**Teachers’ Pension Scheme Pension Board (TPSPB)**

**Service Delivery and Maintenance of Data Sub-committee meeting:**

**26 September 2018**

**MINUTES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:** |  |
| Dave Wilkinson (member representative) Chair | DW |
| Geoff Ashton (Independent Pension Specialist) | GA |
| Julie Huckstep (member representative) | JH |
| Jackie Wood (employer representative) | JW |
| Neville MacKay (Chair TPSPB) | NM |
| Anna Alderson (DfE Contract Manager) | AA |
| Neil Crombie (Teachers’ Pensions) | NC |
| Paula Graham (Teachers’ Pensions) | PG |
| Kathryn Symms (DfE Secretariat) | KS |
| Matthew McNaughton (TP Risk Management & MCR Project) | MM |
| Helen Fisher (DfE, Secretariat) | HF |
| Mark Dutson (DfE Contract Team) (observer) | MD |
| **Apologies:** Trefor Llewellyn and Sue Crane | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Action** |
| Agenda item 1 | **Introduction, attendance, apologies:**   * DW welcomed attendees to the sub-committee meeting and introduced Helen Fisher (secretariat). * DW accepted apologies for Trefor Llewellyn and Sue Crane. |  |
| Agenda item 2 | **Review of previous minutes**   * Minutes from 20/06/2018 were agreed. |  |
| Agenda item 3 | **Review of Actions:**   * AA stated that one action (TPARG) would be covered in agenda item 4; and that all other actions were covered in Paper 6 and were closed. |  |
| Agenda item 4 | **Items raised at TPARG**   * No items had been raised at the TPARG meeting to be discussed at the sub-committee meeting. * **TPARG role:** KS explained that TPARG’s role differs from this sub-committee’s; and both are valued by the department. A paper has been drafted for the main TPSPB board meeting in October, which sets out the 3-tier governance structure of the TPS. KS explained that TPARG sit within the management tier as a consultative body and discuss issues on a case by case basis; whereas sub-committees sit within the monitoring/oversight level of governance. * KS suggested that an employer and member TPARG rep could be invited as observers to the March 2019 sub-committee meeting. * JH agreed this would be helpful, and she observed that co-opting TPARG members to the sub-committee may make the sub-committee too large. * JW and NM also agreed to the suggestion, and acknowledged that TPARG should remain separate as they play a different role, and it would be a loss to amalgamate them. * DW agreed that TPARG should remain separate, but that the sub-committee does have the flexibility to co-opt TPARG members. KS stated that once TPARG members had observed a meeting, and the Board had had chance to consider the Governance paper in October, a final decision could be made. * DW agreed that inviting two observers to the meeting in March would offer the opportunity for improved links with the sub-committee. | SD1/260918 |
| Agenda item 5 | **Monthly Contribution Reconciliation**   * NC provided an update of the current pilot exercise. Although it is concerning that were mismatches in data tested as part of the pilot exercise, NC reassured the sub-committee that TP is working closely with payroll and software providers. * NC explained that training and education will resolve some of the issues, and checking the data had been a valuable exercise. * Stakeholders are generally positive about MCR because they understand that the right solution is being sought. TP is tracking progress in data improvement. * DW asked that MCR remains a standing agenda item, so the committee can keep track of progress. | SD2/260918 |
| Agenda item 6 | **Increase in volume of work**   * DW referred to annex 1 of the report which detailed the membership profile over the last 5 years. * NC explained that overall the membership has increased by 18% and that there has also been an increase in the level of contact. Discussions with the department around resources are ongoing. * NC explained that the retirement trend is showing that members are retiring half a year later than they were five years ago, this is the same for both the male and female population. * JW asked NC to present “age at retirement” for information to the sub-committee. * JW asked for clarification around deferred members. TP explained that there is a current deferred members tracing exercise (due to complete in April 2019), which is contacting members where pension benefits are due but remain unclaimed. * NC explained that members can have multiple statuses i.e. they can be a pensioner and an active member if they have been re-employed after taking their benefits. A deferred member may be working in the teaching arena, but not in pensionable service; therefore, the deferred figures appear high, but may not be a true reflection of a member’s employment. NC explained the definition of an active member for the purposes of the accounts and how this had changed in 2014, leading to more members being categorised as deferred. He also noted that a different definition is often used when engaging with members, meaning a wider group is included in communications. * DW suggested that engagement with deferred members could be something for the Information to Members sub-committee to consider, as deferred members (including part-time workers) may benefit from more TP engagement. | SD3/260918  SD4/260918 |
| Agenda item 7 | **Bereavements and Good Standard of Service**   * AA gave confirmation that the pre-2017 bereavement backlog cases are now completed. The report gives an update on action points 7, 9 and 10 which are complete. A small number of cases are awaiting a 3rd party response.      * PG confirmed that the measure of a good standard of service uses the performance metrics (KPI’s and SLAs), in addition to the outcomes which measure customer satisfaction. * It was agreed that SLA/KPIs are required, but that understanding member feedback and acting on that is important. NC explained that a wide range of measures such as complaints upheld, ombudsman reports and focus groups is used. * DW pointed out that “good” is different for different case types – e.g. deferred, pensioner and active members; and different types of contact e.g. it is good service to provided bereaved families with a point of contact. * Understanding the member and employer experience is essential to deliver a tailored and flexible service. NM suggested a short definition of what a good standard of service looks like would be helpful. | SD5/260918 |
| Agenda item 8 | **Telephony**   * PG explained that the contact centre is stable. There are no issues with waiting times, but the service remains closely monitored. * The sub-committee agreed that telephony should become BAU, with no need for a specific mention on the agenda. * DW requested that the performance metrics table should remain part of the Board report. | SD6/260918 |
| Agenda item 9 | **tPR engagement**   * NC explained that TP and tPR already have a good working relationship, for example, quarterly tele-kits, but that there is to be a more proactive engagement planned with TPS and some other larger schemes. * Data Strategy: NC explained that the Data Strategy is being reviewed in light of MDC and MCR. He suggested this as a potential future deep dive topic. * DW asked for more detail of employers reported to tPR. It was agreed that sector information should be supplied to the sub-committee, to enable the sub-committee to understand the quantum of non-compliance. * JW asked for clarification on member impact. NC confirmed that TP minimise the impact by taking action to ensure they get all the information needed. * NM suggested that the sub-committee review the tPR annual public service governance and administration survey. [http://www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/docs/public-service-research-summary-2018.pdf](http://www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/docs/public-service-research-summary-2018.pdf%20) * Alongside the annual TPAS report, this would be a useful source of information to help validate TP’s standard of service. * AA explained that wider DfE relationships have been built to share information across departments, this collaboration will be ongoing. | SD7/260918 |
| Agenda item 10 | **Discuss sub-committee papers**   * DW opened up a discussion about the dashboard which was well-received. * JW requested information about repayments and how TP deal with these as this was an area where there is a relatively high number of complaints. PG explained that this was due to the process being adopted to prioritise work across TP. Repayments is an area that has temporarily been de-prioritised in favour of more sensitive areas of work until the discussion with the department about resources is resolved. | SD8/260918 |
| Agenda item 11 | **Consideration of actions being taken to address issues**   * Issues log discussed, sub-committee members were aware of the ongoing actions. |  |
| Agenda item 12 | **Deep Dive Topics**   * MCR: update on readiness state of employers * Data Strategy * Staff training (including succession planning, skill base) * Repayments and Correspondence – areas of high volume currently * DW suggested that the operational risk log is reviewed (top 5 risks), this may influence the deep dive topics * DW suggested that Scheme valuation be a topic on all sub-committees ensuring each focuses on their particular area. | SD9/260918 |
| Agenda item 13 | **Agree key issues from the meeting/report to highlight to the next TPSPB**   * Bereavements – to remain under scrutiny, but telephony is BAU * Deep Dive – suggested topics * Valuation |  |
| Agenda item 14 | **AOB**   * None |  |
|  | The next meeting will take place on 12 December 2018 at Teachers’ Pensions, Lingfield Point, and Darlington. |  |

Minutes agreed (Chair): D. Wilkinson Date: 02 October 2018

Confirmed by circulation to sub-committee members on 02 October 2018

To be ratified at the sub-committee meeting on 12 December 2018