

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Friday, 6 February 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant: Susan Diane Oosenbrugh

NMC PIN: 95J0186S

Part(s) of the register: Registered Nurse - Sub Part 1
RNMH: Mental Health Nursing - Level 1
3 March 2000

Relevant Location: Dundee

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: James Carr (Chair, Lay member)
Sophie Agolini (Registrant member)
Olan Jenkins (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Neil Fielding

Hearings Coordinator: Bethany Seed

Order being reviewed: Suspension order (3 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Striking-Off order to come into effect on 26 March 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

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 Miss Oosenbrugh's registered email address by secure email on 29 December 2025.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review, that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 2 February 2026, and inviting Miss Oosenbrugh to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Oosenbrugh 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).

Decision and reasons on review of the current order

The panel decided to impose a striking off order. This order will come into effect at the end of 26 March 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 suspension order originally imposed for a period of six months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 29 May 2025. This was reviewed on 18 November 2025, and a panel imposed a suspension order for a further three months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 26 March 2026.

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

The charge found proved which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order was as follows:

'That you, a registered nurse:

- 1) On 1 September 2021, without clinical justification, failed to perform CPR on Resident A*

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 noted that the original panel did not have any evidence which indicated that Ms Oosenbrugh had demonstrated any insight or had reflected on her actions. At this meeting, the panel also did not have any evidence of reflection or insight, nor did it have any evidence before it to suggest that Ms Oosenbrugh has taken any steps to strengthen her practice.

The panel acknowledged that, whilst Ms Oosenbrugh's misconduct was a single incident, it was a serious breach of fundamental tenets of the nursing profession. Given Ms Oosenbrugh's continued lack of engagement and remediation, the panel determined that the risk of repetition, and consequently the risk of harm, remains high.

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

The panel bore in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest. It considered that a member of the public would be concerned if an experienced nurse who failed to undertake the steps of basic first aid's fitness to practise was not found to be impaired. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required to maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance.

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

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

'The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Ms Oosenbrugh'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 was of the view that there were conditions that could be formulated which would protect patients and meet the wider public interest concerns. However, in light of Ms Oosenbrugh's lack of engagement, the panel had no evidence that she would be willing to engage with a conditions of practice order.'

Given Ms Oosenbrugh's continued lack of engagement with the NMC and her failure to provide information the original panel indicated would assist a future reviewing panel, such as evidence of insight, reflection and strengthened practice, the panel carefully considered the striking-off sanction. The panel had regard to NMC guidance 'REV-2h: Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place', in particular:

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

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

The panel was mindful that the incident was in 2021 and considered that Ms Oosenbrugh has had a significant amount of time to engage and take steps to remediate the concerns but has failed to do so. The panel had no evidence to suggest that Ms Oosenbrugh would begin the journey of remediation with a further period of suspension.

However, because the panel took the view that Ms Oosenbrugh's misconduct is confined to one specific area of practice and is easily remediable, it considered it to

be fair and reasonable to allow one final opportunity for her to take the necessary steps to demonstrate remediation, or to consider alternative options:

'Ways of leaving the register while impaired

1. Agreed removal

A professional who would remain on the register in the absence of the substantive order can make an application for agreed removal to be taken off the register. If the Assistant Registrar agrees removal, a panel will be asked at an early review to revoke the order. Once the substantive order is revoked the agreed removal decision can then take effect and the professional will be removed from the register.

2. Lapse with impairment

Where the professional would no longer be on the register but for the order in place, a reviewing panel can allow the order to expire or, at an early review, revoke the order. Professionals in these circumstances will automatically be removed from the register, or lapse, upon expiry or revocation of the order. The panel will record that the professional remains impaired.'

The panel therefore considered the imposition of a further period of suspension and determined that it 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 3 months.

The panel was cognisant that, in the event that there is no material change in circumstances at the next comprehensive review, the future reviewing panel would have all options of sanction open to it including a striking-off order.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Oosenbrugh'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 practise 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.

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 Oosenbrugh's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Miss Oosenbrugh had provided no evidence of any insight into her misconduct. At this meeting, the panel noted that it had no new evidence of insight from Miss Oosenbrugh. In its consideration of whether Miss Oosenbrugh has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that it has been provided with no evidence of any steps taken by Miss Oosenbrugh to strengthen her practice. The panel was of the view that Miss Oosenbrugh has had extensive time since the substantive hearing to provide evidence of her level of insight, remediation or engagement in these regulatory proceedings but has not done so.

The last reviewing panel determined that Miss Oosenbrugh was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has received no new information to undermine the previous panel's decision. In the absence of any new information regarding Miss Oosenbrugh's current level of insight or remediation, the panel determined that the risk of repetition remains. Consequently, the panel determined that as Miss Oosenbrugh remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved, there also remains a real risk of significant harm to patients. In light of this, the panel determined 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 conduct and performance. The panel considered that the reputation of the nursing profession and the NMC as regulator would be seriously damaged if Miss Oosenbrugh was permitted to return to practice in light of her lack of engagement with the NMC and the seriousness of the charge found proved which was linked to the death of a resident. The panel also considered that a well-informed member of the public would be shocked if this panel did not make a finding of current impairment at this time, given the ongoing risk of repetition and subsequent risk of harm. Therefore, the panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on the ground of public interest is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Oosenbrugh'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 Oosenbrugh'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 Oosenbrugh'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 Miss Oosenbrugh'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 noted that the charge relates to issues in Miss Oosenbrugh's clinical practice, and that typically, conditions of practice can be formulated to address clinical concerns. However, the panel determined that it was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Miss Oosenbrugh's misconduct, given her non-engagement with these proceedings, the seriousness of the misconduct and her apparent lack of insight, reflection and remediation. In view of Miss Oosenbrugh's clear lack of engagement, 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 further suspension order. The panel noted that Miss Oosenbrugh has not shown remorse for her misconduct. Further, Miss Oosenbrugh has not demonstrated any insight into her previous failings. The panel bore in mind that the charge arose over four years ago, and since then, Miss Oosenbrugh has demonstrated no meaningful engagement in these proceedings or developed insight or remediation. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Miss Oosenbrugh no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel considered that the original panel and the first reviewing panel had clearly outlined what evidence could assist a future panel in reviewing the substantive suspension order, but that Miss Oosenbrugh has not engaged with any recommendations. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel considered whether Miss Oosenbrugh was likely to return to safe unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time. However, without any evidence of the intentions of Miss Oosenbrugh, or evidence of insight, remediation or strengthened practice, the panel was unable to conclude this was likely. The panel therefore determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Miss Oosenbrugh 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.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 26 March 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Oosenbrugh in writing.

That concludes this determination.