



Royal College
of Midwives

NHS Staff Council Job Evaluation Group consultation on revisions to the national job matching profiles for nursing and midwifery – bands 4 to 6

The Royal College of Midwives (RCM) is the trade union and professional organisation that represents the vast majority of practising midwives in the UK, we also represent Maternity Support Workers (MSWs). It is the only such organisation run by midwives for midwives. The RCM is the voice of midwifery, providing excellence in representation, professional leadership, education and influence for and on behalf of midwives and MSWs. We actively support and campaign for improvements to maternity services and provide professional leadership for one of the most established clinical disciplines.

The RCM welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation and our views are set out below.

We support the NHS Job Evaluation Scheme, which underpins the Agenda for Change pay structure and ensures equal pay for work of equal value. Capacity building to ensure robust job matching and evaluation locally is essential, and the RCM will continue to encourage our members to get involved in job evaluation and promote opportunities for training. We do continue to be concerned that the increased visibility of job evaluation due to the nursing and midwifery profile review may increase demand locally for job description reviews which trusts and boards cannot meet and are lobbying nationally for increased investment in job evaluation. Reviews and re-banding exercises should continue throughout JEGs review but we acknowledge the increased pressure on systems.

In our engagement with members we often hear that due to staffing shortages, pressures on services and increased complexity of care, both midwives and MSWs are asked to carry out work and use skills of a higher band.

Our response to this consultation is informed by engagement with RCM members, we have also encouraged RCM stewards and trained job matchers to work in partnership with Heads of Midwifery to submit individual responses

We are pleased to note that many of the suggestions made by the RCM in our [initial response](#) to JEG's call for evidence have been captured in these drafts.

We had flagged the need for more consistency, across all the profiles, in the language used for the below factors, and note that these changes have been made across the profiles.

- Factor 15 (Emotional Effort): the relevant information should refer to “difficult family situations/baby death/congenital abnormalities, child protection issues”



Royal College of Midwives

- Factor 16 (Working Conditions): the relevant information should refer to “body fluids, faeces, vomit, smells and foul linen” for all the midwifery profiles.

General points

Midwifery 4 allows for a higher score up to 4a for emotional effort and Midwifery 5 and 6 the highest that can be scored for the same factor is 3b. This needs to be revisited.

Patients and clients is used interchangeably we suggest continuity of one term, preferably clients.

For Midwifery 5 and 6 there is no reference to a requirement that the individual must be a registered midwife on the NMC register and must carry out the requirements of ongoing revalidation

Midwifery 4

What types of jobs would you use this profile for?

Maternity Care Assistant
Infant Feeding Support
Nursery Nurse

Do you have midwifery jobs currently at band 4 that would not match to this profile? If not, why not?

n/a

Any further comments?

Midwifery 5

Minor amendments have been made to this profile to update language and terminology. Do you agree with these changes? Are the examples relevant?

Yes with some amends below.

Job Statement



Royal College
of Midwives

We note the changes made based on our initial consultation and suggest that the words 'and other' in front of birthing people are removed.

Factor 3

Suggest clinical midwifery problems is amended to 'judgements on a variety of clinical care findings which require investigation, analysis and assessment' for clarity

We note that JEG have incorporated the RCM's suggested changes to, **Factor 5**
Factor 6

Factor 13

Suggest instead of feeding clients as an example which is very rarely relevant for midwifery: 'Lifts equipment, moving and handling to assist clients, in clinical and non-clinical environments and use of non-moveable furniture, e.g birth pools.'

Do you have midwifery jobs currently at band 5 that would not match to this profile? If not, why not?

N/A

Any further comments

Midwifery 6

The review received evidence to suggest that the three existing profiles could be combined into one. Can you foresee any unintended consequences of doing this?

No

Does this profile work for non-traditional roles? (for example, does there need to be a wider range in effort factors to take non-traditional roles into account)

n/a at 6

Do you have midwifery jobs currently at band 6 that would not match to this profile? If not, why not?

No



Royal College
of Midwives

Any further comments

Job statement

We note the changes made based on our initial consultation and suggest that the words 'and other' in front of birthing people are removed.

Factor 3

Suggest clinical midwifery problems is amended to 'judgements on a variety of clinical care findings which require investigation, analysis and assessment' for clarity.

Suggest adding 'and other safeguarding' after 'including child protection'

We note that JEG have incorporated the RCM's suggested changes to,
Factor 6, Factor 9 and Factor 12.

Factor 13

Suggest instead of feeding clients as an example which is very rarely relevant for midwifery: 'Lifts equipment, moving and handling to assist clients, in clinical and non-clinical environments and use of non-moveable furniture, e.g birth pools.'