

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Tuesday, 1 April 2025**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Lucy Pollard	
NMC PIN	17K0608E	
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – sub part 1 Learning Disabilities Nursing – level 1	
Relevant Location:	Essex	
Type of case:	Lack of competence	
Panel members:	Paul Grant Donna Green Anjana Varshani	(Chair, lay member) (Registrant member) (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Fiona Moore	
Hearings Coordinator:	Bartek Cichowlas	
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Vida Simpeh, Case Presenter	
Miss Pollard	Not present and unrepresented	
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (12 Months)	
Fitness to practise:	Impaired	
Outcome:	Conditions of practice order (6 months)	

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Pollard was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Miss Pollard's registered email address by secure email on 3 March 2025.

Ms Simpeh, 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, dates and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Miss Pollard'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 Pollard 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 Pollard

The panel next considered an application from Miss Pollard seeking an adjournment of the hearing. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of the case presenter who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Miss Pollard.

Ms Simpeh referred the panel to the email note dated 1 April 2025 from Miss Pollard requesting an adjournment of today's proceedings. In the email, Miss Pollard indicated that [PRIVATE]. Ms Simpeh referred the panel to the case of *R v Jones* [2009] EWCA Civ 824 and submitted that while Miss Pollard had made an application for an adjournment, it is highly unlikely for the case to be relisted prior to the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, given that it expires five days from the date of the current hearing. As a

panel must review this substantive order before its expiry to protect the public, she submitted that it is in the public interest to proceed in the absence of Miss Pollard.

Ms Simpeh also submitted that Miss Pollard has in the past engaged with the proceedings, and provided documentation at previous review hearings. She submitted that any unfairness caused by proceeding in absence is mitigated by the fact that Miss Pollard has submitted a reflective piece as well as testimonials for today's review hearing. She finally submitted that it would be fair, appropriate and proportionate to proceed, as the charges found proved are serious and reviewing this order is necessary to protect the public.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Miss Pollard. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of the case presenter, the representations from Miss Pollard 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:

- Miss Pollard has informed the NMC that she has received the Notice of Hearing, and the NMC has made further efforts on the morning of today's hearing to secure her presence.
- There is no guarantee that an adjournment will secure Miss Pollard's presence at a future date.
- Public protection concerns may arise should the case be adjourned and not relisted prior to the expiry of the order.
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.
- Miss Pollard has submitted further documentation which will be considered by the panel at this review

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

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

Prior to the commencement of the hearing, the panel was provided with an email from Miss Pollard, dated 31 March 2025, in which she made a request that this hearing be held in private. She stated:

‘[PRIVATE]’

The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the ‘Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004’, as amended (the Rules).

Ms Simpeh indicated that she opposed the application that the hearing should be held in private. [PRIVATE]. Ms Simpeh submitted that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that holding the hearing in private is justified by the interests of any party or that it is otherwise in the public interest.

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel determined to refuse the application to hear the hearing entirely in private as it is not sufficiently justified by the interests of any party.

[PRIVATE]. The panel therefore determined to reject the application to have the entire case heard in private.

The panel determined, however, that should any matters relating to [PRIVATE] arise, those parts may be held in private.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to vary the current conditions of practice order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 6 April 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the ‘Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001’ (the Order).

This is the fifth review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 9 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 8 March 2021. The order was reviewed on 23 November 2021 and the conditions of practice order was varied under Article 30(2) and (4) Order and then extended for a further 6 months. The order was further reviewed on 24 June 2022 where the conditions of practice order was extended for a period of 9 months. The order was again reviewed on 24 February 2023 where the conditions of practice order was extended for a period of 12 months. The 12 month conditions of practice order was extended for a further period of 12 months on 4 April 2024.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 6 April 2025.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The charges found proved by way of admission which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

That you, a Registered Nurse employed at Cygnet Victoria House

- 1. On 13 December 2018 signed the medication record to indicate that you had administered the following medication to Patient A when you had not:*
 - a) Relvar Ellipta inhaler **[Proved by admission]***
 - b) Two 25mg Clozapine tablets **[Proved by admission]***
- 2. On 13 December 2018 signed the medication record to indicate that you had administered to Patient B three 100mg Clozapine tablets, when in fact you had not. **[Proved by admission]***
- 3. On 13 December 2018 signed the medication record to indicate that you had administered a 50mg Amisulpride tablet to Patient B, when in fact you had not. **[Proved by admission]***

4. On 26 January 2019 documented that Patient E had been compliant in taking his medication when in fact Patient E did not have a prescription for medication. **[Proved by admission]**
5. On 12 February 2019 failed to administer Bictegravir Emtricitabine Tenofovir to Patient C. **[Proved by admission]**
6. On 12 February 2019 signed the medication record to indicate that you had administered 1mg Lorazepam to Patient C when you had not.
[Proved by admission]
7. On 14 February 2019 you administered to Patient D three 100mg Quetiapine tablets instead of one 300mg Quetiapine XL tablet. **[Proved by admission]**
8. On 14 February 2019 you signed the medication record to indicate that you had administered Oxycodone to Patient D when in fact you had not.
[Proved by admission]

AND your fitness to practice is impaired by reason of your lack of competence.'

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

'The panel first considered whether Miss Pollard's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted Miss Pollard's representations in her email dated 22 February 2023, where she stated that she had tried to secure employment as a registered nurse, but it had been difficult for her to gain employment with the current conditions of practice order in place and she is now trained as an aesthetics practitioner. The panel was of the view that Miss Pollard has not yet had the opportunity to strengthen her practice in relation to her failings, which were deficits of basic nursing skills, and has not been able to provide any evidence that she has complied with the current conditions of practice order due to her inability to secure employment as a registered nurse.

The panel took into account that Miss Pollard has shown a degree of remorse with regards to her failings, has expressed her passion in the nursing profession and her readiness to return to nursing practice. However, it was concerned that Miss Pollard has shown minimum insight into the impact of her failings in medication administration on patients under her care and public safety. It considered the testimonial dated 19 November 2021 which attested to Miss Pollard's competence in medication administration in aesthetics practice, however, the panel was of the view that the testimonial does not attest to her competence with relation to the specific failings identified in her nursing practice. The panel therefore determined that Miss Pollard has not yet demonstrated that she has strengthened her practice with regards to the failings in her nursing practice and concluded that there remains a real risk of repetition and a consequent risk of significant harm to patients under her care and to the wider public.

The last reviewing panel determined that Miss Pollard was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has not received any new information that the circumstances had changed. In light of this, this panel determined that Miss Pollard is liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved and there remains a risk of harm to the public. 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 Pollard's fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Pollard's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register 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 and emails from Miss Pollard. It has taken account of the submissions made by Mr D'Alton.

Mr D'Alton submitted that Miss Pollard's fitness to practice remains impaired and invited the panel to consider a variation of a conditions of practice order. He submitted that Miss Pollard is not currently working in a role as a registered nurse but remains working in her self-employed aesthetics business. While as part of this Miss Pollard will administer some prescribed medication this is not comparable to the volume and type of medication that would be administered if she was working within a care environment as a registered nurse. Therefore, there is a limited amount of strengthening of practice that Miss Pollard has been able to demonstrate that would address the failings identified in some of the basic nursing skills.

Mr D'Alton submitted that from the email documentation received from Miss Pollard she has sought to address these concerns with obtaining supervision when administering prescribed medication as part of her aesthetics practice but that more evidence of longevity of this improvement is required.

Mr D'Alton submitted that the reflective piece that Miss Pollard provided shows developing insight. He submitted that while there is some evidence of a strengthening of practice this is limited due to the difficulties Miss Pollard has experienced in securing employment as a registered nurse.

Mr D'Alton submitted that a conditions of practice order remains appropriate to provide for the public protection and that workable and proportionate conditions

could be formulated. He submitted that a variation to some of the conditions to more accurately reflect Miss Pollard's current employment as an aesthetic practitioner would be appropriate and made suggestions that the panel may wish to consider.

The panel also had regard to Miss Pollard's written representations showing her completing online training in medications administration courses and evidence of her being supervised while administering medication.

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 Pollard's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Miss Pollard had developing insight. At this hearing the panel had sight of Miss Pollard's written reflective piece and her continued engagement with the NMC.

The panel noted that Miss Pollard has completed a number of recent online courses relating to the administration of aesthetics medication and that she has been receiving supervision in this area. However, the panel considered that it would be of value to help strengthen her practice if Miss Pollard was able to attend a practical course on medication administration. The panel further noted that a number of the training certificates Miss Pollard submitted and the testimonials are from 2019 or 2021 and that given nearly five years has passed since then more recent examples would be of benefit to show current strengthening of practice.

The panel considered that as Miss Pollard was not currently working as a registered nurse there is a limited amount of strengthening of practice that she has been able to demonstrate. Therefore, there remains a risk of repetition.

The last reviewing panel determined that Miss Pollard was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has heard no new evidence which would change this view. In light of this, this panel determined that Miss Pollard is now 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 Pollard's fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'Having found Miss Pollard'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, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Miss Pollard'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 and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen

again.’ The panel considered that Miss Pollard’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 imposing a varied conditions of practice order on Miss Pollard’s 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 accepted that Miss Pollard has been complying with current substantive conditions of practice as far as possible due to their current employment status but is engaging with the NMC and is willing to comply with any conditions imposed.

The panel was of the view that a varied conditions of practice order is sufficient to protect patients and the wider public interest, noting as the original panel did that there were no deep seated attitudinal problems and Miss Pollard has been engaged in the process and continuing to show developing insight. In this case, there are conditions which could be formulated to 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 Miss Pollard’s case as the problems raised are not attitudinal in nature and could be remediated by further strengthening of practice.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of 12 months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 6 April 2024. 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:*
 - a) *a single substantive employer; and/or*
 - b) *your self-employed aesthetics practice.*

You cannot be employed by an agency.
2. *Where you are engaged in medicines administration, management, and documentation, including prescription only medicines for the purposes of aesthetics, this must be under direct supervision until such time as you have been formally assessed as meeting the requirements by another registered nurse, or other registered medical practitioner.*
3. *If employed under condition 1. A) you must adhere to the following:*
 - a) *Having been formally assessed on medicines administration, management, and documentation, you must send a copy of this assessment to the NMC within seven days of the sign off date.*
 - b) *You must have fortnightly formal meetings with your supervisor, mentor, or line manager to discuss your progress in relation to meeting the required standards of medicines administration, management, and documentation. These meetings should include discussions of any clinical incidents and near misses.*
 - c) *You must obtain a report which covers all of the matters set out in condition 3.B) from your line manager, supervisor, or mentor and send it to your case officer prior to any substantive order review.*
4. *If working under condition 1. B) you must adhere to the following:*

- a) *Having been formally assessed on medicines administration, management, and documentation for the purposes of aesthetics, you must send a copy of this assessment to the NMC within seven days of the sign off date.*
 - b) *You must keep a record of all medication supervisions and send this record to the NMC before any substantive order review.*
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 the NMC 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 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 12 months.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 6 April 2024 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of the order, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well Miss Pollard has complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order for another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Miss Pollard's attendance at the hearing;*
- An updated reflective piece showing insight and recent strengthening of practice.*

This will be confirmed to Miss Pollard in writing.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Pollard's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as whether the nurse, midwife, or nursing associate can practise kindly, safely, and professionally. In considering this case, the panel has carried out a

comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it has noted the decision of the last panel, this panel has exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle, documentation submitted by Miss Pollard. It has taken account of the submissions made by the case presenter on behalf of the NMC. She gave a background to the case and referred the panel to the case of *Abrahaem and GMC* [2008] EWHC 183 (Admin), which states that: *'there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner, at a review, to demonstrate that he/she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement, sufficiently addressed the past impairment'*.

Ms Simpeh submitted that the present conditions of practice order should be confirmed and extended for a further 6 months. She accepted that Miss Pollard has engaged with the proceedings, provided a reflective piece, and acknowledged that there is no intention that a substantive order should last indefinitely.

However, she submitted that there is insufficient evidence for the panel to conclude that Miss Pollard no longer presents a risk of repeating the type of conduct detailed in the charges found proved. Ms Simpeh submitted that the certification Miss Pollard provided is insufficient to demonstrate understanding of the proper administering of medication within nursing practice and that the reflective piece did not demonstrate understanding of the impact of her actions on patients. Ms Simpeh also referred the panel to a part of the reflective piece in which there is a suggestion that there may have been a further medication administration error while Miss Pollard was subject to the current conditions of practice order, and that this may heighten the risk to the public. For these reasons Ms Simpeh invited the panel to find Miss Pollard impaired on the grounds of public protection.

Ms Simpeh also submitted that a member of the public would be concerned to learn that Miss Pollard is permitted to practise without restriction when she has not yet demonstrated strengthened practice, and therefore impairment should also be found on the grounds of public interest.

On sanction, Ms Simpeh submitted that an order that does not restrict Miss Pollard's practice would be insufficient to address the risk of repetition of the matters proved. She submitted that given the continued, albeit insufficient, engagement with the NMC, a further conditions of practice order would be a proportionate sanction to address the public interest and public protection concerns. A six month conditions of practice order would, in her submission, provide further opportunity to reflect and undertake further training.

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 Pollard's fitness to practise remains impaired.

In its consideration of whether Miss Pollard has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account the additional training certificates and testimonials Miss Pollard has provided and the reflective piece written by Miss Pollard dated 24 February 2025 following a further medication error whilst employed at a nursing home.

The panel determined that the documentation provided is insufficient to demonstrate full insight and remediation. The panel was of the view that the reflective piece is insufficient to show a full understanding of the impact of her conduct on patients and the profession. It noted that there is reference to a new incident which may heighten its assessment of the risk to the public. The panel also found that all of the testimonials, dated between 2019 and 2023, were not current nor relevant to the charges found proved. Regarding the training certification provided, the panel noted that it had limited details as to the contents and length of the courses taken, and that the information it did have showed that they related to Miss Pollard's aesthetic practice, not the medication administration concerns found at the original hearing.

In light of this, this panel determined that Miss Pollard 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, given the length of time that this substantive order has been in place, there is a public interest in seeing this matter moved towards a final resolution, and therefore the panel determined that a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Pollard'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, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Miss Pollard'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 and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.'* The panel considered that Miss Pollard's deficiencies were not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the risk of repetition 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 varied conditions of practice order on Miss Pollard's 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 could not ascertain whether Miss Pollard had fully complied with all of the conditions, given the limited information before it, but acknowledged that she has been engaging with the NMC over the course of these proceedings.

The panel was of the view that a varied conditions of practice order is sufficient to protect patients and the wider public interest, noting as the original panel did that the concerns found were capable of being addressed. In this case, there are conditions that could be formulated which would protect patients during the period they are in force.

The panel understood that Miss Pollard is working as an aesthetics practitioner in an unregulated environment. However, with regard to the present proceedings, the panel determined that the concerns found proved could not be adequately addressed solely through experience gained in this role. The panel was of the view that to demonstrate full and proper remediation and competence, it is necessary for Miss Pollard to do this in a capacity as a registered nurse in a regulated clinical environment.

The panel was mindful that this was the fifth review of an order first imposed in March 2021 and that over this significant period of time Miss Pollard had not made appreciable progress towards returning to unrestricted practice. In light of these circumstances the Panel did give serious consideration to the imposition of a suspension order or a striking-off order. It was cognisant of the case of *Busari v NMC* 2016 EWHC 2547 which makes it clear that orders such as the one imposed upon Miss Pollard's registration are not supposed to be extended indefinitely, but rather support a safe transition back to unrestricted practice.

Therefore Miss Pollard should be aware that any future panel may reach a different conclusion to this panel, regarding the continued suitability of a conditions of practice order, should Miss Pollard fail to demonstrate significant progress in addressing the concerns in this case. However, on balance and given Miss Pollard's continued

engagement this panel decided that the concerns are currently capable of being addressed by appropriately formulated conditions.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of six months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 6 April 2025. 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 a single substantive employer. You cannot be employed by an agency.
2. Where you are engaged in medicines administration, management, and documentation, including prescription only medicines for the purposes of aesthetics, this must be under direct supervision until such time as you have been formally assessed as competent by another registered nurse, or other registered medical practitioner.
3. You must undertake a verified medicines management course which includes medicines administration and documentation.
4. When employed under condition 1) you must adhere to the following:
 - a) Having been formally assessed as competent in medicines administration, management, and documentation, you must send a copy of this assessment to the NMC within seven days of the sign off date.
 - b) You must have monthly formal meetings with your clinical supervisor, mentor, or line manager to discuss your progress in relation to meeting the required standards of medicines administration, management, and

documentation. These meetings should include discussions of any clinical incidents and near misses.

- c) You must obtain a report which covers all of the matters set out in condition 3b from your line manager, clinical supervisor, or mentor and send it to your case officer prior to any substantive order review.
5. You must provide up-to-date training certificates, relevant to the original concerns, and send to your case officer at least seven days prior to a substantive order review.
 6. You must provide a reflection which addresses the original concerns - the impact on patients, your learning and action you have taken to address these, and send to your case officer at least seven days prior to a substantive order review.
 7. 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.
 8. You must keep the NMC 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.
 9. You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:
 - a) Any organisation 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.
 10. 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.

11. 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 six months.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 6 April 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of the order, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well Miss Pollard has complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order for another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Miss Pollard's attendance at a future review
- An indication of Miss Pollard's employment intentions with regards to practising as a registered nurse

This will be confirmed to Miss Pollard in writing.

That concludes this determination.