## Teachers' Pension Scheme Pension Board (TPSPB) Information to Members and Communications Sub-Committee

Date: 11 December 2019

Present:		
David Trace	Member Representative - Chair	DT
Julie Huckstep	Member Representative – Vice Chair	JH
Susan Anyan	Independent Pension Specialist	SA
Jerry Glazier	Member Representative	JG
Dave Wilkinson	Member Representative	DW
David Butcher	Employer Representative	DB
Simon Lowe	Employer Representative	SL
Ian Payne	Employer Representative (by phone)	IP
Neil Crombie	TP Client Director	NC
Kerry Tate-King	TP Head of Engagement	KTK
Jo Cole	TP Engagement Team	JC
Peter Springhall	DfE Head of TPS Supplier Management	PS
Sue Crane	DfE Senior Contract Manager	SC
Kathryn Symms	DfE Policy Team Leader Casework &	KS
	Correspondence & TPSPB (Secretariat)	
Anna-Marie Alderson	DfE Contracts Manager	AMA
Apologies:		
None		

	Item	Action
Agenda item 1	Introduction, attendance, apologies:	
	Welcome and Apologies:	
	DT welcomed those in attendance.	
	Review of previous minutes:	
	<ul> <li>The minutes from the sub-committee meeting of 25 September 2019 were agreed as an accurate record. All actions were closed.</li> </ul>	
Agenda	Forward Work Plan – Annual Review of the Engagement Plan	
Item 2	<ul> <li>TPS Branding. JC introduced TP's presentation. She began by explaining how the rebranding work was progressing. TP had asked three agencies to pitch for the work to refresh the brand. TP need consistency across all communications – whoever and however that happens. Feedback from stakeholders on what they currently like or dislike also helped inform the choice of agency, and the three options that TP have already presented to TP staff, unions, employers and members.</li> <li>JC explained to the group, that although option 1 was the preferred option, it was important to note that elements of option 3 – especially empowering members to own their own pension – would be included in the final version.</li> <li>DW and JG were interested in the low volumes and make-up (mainly pensioner members) of the respondents. JC agreed,</li> </ul>	

	hut was a cured man have that they cure focus away no thay had	INAA /A A A A A A A
	but reassured members that through focus groups they had engaged with a few younger members. TP demonstrated how they had tried to engage younger members through social media, but acknowledged it was difficult – and likewise with deferred members.	IM1/111219
	<ul> <li>DW was disappointed the sub-committee had not seen the options until now, but all agreed to take an action to pass back comments through the secretariat.</li> <li>SC raised the importance of this work on continuing to</li> </ul>	IM2/111219
	<ul> <li>achieve and improve on OM2 and OM3.</li> <li>Webchat JC explained that Webchat was introduced just over a year ago – with around 60,000 chats lasting on</li> </ul>	
	average 7-8 minutes having taken place. TP want to gain feedback from users so that they can improve the service, so have introduced three feedback questions at the end of each conversation. This will be reported through OM 6.	
	<ul> <li>Improvements already in place include improved screens and a webform that, where a members question is not answered, it is a simple process to record the question for other TP colleagues to follow up.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Employers are very keen on Webchat being rolled out to them, so timing of that is under consideration.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Engagement Plan 2020 JC set out what they had learnt about various aspects of engagement. For example, how to improve and better target employer and member campaigns; how to widen research and the use of social media; what's worked well for training employers; and understanding the new website platform capability.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>There was discussion about how the "influencers" (such as McCloud, accepted schools) were taken account of in the plan.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>JG asked whether current communications with accepted schools intending to leave the scheme (and their members) had had an impact. TP could not definitively confirm that, but JC observed that some schools had changed their minds about leaving the scheme. DW recommended that TP flesh out more on what the workforce will miss out to employers, as well as members.</li> <li>JC outlined what the plan will deliver over and above what is</li> </ul>	IM3/111219
	<ul> <li>normally provided such as improve MPO for members and the employer portal dashboard for employers – for example, the ability to change contact details online. There will be more focus groups and improvements to the website.</li> <li>JG enquired about the number of MPO members who register but never re-visit the site. JC described the "dormancy" campaign and agreed to share data on % improvement following that. DW noted the disparity between academy MPO members (60%) v the maintained sector (50%), which prompted a request for further data on primary v secondary take-up.</li> </ul>	IM4/111219
Agenda Item 2a	Next topic for March 2020	
ILCIII Za	<ul> <li>It was agreed that Webchat would be the next forward work plan topic.</li> </ul>	IM5/111219
	It was agreed that the Valuation (accepted schools) should	IM6/111219

	<ul> <li>be a standing agenda item.</li> <li>The secretariat was asked to note MCR pilot (comms with employers); MPO (digital journey for members); and Institute of Customer Service progress as options for future meetings.</li> </ul>	IM7/111219
Agenda Item 3	<ul> <li>Paragraphs 59 and 60 of the quarterly report provide an update on progress on the joint plan for working together. The annex at page 28 provided more details, and subcommittee members were invited to comment. DW welcomed the joint working with MATs and Academies, especially joining group meetings. It was agreed generally that this was a very positive development.</li> <li>JG enquired whether TP thought that academies were tardy in completing paperwork for members. NC was not aware of any significant problems but agreed to flag to the Operations Team and report back, if appropriate. NC commented that risk based assurance will also help with this issue in future.</li> </ul>	IM8/111219
Agenda Item 4	<ul> <li>TPR Review – Comms Challenges</li> <li>KTK explained that TP is keen that members do not go immediately to the Regulator when they are concerned about "missing service". (where members are confused about whether missing service meant that contributions had not been paid over to TP, rather than it being a data issue). This is because of the 17 whistleblower cases that TP has recently resolved.</li> <li>She sought views as to how this could be achieved. It was agreed that KTK would arrange for revised guidance on the website making it clear that members should contact their employer (at the time of the missing service) in the first instance, and then TP if that proved fruitless.</li> </ul>	IM9/111219
Agenda Item 5	McCloud Communications     KTK referred to page 31 of the quarterly report when she gave her update on McCloud engagement. There have been 77,000 visits to the website, with hardly any enquiries by telephone or letter. All agreed that the comms were clear and FAQs helpful – but it was noted that Unions were receiving many enquires.	
Agenda Item 6	Review of Papers	
Agenda Item 7	Agree Key Issues from the Meeting / Report to highlight at the next TPSPB meeting  • Joint working with ESFA • TPS branding refresh • Engagement Plan 2020	
Agenda Item 8	Agree whether any individual papers or presentations should be shared with remaining Board members:	

	TP's Engagement Plan 2020 presentation	IM10/111219
Agenda Item 9	As it was DT's last meeting, he thanked everybody for their contributions at sub-committee meetings.	
Next meeting	25 March 2020, Bishopsgate House, Darlington	

Minutes agreed by Chair: Date: 16 December 2019

Confirmed by circulation to sub-committee members on: 16 December 2019

Ratified at sub-committee meeting on 25 March 2020