

**Teachers' Pension Scheme Pension Board (TPSPB)**  
**Service Delivery and Maintenance of Data Sub-committee meeting:**  
**20 June 2018**

**MINUTES**

<b>Present:</b>	
Dave Wilkinson (member representative) Chair	DW
Geoff Ashton (Independent Pension Specialist)	GA
Julie Huckstep (member representative)	JH
Trefor Llewellyn (employer representative) by telephone	TL
Jackie Wood (employer representative)	JW
Neville MacKay (Chair TPSPB)	NM
Sue Crane (DfE Senior Contract Manager)	SC
Anna Alderson (DfE Contract Manager)	AA
Neil Crombie (Teachers' Pensions)	NC
Paula Graham (Teachers' Pensions)	PG
Kathryn Symms (DfE Policy & Governance team leader) Secretariat	KS
<b>Apologies:</b> None	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
Agenda item 1	<p><b><u>Introduction, attendance, apologies:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DW welcomed attendees to the sub-committee meeting, and extended a welcome to the new TPSPB Chair, NM.</li> </ul>	
Agenda item 2	<p><b><u>Review of Actions:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All actions complete.</li> <li>JW was content that TP had made the letter to employers about Second Bite much clearer.</li> </ul>	
Agenda item 3	<p><b><u>Items raised at TPARG</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The item raised by TPARG for the sub-committee to scrutinise in detail was the <b>Bereavements</b> process and backlog. (Agenda item 7 refers).</li> <li>SC gave some background about TPARG, explaining that it is a DfE meeting that focuses on scheme administration. All agreed that the group is made up of knowledgeable users who are forward-looking – for example, discussing the practicalities of changing processes.</li> <li>TPARG is different to this sub-committee and is valuable, but it was agreed that the two should be closely aligned. TPARG will therefore continue to receive the SD sub-committee report, minutes and dashboard.</li> <li>NM explained that he would like to discuss governance structures more generally at a future full Board meeting.</li> </ul>	SD1/200618
Agenda	<b><u>Overview of the current major projects:</u></b>	

item 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Migration from RMH</b> – Although work is progressing, NC explained that it is likely that the implementation will take place after the September retirements exercise. The current environment is stable, so this was not seen as a risk.</li> <li>• <b>MDC</b>– SC noted the successful completion of the exercise with only around 200 employers left to on-board.</li> <li>• <b>MDC2</b> – SC updated that TP is currently working closely with payroll and software providers, for example, to establish how validation will work.</li> <li>• <b>Monthly Contribution Reconciliation (MCR)</b> – DW recognised that this was a very important piece of work that the Board should monitor closely.</li> <li>• <b>Data Strategy</b> – NM requested that TP’s formal plan and statistics provided to the Pensions Regulator be shared with the Board.</li> <li>• <b>Increase in Volume of Work</b> – TL challenged TP and DfE about how they were improving processes. PG explained that there are very regular DfE/TP meetings where processes are studied with a view to improving them.</li> <li>• DW requested that Increase in Volume of Work (an important area) should be prioritised at the next meeting. To support that a paper showing the annual membership profile for the past 5 years – including part-time workers should be provided with narrative. SC will also consider the School Workforce Census. NM requested that SC linked this to CEM benchmarking – in particular drivers of increasing costs.</li> <li>• <b>Employers reported to tPR</b> – JH asked that the numbers be clarified and in future explain the action the tPR has taken. TL requested a list of the independent schools involved.</li> </ul>	<p>SD2/200618</p> <p>SD3/20618</p> <p>SD4/200618</p>
Agenda item 5	<p><b><u>Visit to TPAS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DW explained that the visit to TPAS (with JH and NM) was very informative. It was particularly interesting to see the range of issues raised by TP members.</li> <li>• TPAS estimated that as well as the circa 75 written enquiries over the two year period covered, there were 1,000 telephone queries out of a total of 200,000 taken by TPAS advisers. This was seen as a relatively low number – especially given the size of the TPS membership.</li> <li>• NC had analysed the circa 75 queries and his view was that the low volume of queries was reassuring, as was the fact that many of the queries were members seeking advice, which TP would be unable to provide. Of the remaining cases, some did reference the telephony problems at TP last year. NC reassured the sub-committee that PATT and TPAS liaise regularly and TP is proactive in forewarning TPAS about what members may enquire about – eg the re-marriage exercise.</li> <li>• NM requested a formal annual report from TPAS, if they are willing, showing the complaint details and the date of</li> </ul>	<p>SD5/200618</p>

	receipt - beginning 31 March 2019.	
Agenda item 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Telephony</b> – PG explained that the expected April peak of calls had been handled effectively. TP had planned for various scenarios, and had deployed their plan to bring in extra resource and helpful IVR messages directing people to the website. The statistics showed the calls and answered and wait time was good; and the drop on complaints was very satisfactory.</li> <li>• SC emphasised the importance of forecasting; but that OM5 was still 3-4% lower than it should be. That OM is sometimes impacted by not being able to tell the member what they want to hear, but nevertheless will continue to be scrutinised.</li> <li>• DW requested that at the next sub-committee meeting the telephony data showed information for 12 months; and that the sub-committee see the reasons for contact. He also requested that TP report on any focus group research and activity on telephone communications.</li> </ul>	SD6/200618
Agenda item 6a	<p><b><u>“Good Standard of Service” - definition</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PG presented suggestions as to “what good looks like” and various measures she had gathered by her own research of other contact centres.</li> <li>• NC described the user-testing TP had carried out towards the end of 2017, using internal experts to test the contact centre member experience.</li> <li>• One further “good” service requirement could be “when the service is available” for example, for a decent length of time outside school hours.</li> <li>• NM asked whether TP measured all of the factors PG had listed and whether TP could show where they are on each of those now so that the sub-committee could track trends in future meetings.</li> <li>• Due to time constraints at the meeting, it was agreed that sub-committee members would email further comments to the secretariat.</li> </ul>	SD7/200618 SD8/200618
Agenda item 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bereavement Cases</b> – PG presented a paper which outlined some of the complexities involved in calculating benefits in respect of a teacher who dies in service.</li> <li>• PG assured the sub-committee that aged pensioner cases were all finalised or TP are waiting for information to process the case. The plan to bring all casework up to date by the end of July is still on track. BAU cases are already up to date.</li> <li>• If TP do not have everything up to date by the end of July, the sub-committee would like a report showing the reasons why and supporting data ie <i>cases in v cases cleared</i>. Otherwise it was agreed a short update would suffice.</li> <li>• PG described the work on bereavements that TP had undertaken – eg personalised service, telephoning the bereaved to talk them through forms etc. NM asked that the sub-committee be shown what TP’s definition/metrics of what a good service looks like.</li> </ul>	SD9/200618 SD10/200618
Agenda	<b><u>AOB</u></b>	

item 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subcommittee agreed that the main Board should be made aware of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NM's request that the whole Board discuss governance structures (the link between this sub-committee's remit and TPARG's is one reason for that request)</li> <li>• Telephony</li> <li>• Bereavement casework</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	The next meeting will take place on 26 September 2018 at Teachers' Pensions, Lingfield Point, Darlington.	

Minutes agreed (Chair):

Date: 27/06/2018

*D. Wilkinson*

Confirmed by circulation to sub-committee members on