

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Monday, 19 January 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Sabbatha Shedrack
NMC PIN:	13C0573E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Adult Nursing – (6 March 2013)
Relevant Location:	West Sussex
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Oluremi Alabi (Chair, lay member) Frances McGurgan (Lay member) Corinne Foy (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Angus Macpherson
Hearings Coordinator:	Emma Hotston
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Ruhena Parker, Case Presenter
Ms Shedrack:	Present and unrepresented in person (written representations submitted by Sonia Clark, Rock Solicitors)
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (6 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Suspension order extended for a period of six months from 27 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to extend the current suspension order for a further six months.

This order will come into effect at the end of 27 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of six months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 30 July 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 27 February 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) *In or around 2019, incorrectly stated;*
 - a) *On your 'LinkedIn' profile, that you had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health 7, from University 1 between 2013-2015.*
 - b) *On your 'Hola' profile, that you had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health 7, from University 1*
- 2) *In one or more Curriculum Vitae, incorrectly stated that;*
 - a) *You had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health & Safety Management at University 2 in September 2017.*
 - b) *You had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health & Safety from University 2 in September 2018.*
- 3) *Your actions in one or more of the above charges 1 a), 1 b), 2 a) & 2 b) were dishonest, in that you misrepresented that you had completed a Post*

Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing and/or Safety Management.

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

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel next went on to decide if as a result of the misconduct, Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

...

The panel acknowledged that no patients or members of the public were harmed within this case as the charges are not in relation to Ms Shedrack's clinical practice. The panel further noted that the witnesses did not raise concerns regarding Ms Shedrack engaging with their clients despite the misleading representations made on her CVs and social media profile. The panel found that limb (a) of the test has not been engaged.

The panel next considered whether Ms Shedrack's misconduct had brought the profession into disrepute. It found that in deliberately misrepresenting qualifications that were either ongoing or incomplete on her CVs and social media profiles, such misconduct undermines public trust and confidence in the nursing profession and therefore determined that Ms Shedrack had brought the nursing profession into disrepute. Furthermore, the panel determined that Ms Shedrack's actions breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession namely the expectations that nurses remain professionally transparent at all times.

The panel determined in view of its finding that Ms Shedrack had been dishonest that limb (d) of Grant was engaged.

The panel next went on to consider whether Ms Shedrack's misconduct was capable of remedy. The panel bore in mind that Ms Shedrack's dishonesty did not involve financial abuse or clinical care that would put her misconduct at a higher level. The panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed. However, it determined that her dishonesty was still significant repeated across multiple CVs and two social media platforms and therefore it was not on the lowest end of dishonesty.

The panel next considered whether Ms Shedrack had remediated her misconduct. The panel determined with regard to insight, there has been no evidence provided before it to show Ms Shedrack has reflected, even within the abstract, developed insight into her misconduct, or acknowledged how her actions could negatively impact others and the reputation of the nursing profession. The panel acknowledged Ms Shedrack's most recent CV which does not list any qualifications which have not been achieved. However, the panel further noted Ms Shedrack's oral evidence in which she maintained that it is the responsibility of the recruiters to determine whether the candidate has obtained the qualifications listed within their application, CVs or social media profiles, not the nurse's responsibility to advance the full truth about their qualifications at the point of application. Consequently, the panel considered this was evidence of Ms Shedrack having an attitudinal concern regarding her approach to professional transparency.

The panel next considered whether Ms Shedrack's misconduct was highly unlikely to be repeated. The panel is of the view that, in spite of Ms Shedrack having since removed the deliberately inaccurate qualifications from her social media profiles/CVs, there is a risk of repetition based upon her ongoing attitudinal concern.

The panel went on to consider as a result of the above whether Ms Shedrack could practise as a nurse kindly, safely and professionally. It determined that there was no evidence in this case to suggest Ms Shedrack could not practise either kindly or safely. However, in light of the above the

panel determined that Ms Shedrack presently could not practise professionally and therefore a finding of impairment was required.

The panel determined as limb (a) of Grant was not engaged, a finding of impairment on the grounds of public protection is not necessary.

The panel bore in mind that 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 concluded that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore finds Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise is currently impaired.'

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel was satisfied that in this case; the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register. The panel acknowledged that there were no concerns raised regarding patient safety and Ms Shedrack's ability to practise kindly and safely. The panel also bore in mind that Ms Shedrack has since amended her CV and there has been no repetition of behaviour since the incident; however, it determined that the deep-seated attitudinal concerns identified and Ms Shedrack's disengagement with the process outweighed the mitigating features.

When weighing all factors the panel determined that a period of suspension would serve to meet the public interest, uphold professional standards and

provide Ms Shedrack with the opportunity and time to reflect further upon her misconduct, develop and demonstrate insight and present evidence of remediation before a future reviewing panel.

It did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate but, taking account of all the information before it, and of the mitigation provided, the panel concluded that it would be wholly disproportionate to impose a striking-off order at this stage.

Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel took into account the hardship such an order will inevitably cause Ms Shedrack. However, this is outweighed by the public interest in this case.

The panel considered that this order is necessary to mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and to send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standard of behaviour required of a registered nurse.

The panel determined that a suspension order for a period of 6 months was appropriate in this case to mark the seriousness of the misconduct and provide Ms Shedrack with sufficient opportunity to demonstrate insight into her misconduct and remediation towards returning to unrestricted practice.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether your fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the registrant's ability to practise kindly, safely and professionally. 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, your written reflective piece dated 16 January 2026, a testimonial submitted by you on 16 January 2026 and your oral submissions made during the hearing. It has also taken account of the submissions made by Ms Parker on behalf of the NMC and the written submissions made by your legal representative dated 16 January 2026.

Ms Parker made submissions on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) in relation to the review of the substantive order imposed on you.

Ms Parker reminded the panel that the referral arose from concerns regarding your social media platforms and your Curriculum Vitae (CV). Specifically, you had stated that you obtained a postgraduate diploma in occupational health, when this qualification had not been completed. Ms Parker submitted that this inaccurate representation enabled you to gain roles within occupational health settings to which you would otherwise not have been entitled. The misconduct therefore related directly to dishonesty and integrity, which are fundamental tenets of the nursing profession.

Ms Parker submitted that this significant dishonesty had already been found by the substantive panel in relation to the allegations.

Ms Parker referred the panel to the directions given by the substantive panel, which made clear what was required of you to demonstrate sufficient insight and remediation for consideration by a review panel. These included: attendance and engagement in future proceedings; evidence of insight and written reflections addressing your misconduct; and evidence of up-to-date testimonials that may be relevant to your nursing practice.

Ms Parker submitted that the panel must now consider whether you have satisfied those requirements. The key questions for the panel were whether you now understand the need for full transparency and honesty with recruiters, and whether you have taken meaningful steps to address the concerns identified.

Ms Parker submitted that, whilst you have provided a reflection stating that you understand the importance of transparent communication, there is no supporting evidence

demonstrating how this insight has been put into practice. In particular, there is no evidence of what roles, if any, you have been working in since the order was imposed. There is also no evidence that you have strengthened your nursing practice or maintained your professional skills during this period.

Ms Parker submitted that it is unclear whether you wish to continue pursuing a nursing career at all, or whether you may no longer wish to remain on the NMC register. Ms Parker noted that your registration fee expired in 2022.

Ms Parker reminded the panel that there is no evidence to suggest that the lack of progress in this case is due to matters outside of your control. Rather, the absence of remediation appears to stem from a failure to meaningfully engage with the requirements set out by the substantive panel.

Ms Parker submitted that public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would be undermined if the panel were not to find that your fitness to practise remains impaired in this case. The NMC therefore submitted that you remain impaired on the grounds of public interest. Ms Parker submitted that the ultimate decision on impairment is a matter for the panel.

Ms Parker reminded the panel that the persuasive burden rests with the registrant to prove that they are no longer impaired. In this case, Ms Parker submitted that you have failed to discharge that burden. Ms Parker noted that it would have assisted the NMC and the panel to have received an updated copy of your CV or, alternatively, evidence such as a screenshot of your updated LinkedIn profile to demonstrate accurate and transparent representations of your qualifications.

Ms Parker submitted that the panel has the full range of sanctions available to it at this review. These include allowing the existing order to lapse, revoking the order, or imposing a striking-off order, should the statutory criteria be met.

Ms Parker highlighted the aggravating features previously identified in this case, namely: a pattern of misconduct; attitudinal issues; and a lack of sufficient insight. Ms Parker

submitted that these factors remain relevant to the panel's consideration of both impairment and sanction.

Ms Parker submitted that you have not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate remediation, insight, or strengthening of practice. The NMC invited the panel to make findings accordingly and to determine the appropriate outcome.

You gave oral evidence that your professional experience is within occupational health settings rather than in hospital practice. You explained that your work has involved supporting employees through immunisation programmes, stress management, and other health-related issues. You assist employees in liaison with their employer, and you undertake triage functions. You submitted that this is the area in which your competence and experience are used.

You explained [PRIVATE]. You submitted that these circumstances have had a substantial impact on your ability to fully engage with and appreciate the regulatory process.

You stated that the information on your LinkedIn profile reflected what you were studying at the time it was uploaded. You emphasised that you have a previously unblemished professional record and that there had been no concerns raised about your clinical practice prior to this matter.

You submitted that you had provided your CV to the NMC in good faith and out of personal integrity, with the intention of being transparent. You stated that you did not intend to mislead anyone regarding your qualifications.

When asked by the panel whether you considered that it was for recruiters to investigate the wording of your CV, you explained that you had always been open in discussions with recruiters and employers. You confirmed that you had a LinkedIn page at the time you graduated, but that you obtained employment through a recruitment agency and therefore did not update your LinkedIn profile thereafter.

You explained [PRIVATE], which had a profound impact on you and led to you having to stop your occupational health course. You stated that, during interviews for employment,

you were asked questions about your work experience and whether you were on the NMC Part 3 register, and that you always answered honestly that you were not on Part 3 of the register.

You said that the recruitment agency worked with your existing skills and experience and placed you with employers accordingly. You stated that the recruitment agency did not tell employers that you held an occupational health qualification or that you were on Part 3 of the NMC register. You emphasised that no employer has made a complaint to the NMC regarding your practice and that, in your view, this matter arose from an administrative issue rather than any clinical failing.

When asked by the panel about your understanding of the wrongdoing, you explained that you did not initially understand why the allegations were being brought, as the NMC had not previously queried your qualifications. You told the panel that your current understanding is that there was a misconception arising from the way your CV was worded, in particular the absence of end dates for your studies.

You explained that, in response to the charges, you recognised that on your CV you had included the start date of your postgraduate occupational health studies but not the end date. You stated that in 2020 you failed one of the final modules of the occupational health diploma that you were studying and therefore did not complete the qualification. You explained that this coincided with [PRIVATE], which contributed to you failing the examination and not updating your CV at that time.

You said that you have never relied on this incomplete qualification in your practice and that you have not used any competencies associated with a qualification that would permit registration on Part 3 of the NMC register. You reiterated that all of your employment was obtained through recruitment agencies and that you always told recruiters and employers that you were studying for, rather than had completed, an occupational health qualification. When asked what you would do differently if advertising yourself on social media or updating your CV in the future, you stated that you would clearly include both start and end dates for any courses of study. You said that you would also ensure that employers were fully informed of what you were studying and what qualifications you had not completed.

You told the panel that you now understand the potential impact of your actions on others. You acknowledged that employers or members of the public might assume that you held the qualification unless it was made explicitly clear, and that it should not be left to informal discussion to clarify this.

In response to questions from the panel regarding Charge 1 and the presence of an end date on your CV, you explained that this related to when you first created your LinkedIn profile. You explained that you completed your nursing qualification in 2013 and commenced postgraduate studies around that time. You reiterated that you never obtained employment through LinkedIn and that all of your work has come through recruitment agencies.

You explained that you had studied at different universities, including University 2 and University 1, and that when you updated your LinkedIn profile you were actively studying for the occupational health diploma. You said that, had you completed the qualification, you would have been eligible for Part 3 registration.

You stated that your understanding of the concerns in this case now centres on the need for clarity and accurate representation, specifically being clear with employers about your qualifications.

In response to questions from the legal assessor, you explained your nursing employment history. You confirmed that you graduated as an adult nurse from University 1 and worked at Hospital 1, where you practised as a nurse for approximately six months. You explained that your experience on the wards, and seeing colleagues under significant stress, motivated you to pursue a career in occupational health.

When asked about your testimonial contact, you explained that she has known you for approximately fifteen years. You stated that she knows you through your nursing work and is both a long-standing friend and professional colleague.

When asked by the panel whether you wish to remain on the NMC register, you confirmed that you do. You explained that when you previously indicated that you did not wish to

remain on the register, this was said during a period of emotional distress and did not reflect your true intentions.

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 your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel took into account that you have engaged with these proceedings.

The panel noted that the previous panel found your fitness to practise was impaired on the ground public interest only. The panel decided that you have not demonstrated sufficient insight or remediation, at this time.

The panel noted it has received limited information which demonstrates the steps you have taken to develop your insight or strengthen your practice through training or professional development so to remediate the concerns found.

Whilst the panel noted through your written reflection and oral evidence that your level of insight into your dishonesty has improved since the substantive hearing, it determined that your insight remains incomplete and is still developing. In particular, the panel was not satisfied that you have demonstrated significant evidence of remorse and fully accepted the effect of your actions on others, including the extent to which your actions undermined public trust and confidence in the profession. The panel considered that your reflection was largely inward facing, focusing predominantly on the effect of the proceedings on you personally, rather than providing reflection on how you would remediate and acknowledge the wider impact of your actions on employers and public confidence in the nursing profession. The panel also noted that you did not provide sufficient evidence to show how you would ensure sustained and consistent honesty and transparency in your future practice.

The panel noted that you have not worked as a nurse for the past five years. Whilst the panel was empathetic to your personal circumstances and difficulties in securing employment, the panel noted the absence of any evidence of steps taken to strengthen your nursing practice and demonstrate remediation during this period; for example, through completion of relevant training courses, engagement in voluntary work, or other activities that may demonstrate a continued commitment to the nursing profession, such as work within care homes, charities, the church, or community organisations.

The substantive panel determined that you are likely to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Having had regard to all the information before it, today's panel determined that there was still a likelihood of repetition of the misconduct, given the insufficient evidence of insight and remediation in respect of the areas of regulatory concern.

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 required.

In view of all of the above, the panel determined that your fitness to practise remains currently impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found your 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 noted the limited evidence of your having addressed the fitness to practise concerns raised by the substantive panel and that you provided limited new information to this panel.

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 deep-seated attitudinal concerns identified, an order that does not restrict your 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 your 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 would neither be a proportionate response to the seriousness of the conduct found proved, nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

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

The panel agreed with the substantive panel to the extent that that there are no practical conditions that could be formulated, given the nature of the charges in this case, which relate to attitudinal concerns. The panel has determined that due to your lack of insight, the current risks to public interest are too great and accordingly, conditions at this stage are not measurable and would not mitigate these risks.

The panel next considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. The panel was not satisfied that you have demonstrated sufficient insight into the impact of your actions and recognised the risks to the public interest and the wider profession.

The panel, however, was of the view that extending the suspension order would allow you further time to fully reflect on your misconduct. The panel concluded that a further six-month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford you adequate time to demonstrate meaningful insight, and address the concerns raised by the previous panel regarding your fitness to practise. This includes taking steps

to develop insight and demonstrate strengthening of your practice through providing evidence of professional development or training, alongside updated written reflections.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would satisfy the wider public interest. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

The panel did consider whether to make a striking-off order but considered such a sanction to be disproportionate when focusing on the matters found proved at the original hearing. However, you should be aware that if you choose to not re-engage with these proceedings, then you risk such an outcome at any subsequent review. It would not be appropriate for panels to continuously extend their suspension orders in the hope that a registrant will eventually comply with its suggestions. Accordingly, the panel wishes to encourage you to follow the suggestions made below to assist the future panel reviewing this case.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 27 February 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:

- Your continued engagement with the NMC and the regulatory process.
- For you to provide a further written reflective statement that demonstrates your insight into the impact of your actions on the public, including potential employers, and the public's confidence in the nursing profession.
- Evidence of maintaining your professional skills through Continuous Professional Development (CPD) training.
- Evidence by way of testimonials from colleagues and employers in paid or voluntary work relating to your honesty and integrity.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.