

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting  
Friday, 19 June 2026**

Nursing and Midwifery Council  
2 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London, E20 1EJ

**Name of Registrant:** Joanne Marie Millard

**NMC PIN** 14F0662E

**Part(s) of the register:** Registered Nurse – Adult Nursing  
RNA – (20 September 2014)

**Relevant Location:** Essex

**Type of case:** Misconduct

**Panel members:** Amy Barron (Chair, Lay member)  
Daniel Harris (Registrant member)  
Yusuf Deerow (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:** Cyrus Katrak

**Hearings Coordinator:** Nicola Nicolaou

**Order being reviewed:** Suspension order (6 months)

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired

**Outcome:** **Striking off order to come into effect at the end of 26 July 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 Millard's registered email address by secure email on 5 May 2026.

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 8 June 2026 and inviting Miss Millard to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Millard 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 replace the current suspension order with a striking off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 26 July 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order imposed for a period of six months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 17 December 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 26 July 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:

### ***'Details of charge***

*That you, a registered nurse on 4 July 2020:*

1. *Did not complete adequate records for Resident 1, in that you:*
  - a. ...
  - b. *Did not record Resident 1's deteriorating reaction to the sternal rub.*
  - c. ...
  - d. ...
  - e. ...
  - f. ...
  
2. *Did not take appropriate and /or timely action upon being told that Resident 1 was less responsive and/or unresponsive*

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

The original substantive panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

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

*In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'Impairment' (Reference: DMA-1 Last Updated: 03/03/2025) in which the following is stated:*

*'The question that will help decide whether a professional's fitness to practise is impaired is:*

*"Can the nurse, midwife or nursing associate practise kindly, safely and professionally?"*

*If the answer to this question is yes, then the likelihood is that the professional's fitness to practise is not impaired.'*

*Nurses occupy a position of privilege and trust in society and are expected at all times to be professional. Patients and their families must be able to trust nurses with their lives and the lives of their loved ones. They must make sure that their conduct at all times justifies both their patients' and the public's trust in the profession.*

*In this regard the panel considered the judgment of Mrs Justice Cox in the case of CHRE v NMC and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) in reaching its decision. In paragraph 74, she said:*

*'In determining whether a practitioner's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct, the relevant panel should generally consider not only whether the practitioner continues to present a risk to members of the public in his or her current role, but also whether the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances.'*

*In paragraph 76, Mrs Justice Cox referred to Dame Janet Smith's "test" which reads as follows:*

*'Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor's misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her/their fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that S/He/They:*

- a) has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*

- b) *has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or*
  
- c) *has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or*
  
- d) *....'*

### **Public protection**

*The panel first considered impairment from the ground of public protection.*

*The panel found that Miss Millard had, in the past, acted so as to put a patient at unwarranted risk of harm. Resident 1 was a vulnerable resident, unable to advocate for himself, and wholly reliant on nursing staff to recognise and respond to signs of clinical deterioration. Despite being informed on multiple occasions that Resident 1 was less responsive and unwell, and observing this for herself, Miss Millard did not take appropriate and timely action to escalate concerns or secure urgent medical intervention.*

*The panel considered that the misconduct went to the heart of patient safety. The failure to escalate a deteriorating patient, particularly over a prolonged period, represented a serious departure from the standards expected of a registered nurse, and one that exposed Resident 1 to a risk of significant harm.*

*In considering whether Miss Millard currently presents a risk to patients, the panel carefully assessed insight, remediation, and the likelihood of repetition. While the panel acknowledged that Miss Millard had accepted, during the employer's investigation, that she should have called for emergency assistance earlier, it considered that this amounted to only limited insight. The panel was not provided with evidence demonstrating a clear understanding of why the misconduct occurred, the impact of the delay on Resident 1, or how similar situations would be managed differently in the future.*

*The panel also noted that Miss Millard's reflections focused predominantly on documentation, rather than on the core failing identified by the panel, namely the failure to escalate a deteriorating patient. The panel therefore concluded that Miss Millard had not demonstrated sufficient insight into the seriousness of the misconduct.*

*The panel accepted that the misconduct in this case was capable of remediation. However, it noted that Miss Millard had not provided evidence of any relevant training, refreshed clinical skills, or steps taken to strengthen her practice. In this regard, the panel placed weight on the fact that Miss Millard has not practised as a nurse since 2020. The absence of any evidence of recent practice or professional development significantly reduced the panel's ability to be reassured that she could return to practice safely.*

*The panel further took into account Miss Millard's limited engagement with the regulatory process. The panel noted her sporadic communication with the NMC, her failure to progress undertakings or voluntary removal. The panel noted Miss Millard's challenging personal circumstances as outlined in her correspondence with the NMC. While disengagement alone does not establish impairment, the panel considered that, in this case, it underlined the concerns identified and further reduced the panel's confidence that the risks arising from the misconduct had been addressed.*

*Taking all of these matters into account, the panel concluded that there remains a real risk of repetition of this conduct. The panel therefore found that Miss Millard's fitness to practise is currently impaired on the grounds of public protection.*

### **Public interest**

*The panel then considered whether a finding of impairment was also required on public interest grounds.*

*The panel determined that Miss Millard's misconduct breached fundamental tenets of the nursing profession, including the duty to preserve patient safety and to respond appropriately in emergency situations. The panel considered that Miss*

*Millard was acting as nurse in charge and was therefore expected to demonstrate leadership, sound clinical judgement, and accountability. Her failure to escalate concerns in these circumstances was particularly serious.*

*The panel placed weight on the evidence of other healthcare professionals, including another nurse and the attending paramedics, who expressed concern that Resident 1 had been left without appropriate intervention for too long. The panel also noted that the Ambulance Service considered the circumstances sufficiently concerning to raise a safeguarding referral. The panel considered that this objective professional concern reinforced the seriousness of the misconduct.*

*The panel acknowledged that this was a single episode. However, the panel concluded that this did not outweigh the seriousness of the misconduct or negate the need for regulatory intervention.*

*The panel was satisfied that public confidence in the nursing profession, and in the NMC as a regulator, would be undermined if no finding of impairment were made in circumstances where a nurse in charge failed to take timely action to escalate concerns about a vulnerable patient.*

*Accordingly, the panel determined that a finding of impairment was also required on public interest grounds, including the need to uphold proper professional standards and to maintain confidence in the profession.*

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

The original substantive panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

*'The panel then went on to consider whether a suspension order would be an appropriate sanction. The panel took into account the Sanctions Guidance, which states that a suspension order may be appropriate where:*

- there is a single instance of misconduct, but a lesser sanction is not sufficient;*

- *there is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems; and*
- *the misconduct is serious, but not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register.*

*The panel was satisfied that, in this case, the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with Miss Millard remaining on the register. The panel noted that the misconduct arose from a single episode, was potentially remediable, and did not involve dishonesty or deliberate harm.*

*However, the panel concluded that the seriousness of the misconduct, the public protection concerns identified, and the need to maintain public confidence in the profession meant that a lesser sanction would be insufficient. The panel therefore determined that a suspension order was the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case.*

*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 disproportionate. Whilst the panel acknowledges that a suspension may have a punitive effect, it would be unduly punitive in Miss Millard's case to impose a striking-off order.'*

## **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Millard's fitness to practise remains impaired. There is no statutory definition of fitness to practise. However, the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) has recently redefined fitness to practise as a registrant's ability to practise safely and effectively without restriction. (Reference: DMA–1 updated 28 January 2026). 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, various emails from Miss Millard, and two telephone notes between Miss Millard and her NMC Case Officer dated 9 March 2026 and 30 March 2026.

The panel 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 Millard's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the original substantive panel found that Miss Millard had insufficient insight. At this meeting the panel considered that there is no new evidence before it to suggest that Miss Millard has developed her insight, or reflected on her misconduct. The panel considered that Miss Millard has not demonstrated an understanding of how her actions put the patient at a risk of harm, nor has she demonstrated an understanding of why what she did was wrong and how this impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession.

The panel considered that there is no new evidence before it to suggest that Miss Millard has taken steps to strengthen her practice. It has not had sight of any reflection, or relevant training undertaken by Miss Millard which addresses her misconduct.

The original substantive panel determined that Miss Millard was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has received no new information to suggest that the risk has been reduced. In light of this the panel determined that Miss Millard remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required given the seriousness of the misconduct, and Miss Millard's continuing lack of meaningful engagement.

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

The panel had sight of an email from Miss Millard dated 15 April 2026 which stated:

*'Hi I would like to make an order to have my name taken off of the nmc register please as I have no intention of practicing anymore as a registered nurse. I haven't practice as a registered nurse since 2021 and will no longer be seeking employment as a nurse from now on.'*

The panel considered the NMC Guidance entitled '*Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place*' (reference: REV-2h last updated 13 May 2026). The panel considered that the misconduct in this case is so serious that it would be inappropriate to allow Miss Millard's registration to lapse upon its expiry with a finding of current impairment. It also considered that it had not been provided with adequate details about Miss Millard's proposed retirement considerations, nor any supporting evidence.

### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

Having found Miss Millard 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) (last updated: 28 January 2026), 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, not in the public interest, nor would it protect the public to take no further action.

The panel next considered a caution order and had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Caution order*' (Reference: SAN-2b Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following is stated:

*'A caution is only appropriate if the Committee has decided there's no risk to the public or to people using services that requires the professional's practice to be restricted. This means 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 Miss Millard's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case, and the finding of current impairment. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate, not in the public interest, nor would it protect the public to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Miss Millard'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 considered that Miss Millard has had minimal engagement with the NMC throughout these proceedings. She has not demonstrated a willingness to develop insight or remediate the concerns identified. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original substantive hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest.

The panel noted that Miss Millard does not intend to return to practise as a nurse. In view of Miss Millard's apparent clear settled intention not to return to nursing, 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 Millard has not shown remorse for her misconduct. Further, Miss Millard has not demonstrated any meaningful insight into her previous failings. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Miss Millard no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Miss Millard from practising in the future and

concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

The panel had regard to SAN-3 *Deciding between suspension and strike off* in the recently revised SG and, in particular, the last two bullet points:

- *Consider the professional's insight and attitude to addressing the concerns, and whether it is realistically possible that these will change positively during the suspension period. If it is unlikely the professional will try to address the concerns, there may not be appropriate for them to be suspended in the hopes that they will eventually return to practice.*
- *Professionals are under an obligation to cooperate with their regulator. Where professionals have failed to engage with the fitness to practise process, it won't usually be appropriate to use a suspension order as a means of giving them a 'last chance' to engage, reflect or show insight.*

The panel considered that there is no evidence before it to suggest that there is a realistic possibility that Miss Millard will engage more meaningfully in the future with the NMC proceedings. It further considered that there is no evidence to suggest that Miss Millard would develop any, or any sufficient insight during a further period of suspension, nor address the misconduct found by the previous panel.

The panel considered that it would be inappropriate to impose a further period of suspension as a means of giving Miss Millard a *'last chance'* to engage, reflect, or show insight. Further, the panel took into account that Miss Millard does not intend to practise as a registered nurse, and has asked via email for her name to be removed from the NMC register.

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

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Millard in writing.

That concludes this determination.