home ("the Home") on or around 26/27 July 2019, following Resident A's fall:

1) ...

2) Did not undertake/record neurological observations, including;

a) ...

b) ...

c) Touch response check

d) Pain response check

3) Did not complete a Falls Risk Record

4) Did not complete a Risk Assessment

5) Did not fully/adequately complete an accident/incident form in that you;

a) Did not fully complete Section 1 of the form.

b) Did not fully complete Section 2 of the form

c) Did not fully complete Section 5 of the form.

d) Did not fully complete Section 6 of the form

6) Did not complete a daily record of care

7) Did not complete a separate Body Map/Evaluation of Injury form

8) ...

9) Did not notify Resident A's family/next of kin

10) On 5 January 2019 when admitting Resident B to the Home;

- a) *Did not complete Resident B's admissions records.*
- b) *Did not undertake adequate observations.*
- c) *Did not notify Resident B's family/next of kin.*

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

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

'The panel took into consideration your undated reflective piece and that you do not contest that your fitness to practise is currently impaired. It noted that since the imposition of the order, you have faced some difficult personal circumstances which have rendered you unable to comply with the conditions. It noted the insight you expressed in the reflective piece and through your representative regarding the Return to Practice course.

However, the panel noted that you resigned from your post in July 2019 and that since the imposition of the substantive order, you have not worked in a nursing capacity. The panel also noted that there is no evidence before it today to show any further training you have carried out which addresses the misconduct found proved. It also noted that you accept that your fitness to practise remains impaired. On this basis, the panel was of the view that there remains a risk of harm to the public should you be allowed to practice without restriction. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the ground 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 performance. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also necessary.

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

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

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

The panel noted that due to your personal circumstances, you have not been able to engage with the substantive conditions of practice order. However, it noted that there is no information before it today to suggest a breach of any conditions, increase in risk or material change to your circumstances. The panel noted the submissions of Ms Bowen, who invited the panel to extend the order for a further period of 3 years to allow you sufficient time to engage with the conditions, manage your personal circumstances and undertake the Return to Practice course. The panel also noted that in asking for a period of 3 years, you had considered your circumstances in line with the NMC's obligations and had reached an insightful request. Therefore, the panel was satisfied that a conditions of practice order, on the same terms as previously, continued to be the appropriate and proportionate order which would protect the public and the wider public interest.

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 your case.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of 3 years, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 2 May 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 on any shift.*
- 2. You must ensure that you are supervised by a registered nurse any time you are working. Your supervision must consist of working at all times on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by, a registered nurse.*
- 3. You must work with your line manager, mentor or supervisor to create a personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must address the concerns about completing observations and your record keeping. You must:*
 - a. Send your case officer a copy of your PDP within a month of commencing any employment.*
 - b. Meet with your line manager, mentor or supervisor at least once a month to discuss your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP.*
 - c. Send your case officer a report before any review hearing. This report must be written by your line manager, mentor or supervisor and show your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP.*
- 4. You must meet with your line manager, mentor or supervisor at least every month to discuss your clinical practice with particular reference to clinical observations, documentation and record keeping.*
- 5. You must keep us 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 us 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.*
 - b. *Any agency you apply to or are registered with for work.*
 - 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 training and/or supervision required by these conditions.*

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 2 May 2023 in accordance with Article 30(1).'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Ms Ramsay'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.

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 Ms Ramsay's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel had regard to the substantive hearing decision, as well as the subsequent review involved in this case.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel took account of the fact that Ms Ramsay had not worked as a nurse since her resignation in July 2019. The last reviewing panel also took account of Ms Ramsay's reflective piece where she did not contest that the fitness to practice was currently impaired. Additionally, the last reviewing panel noted that she had been unable to comply with the conditions of practice order due to difficult personal circumstances.

In considering the position today, the panel had no further information from Ms Ramsay since her substantive hearing to demonstrate that the concerns of the substantive panel have been addressed. It had no evidence that Ms Ramsay had strengthened her practice or developed further insight in relation to her professional practice.

The panel had no evidence to suggest that Ms Ramsay is currently working as a registered nurse. It noted that she had not complied with any of the recommendations stipulated by the first reviewing panel, nor has she provided the NMC with any indication

as to her future intentions, specifically with regard to whether she does intend to return to the nursing profession at some point in the future.

In light of this lack of information and Ms Ramsay's lack of engagement, the panel determined that there remains a risk of harm to the public if Ms Ramsay was permitted to practise as a nurse without restriction. In light of this the panel determined that Ms Ramsay is 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 given the lack of progress or remediation demonstrated.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Ramsay'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 Ms Ramsay'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 Ms Ramsay'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 a conditions of practice on Ms Ramsay's registration would still 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 that Ms Ramsay had already been subject to a condition of practice order for nearly four years. In those four years, it had no information before it to suggest that Ms Ramsay had complied with the conditions of practice order. There has been no engagement from Ms Ramsay and the panel do not have confidence that a further imposition of a conditions of practice order will have the desired impact.

In light of this, the panel considered that any conditions of practice order would not be workable and would serve no useful purpose.

The panel next considered imposing a suspension order. However, the panel bore in mind that Ms Ramsay has not engaged with the NMC for a prolonged period of time and therefore there is no evidence before the panel that she has shown any further insight or reflections into her previous failings. In these circumstances the panel determined that a period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose.

The panel had regard to the NMC *guidance "Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place"* (reference: Reference: REV-2h) noted that an option was to allow this order to lapse with a finding of impairment. Within the guidance, under the sub-heading "*Lapse with Impairment*", it particularly noted the following:

"Panels should be considering lapse with impairment even where the reason for a professional's lack of progress is outside their control. What matters is whether such issues are likely to be resolved in a reasonable period of time."

The panel bore in mind that Ms Ramsay has been on a conditions of practice order for a significant period of time. Additionally, within that time, she had not engaged with the NMC

nor provided evidence of further insight or strengthened practice. There is nothing before the panel to suggest that this evidence will be forthcoming within a reasonable time frame.

Within the guidance, under the heading “*Striking off*”, it particularly noted the following:

“Cases where striking off is likely to be appropriate include when:

- *the professional has shown limited engagement and/or insight,*
- *...; or*
- *the professional has otherwise made no or negligible progress towards addressing issues with their fitness to practise.”*

The panel was of the view that the bullet points above apply in this case. It determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Ms Ramsay from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order. The panel therefore directs the registrar to strike Ms Ramsay’s name off the register.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 2 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This will be confirmed to Ms Ramsay in writing.

That concludes this determination.