

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Thursday, 8 October 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Karen Faith Campbell
NMC PIN:	90D0317E
Part(s) of the register:	Cheshire
Relevant Location:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 & Sub part 2 Adult nursing level 1 – (19 September 1998) Adult nursing level 2 – (2 June 1992)
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Christine Nwaokolo (Chair, Lay member) Sarah Freeman (Registrant member) Mitchell Parker (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Nigel Ingram
Hearings Coordinator:	Isabella Payne
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Teri Howell, Case Presenter
Miss Campbell:	Not present and not represented at this hearing
Order being reviewed:	Suspension Order (5 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect on 17 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Campbell was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Miss Campbell's registered email address by secure email 7 September 2026.

Ms Howell, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the substantive order being reviewed, the time, date and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Miss Campbell's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Campbell has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Miss Campbell

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Miss Campbell. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Howell who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Miss Campbell. She submitted that Miss Campbell has voluntarily absented herself.

Ms Howell submitted that there had been no engagement at all by Miss Campbell with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.

Ms Howell referred the panel to the NMC documentation relating to several attempts made by the NMC, by telephone and email, to contact Miss Campbell to ascertain her attendance at this hearing. When the NMC attempted to contact Miss Campbell via telephone, the call did not connect, therefore Miss Campbell may have changed her telephone number but has not provided the NMC with the updated number. She submitted that Miss Campbell has not responded to any correspondence or attempts to contact her since the substantive order review hearing of 15 December 2025. She submitted that Miss Campbell has voluntarily absented herself and invited the panel to proceed in her absence.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel decided to proceed in the absence of Miss Campbell. In reaching this decision, the panel considered the submissions of Ms McFarlane and the advice of the legal assessor. It had particular regard to any relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- The panel has found effective service of the Notice of Hearing;
- No application for an adjournment has been made by Miss Campbell;
- Miss Campbell has not engaged with the NMC since the last review and has not responded to any of the communications to her about this hearing;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.
- She has not renewed her registration

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Miss Campbell.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to impose a striking-off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 17 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the fourth effective review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed on 17 May 2024 at a substantive meeting for a period of 12 months. This was reviewed on 2 June 2025 when the panel imposed a 6-month suspension order. A hearing on 6 November 2025 to review the order was adjourned. The order was then reviewed 15 December 2025 when the suspension order was extended for a further 5 months. The order was last reviewed on Thursday 9 April 2026 and the suspension order was extended for a further 5 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 17 October 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. On 1 August 2022 failed to ensure Patient A's safety in that you:*
 - a. Failed to carry out clinical observations during your initial visit;*
 - b. Failed to promptly call the co-ordinator for assistance or advice during your initial or subsequent visit;*
 - c. Failed to manage/ escalate the care of Patient A in that you failed to:*
 - i. Promptly inform Colleague A of Patient A's deterioration when you returned to the office/during handover, following your initial visit;*
 - ii. Promptly call a GP during or following your visit/s;*
 - iii. Promptly call an ambulance during or following your visit/s;*
 - d. Failed to 'ACT NOW' in accordance with the NEWS2 guidelines.*
- 2. On 1 August 2022, you failed to make a clear and accurate record of your visits to Patient A on EMIS, in that you recorded:*

- a. one visit when you had made two visits;*
- b. that you had taken observations at 12.30 when you had not;*
- c. that you had left Patient A in the care of his father at 12.30 when you had not;*
- d. that you had called 999 at 12.30 when you had not.*

3. Your actions as specified at any of the charges at 2a. – 2d. above were dishonest, in that you intended to mislead others to believe that you:

- a. had carried out one visit to Patient A when you knew that you had carried out two visits;*
- b. That you had carried out observations at 12.30 when you knew that you had not;*
- c. That you had left Patient A in the care of his father at 12.30 when you knew you had not;*
- d. That you had called 999 at 12.30 when you knew you had not.*

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

The last reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

At this hearing the panel determined that there has been no engagement by Miss Campbell since the last review hearing. The panel is aware of Miss Campbell's health challenges however it appears that her engagement is inconsistent and at odds with the process from being engaged to suddenly disengaging altogether with the NMC.

Miss Campbell has not demonstrated an understanding of how her actions put the patient at risk of harm.

In its consideration of whether Miss Campbell has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that there is nothing new before it to show that she has taken any steps to strengthen her practice, undertaken any

additional relevant training or provided a reflective piece addressing her misconduct.

The last reviewing panel determined that there remained a real risk of repetition of the kind found proved. Today's panel has noted that given the lack of engagement by Miss Campbell with these proceedings, it determined that the risk of repetition remains high. In light of this, this panel determined that Miss Campbell is still 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.

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

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

'The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of five months would provide Miss Campbell with an opportunity to engage with the NMC, or to establish that she has no interest in doing so. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

In the panel's consideration on sanction, it deliberated on the imposition of a striking-off order. However, primarily due to the lack of information into Miss Campbell's mental health and information from her GP or other health profession, it decided that, on balance, it would not be appropriate to impose a striking-off order absent of information about her health.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 17 May 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:

- Miss Campbell's explanation of why she has disengaged from the process and, if its a health reason, provision of a GP report*
- A GP report in any event*
- A reflective piece and insight to demonstrate an understanding of Miss Campbell's clinical failings and dishonesty*
- Evidence of any training and testimonials*
- Miss Campbell's engagement with the NMC process to indicate her professional intentions and response to her need for remediation in her case.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel considered carefully whether Miss Campbell's 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 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Howell on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Howell outlined the brief background and procedural history of the case; she referred the panel to the hearing bundle.

Ms Howell submitted that the misconduct was at the more serious end of the spectrum as it related directly to patient care and had the potential to result in fatal consequences or serious harm. She submitted that if there had not been intervention by other healthcare professionals, there would have been a confirmed risk of death. She invited the panel to apply weight to the seriousness of the potential consequences arising from Miss Campbell's failings.

Ms Howell further submitted that the panel had made finding that clinical records had been deliberately and intentionally recorded inaccurately, which added a further significance to the misconduct. She submitted that dishonesty breaches the fundamental tenets of the NMC code of conduct. Ms Howell invited the panel to place particular weight on both the seriousness of the misconduct and the dishonesty involved.

Ms Howell submitted that, notwithstanding the numerous previous hearings and reviews, there remained insufficient evidence of remediation, developed insight or reflections, or strengthening of Miss Campbell's clinical practice. She further submitted that there has been a continued lack of engagement with the regulatory process with no explanation.

Ms Howell submitted that, when balancing the seriousness of the misconduct, including the dishonesty involved, the lack of engagement from Miss Campbell, against the need to uphold confidence in the profession and maintain proper professional standards, it is imperative the panel find Miss Campbell's fitness to practice currently impaired.

Ms Howell reminded the panel that, following each review, the panel had provided recommendations as to the evidence it would expect to see at a future review. This included:

- *Miss Campbell's explanation of why she has disengaged from the process and, if its a health reason, provision of a GP report*
- *A GP report in any event*
- *A reflective piece and insight to demonstrate an understanding of Miss Campbell's clinical failings and dishonesty*
- *Evidence of any training and testimonials*
- *Miss Campbell's engagement with the NMC process to indicate her professional intentions and response to her need for remediation in her case.'*

Ms Howell submitted that there was no evidence that these recommendations had been undertaken or adhered to, and that Miss Campbell had therefore failed to demonstrate what is required of her to remain on the register.

Ms Howell submitted a further suspension order would be inappropriate given Ms Campbells lack of engagement and insight. She submitted that the previous suspension orders have not resulted in any meaningful improvement or remediation, and that Miss Campbell's continued lack of engagement indicated no intention to address the concerns.

Ms Howell submitted that there is an ongoing risk of repetition due to the lack of evidence of remediation and insight and allowing Miss Campbell to remain on the register would undermine public confidence in the profession. Ms Howell referred the panel to the NMC sanctions guidance REV-2h and invited the panel to consider a striking-off order the most appropriate sanction on the grounds of both public protection and 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 considered whether Miss Campbell's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Miss Campbell had insufficient insight. At this hearing the panel found that there had been no new evidence to suggest any form of developed insight. The panel noted the absence of evidence of reflection and testimonials. The panel noted that Miss Campbell had not attended the previous review hearing and had not adhered to its recommendations. It considered that there was no new evidence before it to demonstrate that Miss Campbell's insight had improved. The panel considered this was particularly important given the serious findings made about her clinical practice as well as her dishonesty. The panel noted that for the review in 2025, which was attended by Miss Campbell, she had provided a reflection and also spoke to the panel, however the panel had found her insight at time limited and still developing as she did not recognise how her conduct impacted patients and the profession as a whole.

The panel noted that there is no evidence of strengthened practice. Again, it recognised that for the review in 2025 Miss Campbell had completed courses, however that panel considered that the courses did not provide the depth required to strengthen her practice. Since then, there is no evidence of any steps Miss Campbell has taken to strengthen her practice.

The last reviewing panel determined that Miss Campbell was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel had not received any new information that would suggest she is not liable to repeat matters or that her practice is not a risk to profession or the public. In light of this, this panel determined that Miss Campbell is 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 and the reputation in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The finding made about Miss Campbell's practice were serious. Her clinical misconduct could have had extremely serious consequences, and her dishonesty also placed patients at risk. Miss Campbell breached numerous fundamental tenets. The panel

determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

The panel determined that Miss Campbell had not demonstrated that she was upholding the proper standards expected of a registered nurse. The panel considered the seriousness of the misconduct and the risks posed to patients and colleagues, as well as the dishonesty, the lack of remediation or developed insight, which undermined public confidence in the profession. It therefore considered her currently impaired on both grounds of public protection and public interest.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Campbell's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel noted that its powers are set out in Article 30 of the Order. The panel has also taken into account the 'NMC's Sanctions Guidance' (SG) and has borne in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, though any sanction imposed may have a punitive effect.

The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, the ongoing clinical risk, as well as the dishonesty, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Miss Campbell's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again'* The panel determined that Miss

Campbell's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the issues identified. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Miss Campbell's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original meeting, as well as her non engagement, and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Miss Campbell's misconduct and dishonesty.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. Despite there being a professional obligation on Miss Campbell to engage with proceedings, and to demonstrate why past professional performance was deficient, the panel noted that Miss Campbell had not complied with the previous reviewing panel's recommendations and that there has been no engagement or any explanation as to why. It considered that after two years, and without satisfactory evidence of remediation, developed insight, nor contextual health information, that a further suspension order would not be an effective sanction or maintain public confidence in the profession.

The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Miss Campbell no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel noted that Miss Campbell had previously expressed an interest in returning to the register, but she had not renewed her professional registration since 2024. It noted that registered nurses are aware that in order to revalidate their professional registration they must demonstrate evidence of continued professional development and reflection. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel also gave consideration to the NMC sanction guidance REV-2h, which expressly states that suspension orders are not intended to exist indefinitely and that it is neither in the interest of the public nor Miss Campbell to do so.

The panel attached considerable weight to the seriousness of the misconduct and the risk it posed on patients and colleagues and Miss Campbells further dishonestly. It considered that there was no new evidence brought before it that undermines the seriousness of the case. The panel therefore determined that on balance, there is no realistic prospect that Miss Campbell is likely to return to safe and unrestricted practice within a reasonable timeframe, and that it was necessary to take action to prevent Miss Campbell from practising in the future. It concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 17 October in accordance with Article 30

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Campbell in writing.

That concludes this determination.