

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Tuesday, 28 July 2026 – Wednesday, 29 July 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Karen Chamberlain
NMC PIN	1611996S
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Adult RNA – 25 September 2019
Relevant Location:	Fife
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Mary Idowu (Chair, Lay member) Purushotham Kamath (Registrant member) Vinod Wagjiani (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Neil Fielding
Hearings Coordinator:	Teige Gardner
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Robert Rye, Case Presenter
Miss Chamberlain:	Present and represented by Jennifer McPhee, instructed by Anderson Strathern
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Conditions of practice order (6 months) to come into effect on 5 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Background

At the outset of the hearing, the panel were made aware of new allegations arising against you. It is alleged that, on or around 7 July 2025, you applied for a course at Queen Margaret University ('the University') without providing them with a copy of your Interim Conditions of Practice Order.

The panel heard submissions from both parties regarding the new charges.

Decision and reasons on application to amend the charge

The panel heard an application made by Mr Rye, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council ('NMC'), to amend the wording of the charges.

The proposed amendment was to add the word '*Interim*' in front of '*Conditions of Practice Order*'. It was submitted by Mr Rye that the proposed amendment would provide clarity and more accurately reflect the evidence. He submitted that there is no unfairness to you in amending this charge, as you have been aware of this allegation since August 2025. Further, he submitted that the proposed amendment would not be unfair as it does not change the mischief of the charge. He submitted that the interim conditions of practice order and the substantive conditions of practice order contained the same wording.

Proposed amendments:

"That you, a registered nurse:

- 1. On or around 7 July 2025, did not comply with an Interim Conditions of Practice Order imposed on your registration on 3 July 2025, in that you applied for a course at Queen Margaret University ("the University") without providing the University with a copy of the Interim Conditions of Practice Order at the time of the application.*
- 2. Your conduct at charge 1 was dishonest in that you sought to conceal from the University the fact that you were subject to an Interim Conditions of Practice Order.*

3. *Your conduct at charge 1 demonstrated a lack of integrity in that you did not provide the University with a copy of your Interim Conditions of Practice Order.*

We will be asking the panel to decide if they find the above concerns proved and, if so, to take action.”

Ms McPhee, on your behalf, submitted that the NMC was directed by the previous panel to particularise the new charges. She submitted that this error in the charges shows that the NMC failed to particularise the charges adequately as instructed by the previous panel. She submitted that it would be unfair and prejudicial to you to amend this charge, as the NMC has been aware of this allegation since August 2025 and should have ensured this charge was drafted correctly. Further, she submitted that you have not had adequate notice of these new charges, as the previous hearing, dated 8 July 2026, was relisted for today. She invited the panel to reject this application.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor and had regard to Rule 28 of ‘Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004’, as amended (the Rules).

The panel was of the view that such an amendment, as applied for, was in the interest of justice. The panel noted that the charges are serious, as they relate to you allegedly breaching your interim conditions of practice order. The panel considered Ms McPhee’s submission regarding the lack of notice for these new charges. The panel noted the letter sent to you on 1 May 2026, which informed you of the alleged breach and included the new charges being brought forward. This email states:

‘Good afternoon

I hope you are both well.

For ease of reference condition 7 reads as follows.

7. a) b) c) You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to: Any organisation or person you work for. Any employers you apply to for work (at the

time of application). Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.

We received information stating that Karen applied for a Masters Course at Queen Margaret University in August 2025, without disclosing the conditions of practice order.

It was stated that the order was discovered when the University accessed the NMC website.

I would be most grateful if you could kindly provide a response to the above as soon as practicably possible.'

Therefore, the panel was satisfied that you had sufficient notice of these charges.

The panel was satisfied that allowing the proposed amendment would cause no prejudice to you and no injustice to either party. In reaching that conclusion, the panel determined that the amendment did not alter the substance or material mischief of the charge. It noted that the substantive Conditions of Practice Order and the Interim Conditions of Practice Order are identically worded and that both constitute binding orders requiring compliance with their terms, irrespective of whether the order is substantive or interim in nature. Accordingly, the panel concluded that the proposed amendment was appropriate, as it provides clarity and accuracy without changing the effect or nature of the allegation.

The panel therefore accepted the proposed amendment of the charge.

Detail of charge (as amended)

That you, a registered nurse:

1. On or around 7 July 2025, did not comply with an Interim Conditions of Practice Order imposed on your registration on 3 July 2025, in that you applied for a course at Queen Margaret University ("the University") without providing the University with a copy of the Interim Conditions of Practice Order at the time of the application.

2. Your conduct at charge 1 was dishonest in that you sought to conceal from the University the fact that you were subject to an Interim Conditions of Practice Order.
3. Your conduct at charge 1 demonstrated a lack of integrity in that you did not provide the University with a copy of your Interim Conditions of Practice Order.

Decision and reasons on application to admit the evidence of Ms Crowley

The panel heard an application made by Mr Rye under Rule 31 to allow the evidence of Ms Crowley into evidence. Ms Crowley was not present at this hearing and, whilst the NMC had made sufficient efforts to ensure that this witness was present, she was unable to attend today because she has recently commenced a new job. He submitted that the evidence provided by Ms Crowley is relevant and fair as it speaks to the factual basis of the charges, in particular charge 1. He submitted that there is no evidence to suggest that Ms Crowley fabricated her evidence or that she bears a grudge against you. He submitted that Ms Crowley's evidence is not sole or decisive and it can be tested. He submitted that you are also able to provide live evidence regarding these charges and the evidence Ms Crowley provides. He invited the panel to admit Ms Crowley's evidence.

Ms McPhee submitted that there is no good reason as to why Ms Crowley is not attending this hearing. She submitted that the NMC did not give you notice of Ms Crowley's non-attendance at this hearing, despite knowing for over a week. She submitted that it would be unfair to you to admit this evidence, as you were under the impression that Ms Crowley was attending and you would have the opportunity to cross-examine her, which is not the case. She submitted that there are several inaccuracies in the evidence Ms Crowley provides, which you are now unable to test as Ms Crowley is not attending. She submitted that it would be wholly unfair to you to admit the evidence of Ms Crowley and invited the panel to reject this application.

The panel heard and accepted the legal assessor's advice on the issues it should take into consideration in respect of this application. This included that Rule 31 provides that, so far as it is 'fair and relevant', a panel may accept evidence in a range of forms and circumstances, whether or not it is admissible in civil proceedings. The legal assessor also

made reference to *Thorneycroft v Nursing and Midwifery Council* [2014] EWHC 1565 (Admin), *El Karout v The Nursing and Midwifery Council* [2019] EWHC 28 (Admin) and *NMC v Ogbonna* [2010] EWCA Civ 1216 as well as DMA-6, 'Evidence' (9 June 2025), in particular the section on hearsay evidence.

The panel determined that admitting Ms Crowley's evidence was relevant to the charges, as it related directly to your application to the University. The panel also found that it was fair to admit the evidence. The panel noted that her evidence was not sole or decisive in relation to the charges, as there was other evidence before it concerning the same matters, including evidence which appeared to indicate that you accepted that you had not physically provided a copy of your Conditions of Practice. The panel found no evidence to suggest that Ms Crowley had fabricated her evidence, or that she knew you or bore any grudge against you. The panel recognised that the reason for non-attendance was not ideal. However, having considered the information provided regarding Ms Crowley's recent employment commitments and the efforts made by the NMC to secure her attendance, the panel was satisfied that reasonable steps had been taken.

The panel considered the allegations to be serious, as they concern an alleged failure to provide a copy of your Interim Conditions of Practice Order to the University when you had a regulatory obligation to do so. The panel considered Ms McPhee's submissions and concluded that the concerns raised in relation to Ms Crowley's evidence do not relate directly to the central issues in the charges. Rather, they concern peripheral matters regarding what information you did, or did not, provide to the University in connection with your application. Whilst those matters could conceivably be relevant to charges 2 and 3, the panel noted that Ms Crowley's evidence is not sole or decisive on those issues. There is other evidence before the panel, including documentary evidence and evidence arising from the surrounding circumstances, which is capable of addressing the same matters.

The panel noted that much of what is contained in the witness statement Ms Crowley and much of the exhibits referenced in her witness statement were contained in the NMC case for some time. Therefore, in terms of notice, whilst there was limited notice of the specific application, the key material was available to you in the main bundle. Ms McPhee was able to address the application by presenting full and detailed argument.

The panel further noted that, although Ms Crowley cannot be cross-examined, Ms McPhee has identified a number of inconsistencies within her evidence. The panel considered that those matters can properly be addressed by way of submissions as to the weight to be attached to the evidence. The panel was not persuaded that the inconsistencies identified are such as to render the evidence unreliable on the key issues or to justify its exclusion. The panel also noted that you are able to give live evidence at this hearing and challenge Ms Crowley's account through your own evidence (including documentary evidence) and the submissions made on your behalf. The panel was therefore satisfied that any potential disadvantage arising from the admission of Ms Crowley's evidence could be adequately addressed during the course of the hearing.

Application to adjourn proceedings

Ms McPhee made an application for the panel to adjourn the hearing, and extend the current Conditions of Practice Order for a short period of time. She submitted that there is no realistic prospect that the panel will finish making its decision on the facts of this case by the end of today. She submitted that neither you nor her will be available to provide evidence or make submissions prior to your order lapsing on 5 August 2026. Therefore, she submitted it would be wholly unfair to you if the panel are to proceed with this hearing and not be able to finish making its decision by the end of today. She submitted that you have engaged with the NMC process throughout with her as your legal counsel, and it would be unfair to proceed and make a decision in your absence. She submitted the only fair outcome in this case would be for the panel to adjourn the case and extend the existing Conditions of Practice Order.

Mr Rye submitted that the panel have been made aware of new allegations in this case which could, if found proven, increase the risk posed by you to the public. He submitted that if the panel do accept this application, its decision on impairment and sanction would be hollow as it cannot take into consideration these new allegations. However, he accepted that there is no realistic prospect at this stage that the panel will finish making its decision on the facts of this case. Therefore, he submitted that it is for the panel to decide whether to accept or reject this application.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor, who made reference to Rule 32(4).

The panel accepted the application to adjourn this hearing. The panel accepted that there is no time to realistically finish making its decision on the new allegations in this case. The panel also considered it would be wholly unfair to you for it to relist your case next week as neither you nor your representative are available. The panel noted that nobody would be inconvenienced as a result of adjourning this hearing, as there are no witnesses due to attend.

Therefore, the panel determined, in the interests of fairness to all parties, to adjourn proceedings.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to extend the current conditions of practice order for a period of six months in order to allow the hearing to reconvene before the same panel, with each of the relevant parties' full participation. This will enable the panel to reach a conclusion in relation to the contested facts and review the current order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 5 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 3 July 2025. On 7 July 2026, another hearing was listed. However, this hearing was adjourned until 28 July 2026 due to a lack of time to hear the necessary applications.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 5 August 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 was as follows:

'That you, a registered nurse:

1. *On 10 July 2020 said to Patient B words to the effect of 'get back in bed' 'you fucking old bag' and/or 'you are a liar'*
2. ...
3. ...
4. *Between 20-23 February 2022 used inconsiderate and uncompassionate language on several occasions in that you;*
 - a) *said 'shut up' directed towards Patient A*
 - b) ...
 - c) *stated words to the effect of, 'for fucks sake I've got better things to do I'm busy' in relation to removing Patient F's catheter.*
5. *On 15 May 2021 spoke in a rude tone and/or manner towards Patient D and their relative by;*
 - a) ...
 - b) *saying to Patient D's daughter 'I gave her paracetamol tablets this morning and she managed them with no problems'*
 - c) *putting liquid form paracetamol down onto the table and said 'there's your paracetamol it's liquid'*
6. *On the dates below worked when it was unsafe for you to do so, in that you worked a day shift immediately after you had completed a night shift;*
 - 6.a.1.1.1. *12 and 13 November 2021*
 - 6.a.1.1.2. *20 and 21 November 2021*
 - 6.a.1.1.3. *21 and 22 January 2022*
 - 6.a.1.1.4. *6 and 7 February 2022*
 - 6.a.1.1.5. *16 and 17 February 2022*

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

‘The panel carefully considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired and concluded that it is. This decision is based on concerns relating to both public protection and the wider public interest.

You have accepted the findings of facts made by the panel, expressed remorse and apologised for your actions.

The panel considered that showing kindness and compassion should be demonstrated by a nurse as part of professional practice. However, your repeated misconduct over a prolonged period of time demonstrated a concerning lack of compassion towards patients, a patient’s relative, and a colleague. This absence of empathy is inconsistent with the standards expected of a registered nurse.

While the panel acknowledged that you have undertaken some online training in an effort to remediate your misconduct, it considered this to be brief and limited in its ability to address the issues of demonstrating empathy and compassion in order to practise safely, kindly and professionally in the future.

The panel also identified multiple disconnects between your written reflective statement and your oral evidence. Although your written reflection was structured, your oral evidence at times demonstrated a continued lack of compassion and did not reflect a sufficient understanding of the impact of your actions. One notable example was, during your oral evidence while describing how you dealt with a pregnant passenger who you stated was “agitated” and had asked for orange juice due to the flight being delayed, you said “she was demanding freebies...”

The panel recognised that you were dealing with multiple personal and professional challenges at the time of the misconduct, including a lack of support, feeling excluded from your team, and experiencing health issues which prompted you to seek support from your General Practitioner (GP). Additionally, the panel has taken full account of the positive feedback you have received in your current public facing role. However, the panel considers you have not otherwise demonstrated that you

have strengthened your practice in order for you to work kindly, safely and effectively in similar circumstances in the future. In addition, the panel was not sufficiently assured that you have appropriate safeguards in place to ensure that your actions are not repeated. Instead, you appear to rely on the fact that the multiple stressors will not recur, and you hope that you would work in an environment that was not lacking in support. This raises a concern about the risk of repetition.

The panel also determined that your actions breached fundamental tenets of the nursing profession, particularly the duty to treat patients with respect, kindness, and compassion, and to uphold public trust in the profession.

Given the lack of meaningful insight, the panel could not be satisfied that the misconduct is highly unlikely to be repeated. For that reason, the panel concluded that your fitness to practise is currently impaired on the grounds of public protection.

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 determined that given the seriousness and the nature of your misconduct a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is required to uphold public confidence in the profession and to maintain proper standards.

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, 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 that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether placing 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 considered the following aspects of the SG apply in this case:

- Identifiable areas of the nurse or midwife’s practice in need of assessment and/or retraining;*
- No evidence of general incompetence;*
- Potential and willingness to respond positively to retraining;*
- Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- The conditions will protect patients during the period they are in force; and*
- Conditions can be created that can be monitored and assessed.*

The panel determined that it would be possible to formulate appropriate and practical conditions which would address the failings highlighted in this case. The panel accepted that you would be willing to comply with conditions of practice.

In reaching its decision, the panel noted that the incidents occurred some time ago. While attitudinal concerns remain, it acknowledged that you have shown meaningful reflection. The panel considered that a conditions of practice order would allow you to further develop and strengthen your professional practice and provide you with an opportunity that a suspension order would deny, whilst still ensuring the safety of the public. It was of the view that regular meetings with your line manager, as part of the conditions, will provide the necessary support and structure for continued reflection and professional growth.

The panel was satisfied that, with appropriate safeguards in place, it is in the public interest for you to return to nursing practice. Balancing all the relevant factors, the panel concluded that a conditions of practice order is the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel gave consideration to a suspension order. It took full account of the attitudinal concerns found in this case and that the charges found proved did not relate to a single isolated incident but occurred over a period of time. However, there is no evidence of actual harm, and the panel found that there were no deep-seated personality issues arising. There are no concerns that involve dishonesty, criminality or exploitation, and a lack of clinical competence was not an issue in this case. The panel, taking full account of the principles in the overarching objective of the NMC, guidance in the SG and the principle of proportionality, concluded that a suspension order is not proportionate in this case and that a conditions of practice order would protect the public. Furthermore, a conditions of practice order will mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession and will send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of practice required of a registered nurse.

The panel determined that the following conditions 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.’

‘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 limit your nursing practice to one employer. This must not be an agency.*
2. *You must ensure that you are indirectly supervised any time you are working. Your supervision must consist of:*
 - a) *Working on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by, a registered nurse on every shift.*
 - b) *You must not be the nurse in charge.*
3. *You must work with your line manager and/or allocated mentor to create a personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must address the concerns about communication, attitude, nursing values, and your working hours. You must:*
 - a) *Meet with your line manager or mentor weekly for the first month of employment, and subsequently monthly to discuss your progress against your PDP.*
 - b) *Send your case officer a copy of your PDP once created, and then updates on progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP every three months.*
4. *You must keep a reflective practice profile. The profile will:*
 - a) *Detail your communication with patients, their families and colleagues*
 - b) *Be signed by your mentor or line manager each time.*
 - c) *Contain feedback from your mentor or line manager on how you have communicated with patients, their families and colleagues.*
 - d) *You must send your case officer a copy of the profile every three months.*
5. *You must keep the NMC 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 employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).*
 - c) *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.*
- Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.'*

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 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 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 notes that, while it has considered the case on the basis of the information currently available, there remain outstanding matters which have yet to be determined and which may have a material bearing on both impairment and sanction. Regrettably, it has not been possible to resolve those issues at this stage. Furthermore, due to practical and logistical constraints, it has not been possible to convene a further hearing before the expiry of the current order. Accordingly, the panel has conducted this review on the basis of incomplete information in order to discharge its overarching objective of protecting the public and maintaining confidence in the profession and the regulatory process.

The panel considers that this order should be reviewed at the earliest reasonable opportunity to enable any outstanding matters to be determined and brought to a proper conclusion. This will ensure that any future assessment of impairment and sanction is informed by the fullest available evidence and circumstances at that time.

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 Mr Rye and Ms McPhee.

Mr Rye submitted that you remain impaired and the current Conditions of Practice Order remains necessary on the grounds of public protection and also in the wider public interest.

Ms McPhee submitted that you accept that you are currently impaired and the current Conditions of Practice Order is sufficient to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest.

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 determined that you remain impaired. It was of the view that the allegations are serious and it had not received sufficient evidence to mitigate the impairment as set out in the original charges since the previous hearing. Therefore, for the same reasons listed at the original substantive hearing, the panel determined that there remains a risk of repetition and subsequent risk of harm to patients if you are allowed to practice without restriction.

The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required for the same reasons set out by the original substantive hearing panel.

For these reasons, the panel finds that your fitness to practise remains 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 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 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, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened 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 that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

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 determined that it would be possible to formulate appropriate and practical conditions which would address the failings highlighted in this case.

The panel was of the view that a further conditions of practice order is sufficient to protect patients and the wider public interest. In this case, there are conditions could be formulated which would protect patients during the period they are in force.

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 at this moment.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of 6 months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 5 August 2026. 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 limit your nursing practice to one employer. This must not be an agency.
2. You must ensure that you are indirectly supervised any time you are working. Your supervision must consist of:
 - a) Working on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by, a registered nurse on every shift.
 - b) You must not be the nurse in charge.
3. You must work with your line manager and/or allocated mentor to create a personal

development plan (PDP). Your PDP must address the concerns about communication, attitude, nursing values, and your working hours. You must:

- a) Meet with your line manager or mentor weekly for the first month of employment, and subsequently monthly to discuss your progress against your PDP.
 - b) Send your case officer a copy of your PDP once created, and then updates on progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP every three months.
4. You must keep a reflective practice profile. The profile will:
 - a) Detail your communication with patients, their families and colleagues
 - b) Be signed by your mentor or line manager each time.
 - c) Contain feedback from your mentor or line manager on how you have communicated with patients, their families and colleagues.
 - d) You must send your case officer a copy of the profile every three months.
5. You must keep the NMC 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 employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).
 - c) 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 retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.

The period of this order is for 6 months. The panel directs the NMC to list a review at the nearest possible date which is convenient for all parties involved in this case for, at least, two full days.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 5 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.