

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Incorrect Entry Meeting
Thursday, 11 June 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant: Amarachi Marie Madu

NMC PIN: 21F21520

Part(s) of the register: Registered Nurse – Adult Nursing

Relevant Location: Nigeria

Type of case: Incorrect entry

Panel members: Ingrid Lee (Chair, lay member)
Georgia Kontosorou (Registrant member)
Dee Rogers (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: William Hoskins

Hearings Coordinator: Adaobi Ibuaka

Outcome: **Registration entry incorrectly made**

Direction: **The panel directs the Registrar to remove Mrs Madu’s entry on the register in accordance with Article 26 (7) of the Order**

Direction: **No Order**

Service of Notice of Meeting

The panel noted that notice of this meeting was sent to Mrs Madu's registered email address by secure email and registered address by recorded delivery and by first class post on 6 May 2026.

The notice of meeting informed Mrs Madu that a meeting would be held on or after 9 June 2026 and the allegation against her, and enclosed a bundle of evidence that the panel would consider. It also informed her that if she wished to provide a written response, she should do so no later than 8 June 2026. The panel noted that no written responses had been provided by Mrs Madu to the notice of this meeting.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of the information available, the panel was satisfied that reasonable notice of this meeting has been sent to Mrs Madu.

Details of allegation

The allegation that will be considered by the Investigating Committee is as follows:

That you

- 1. Submitted or caused to be submitted, a Computer Based Test result, obtained at Yunnik Technologies Limited test centre ("the test centre") on 22 July 2020, that was subsequently declared void by the NMC due to concerns about the manner in which tests were being conducted at the test centre.*

And, in light of the above, your entry on the NMC register, in the name of **Amarachi Marie Madu, 21F2152O** was incorrectly made.

Background

Pearson VUE have a contract with the NMC as their Computer Based Test (CBT) provider which has been in place since 2014. CBT is one part of the NMC's Test of Competence

(ToC) and is used by the NMC to assess the skills and knowledge of people wanting to join the NMC's register from overseas as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate or re-join the register after a long period away from practice. The second part of the ToC is an objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) – a practical examination.

The current CBT, created on 2 August 2021, is split into two parts (Part A and Part B). Part A contains a numeracy test consisting of 15 short answer questions and lasts for 30 minutes. Part B is a clinical test consisting of 100 multiple-choice questions and lasts for 2 hours and 30 minutes. All questions are scored as either correct or incorrect and there is no partial credit.

Pearson VUE contracted with a third party, Yunnik Technologies Ltd, in relation to a Pearson VUE Authorised Test Centre (PVTC) in Ibadan (the Yunnik centre), Nigeria. This testing centre is where the concerns in this matter relate.

Pearson VUE has control over the technology, but the environment is owned/controlled by the test centre and personnel are test centre employees. PVTCs and PVTC Selects are contractually required to adhere to specific Pearson VUE standards for delivery and operations.

Pearson Professional Centres (PPCs) and PVTC Selects also have the additional security measures of biometrics (palm vein) and CCTV footage which are not available in PVTCs.

On 15 March 2023, Pearson VUE identified that the Yunnik centre was delivering NMC CBTs for multiple candidates in unusually short test times (exam length is 3 hours for Part A and Part B combined and the Legacy test was 3 hours in total). The number of candidates was initially unknown.

The NMC was notified, and the Pearson VUE results team ran a report from January 2022, for all NMC exams that were delivered at the Yunnik centre. This report identified a suspicious level of activity. A security review was also conducted which found several instances of the Yunnik centre submitting suspicious admission photos for NMC candidates.

Pearson VUE conducted a thorough and detailed investigation into the Yunnik centre and identified testing anomalies. They found that the data set for the period between 15 March 2019 and 31 March 2023 indicated a specific pattern of probable fraudulent behaviour, likely to be proficient proxy testing, which was not present in other test centres globally.

Pearson VUE's investigation also concluded that there was no technical error at the Yunnik centre that had led to the data set and that human interference was involved.

The NMC commissioned a report from Richard Steele, instructed as an independent expert to analyse and report on data provided by the NMC. He reached essentially the same conclusion, namely, that there were a significant number of exceptionally quick test times at the Yunnik centre, compared to global averages.

On 3 August 2023 the NMC's Registrar decided to use as a benchmark the 1 in 2,500 percentile, in order to identify tests which were taken at such a speed that it is likely that the results had been fraudulently obtained (most likely utilising a proxy test taker).

Because of the evidence of widespread fraudulent activity at the Yunnik centre, the NMC was unable to be confident in any of the CBT results obtained at the Yunnik centre. The Registrar therefore considered all CBT results obtained there to be invalid and that the safest, fairest, and most proportionate way to deal with this was to ask everyone who sat their CBT at the Yunnik centre, to take a new CBT. In the absence of a valid CBT an individual should not have been allowed entry to the NMC register.

On 22 July 2020, Mrs Madu completed the CBT test at the Yunnik Centre.

The panel noted that there was no information before it, in regards to Mrs Madu's test time, therefore it was not for the panel to determine whether fraud was used by Mrs Madu, to obtain her registration.

Decision and reasons on Incorrect Entry

This matter has been referred to the Investigating Committee under rule 2A of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2004 on the basis that Mrs Madu's entry in the register has been

incorrectly made. As there has been no request for a hearing and the Registrar does not consider a hearing to be necessary, the Investigating Committee is meeting in private to dispose of the matter in accordance with Article 26 of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001. Article 26 requires the panel to consider whether Mrs Madu's entry in the Register was incorrectly made. If so, the panel may make an order that the Registrar remove or amend the entry.

The panel recognised that the burden of proving that an entry was incorrectly made rests upon the Council. The Council must prove the allegation on the balance of probabilities. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on Incorrect and Fraudulent entries in the register.

The panel noted the letter sent to Mrs Madu, dated 6 May 2026, providing Notice of this Meeting, setting out the allegation, and inviting her to make any "final written comments about the case". No representations had been received from Mrs Madu in response to this letter.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decisions, the panel took into account all the documentary evidence provided by the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) before it.

The panel had regard to witness statements of Brian Friess, who set out the background as to when and how the incident at the testing centre came to Pearson VUE's attention and how they analysed the data relating to the incident. The witnesses statement of Sarah Kovach-Clark, who set out the NMC's role is setting standards for education and training, it's current registration requirements for applicants trained in the United Kingdom (UK) and overseas, as well as the details of the Computer Based Test (CBT) which is part 1 of the NMC's competence tests, along with the differences between the previous test of competence known as the legacy test, and the current test of competence the ToC202.

The panel also had regard to witness statements from Witness 1 and Witness 2 who describe attending the Yunnik Centre for the CBT and subsequently being pressured into using a proxy tester. It also considered the summary of admissions document of

candidates who had utilised a fraud/proxy during their CBT. Furthermore the panel had regard to the expert report and analysis of Richard Steele, which set out the vastly different distribution of times in which candidates at Yunnik completed the CBT compared to those at other centres across the rest of the world including the rest of Nigeria.

In light of all the above, the panel determined that the data before it supports that widespread fraud was taking place at Yunnik centre for many years. In view of this data the panel has concluded that the Registrar was justified in deeming that any test taken in Yunnik Centre, Ibadan was invalid and that an entry in the Register which depended upon the outcome of a CBT taken at that centre was incorrectly made.

The panel noted that since being informed of the allegation, Mrs Madu has engaged with the NMC.

Mrs Madu was first informed of the concerns on the 4 May 2023, to which she responded to the NMC in an email dated 28 May 2023 where she states the following:

'My name is Amarachi Madu, I gained entry into the NMC register in 2021 my NMC pin is 21F21520, I no longer practice in the UK as I had to relocate to the USA with my family.

I'm still willing to rewrite the CBT if I have to, just to set records straight about my innocence as I studied and wrote CBT by myself.

Kindly let me know the next step to take.

Thank you very much.'

Following this, the NMC then sent Mrs Madu a further email and letter dated 24 May 2023 asking her to retake her CBT. However, Mrs Madu did not respond.

The NMC sent another email dated 2 July 2024 which asked Mrs Madu to take a second CBT and that if the NMC did not hear from her by 16 July 2024, the matter would be referred to the investigation committee. The NMC sent further correspondence on the 20

November 2024 asking Mrs Madu to respond and/or take a CBT with a deadline of 4 December 2024. Mrs Madu again did not respond.

The NMC then sent a further similar email dated 12 September 2025 with a deadline for the 24 September 2025.

Mrs Madu sent an email to the NMC dated 12 April 2026, with the following:

'I recently received a document at my home address indicating that I have been removed from the NMC register. I would like to clarify that I left the United Kingdom in 2022 and, at this time, I do not have plans to return to work there. As a result, I have not retaken the required examination.

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity I had to work with you and remain grateful for the experience.

Should my plans change in the future and I decide to return to the United Kingdom to practice, I will ensure that I complete the necessary examinations and fulfill all requirements for re-registration.

Please let me know if you need any additional information'.(sic)

The panel noted from the correspondence emails between Mrs Madu and the NMC, she appeared to have relocated and is living in the United States of America (USA). The panel also noted that the yearly registration fee of £120 for her registration on the NMC Register was due on the 30 June 2023 and it has not been paid and as a consequence her registration lapsed and expired on the 1 July 2023.

The panel also noted the absence of any information supporting that Mrs Madu had potentially committed fraud to obtain her CBT.

Decision on Incorrect Entry

The panel therefore found that the entry on the NMC register in the name of Amarachi Marie Madu, PIN 21F2152O was incorrectly made.

Decision and reasons on direction

Having determined that Mrs Madu's entry on the NMC Register was incorrectly made, the panel went on to decide what direction, if any, to make under Article 26(7) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

Article 26(7) states:

'...If the Investigating Committee is satisfied that an entry in the register has been ... incorrectly made, it may make an order that the Registrar remove or amend the entry and shall notify the person concerned of his right of appeal under article 38.'

The panel considered that, having found that Mrs Madu's entry on the NMC register was incorrectly made, it would be inappropriate to take no action.

In all the circumstances the panel decided that the only appropriate order is to direct the Registrar to remove Mrs Madu entry from the register.

Mrs Madu will be notified of the panel's decision in writing. Mrs Madu has the right to appeal the decision under Article 38 of the Order. This order cannot take effect until the end of the 28 day appeal period or, if an appeal is made, before the appeal has been concluded.

Decision and reasons on interim order

Having directed that the Registrar remove Mrs Madu's entry from the register, the panel then considered whether an interim order was required under Article 26(11) of the Order, in relation to the appeal period.

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

In reaching its decision on whether to impose an interim order, the panel had regard to the reasons set out in its decision on the allegations and its decision to direct the Registrar to remove Mrs Madu's entry from the Register. It also had regard to the NMC's published Guidance on Fraudulent and Incorrect Entry cases. It noted that the imposition of an interim order is not an automatic outcome but is a matter for the panel's discretion in the circumstances of the case, having regard to the public interest in maintaining the integrity of the register. It also had regard to Article 31 of the Order and the NMC's Guidance on interim orders.

The panel determined that an interim order was not necessary in this case as Mrs Madu's registration had lapsed, and she was no longer on the register as of 30 June 2023.

Therefore she can no longer practice as a nurse and any checks by employers would reveal that she does not have a valid registration. Further, Mrs Madu appears to be living in the USA. The panel could not identify any risks to the public at this stage and the public interest did not require an interim order in the circumstances of this case.

That concludes this determination.