Would 'opinions' work better here?

5 FACTS: USS PENSIONS

Careful! This isn't true, is it? Perhaps you could say "benefits are expensive once we choose to make them

Not sure about this... By closing DB accrual you could find you enter a spiral of funding problems, as others who closed their schemes have found.

1 CURRENT USS PENSION BENEFITS ARE UNAFFORDABLE

so with the de-risking plans"

Every three years there is a valuation of Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) to ensure it has sufficient funds to pay the pensions already earned, and that future contributions into the scheme will cover the cost of anticipated payments for pensions and other benefits, such as ill-health, when due. Calculations are complex and involve making a number of assumptions about the future. The USS Trustees must ensure that the costs and risks are understood, especially if the future does not turn out as expected.

Pensions are paid through employer and employee contributions, as well as investment returns. If the current level of pension benefits continued to be available this would result in an additional cost of at least 11.4% of salaries (currently Misleading! Depends on employers contribute 18%; employees 8%.) This would be choices over the unaffordable to employers and any increase in the member contribution rate would be difficult for many USS members, particularly early career staff." who will instead be screwed-over the most by our proposals." Best to be honest! Under the contribution of the contribut

2 IT IS NECESSARY TO MAKE USS SUSTAINABLE AND SECURE FOR THE LONG-TERM (Remember that you created this deficit with the de-risking plans)

Change is needed to address the scheme's deficit and the rising cost of future pensions. The independent Pensions Regulator has expressed its concerns over the future of the scheme.

Employers' proposals for reform will address the scheme's

funding challenges so that universities can continue to offer attractive pensions benefits to staff.

Haven't staff made it clear these proposals are entirely unattractive?

Most universities can't afford to pay more into pensions OK, but perhaps without diverting money from other central areas, such as buildings too teaching or research, reducing their positive impact. Increasing contributions could damage the high standards that students, research funders and others rightly expect. It could even undermine the sustainability of some institutions. The option of no reform would be a dangerous gamble that employers are unwilling to take.

At least you've built up billions in sustainability reserves: Claw back pay from VCs, perhaps?

FOLLOWING THE REFORMS, USS WILL CONTINUE TO OFFER ATTRACTIVE BENEFITS Not for you to judge!

Employers want to provide good pensions to existing, and This language doesn't work wis legends on the interest over the employers' proposal is to offer market-leading defined and with academic contribution saving (through the USS Investment Builder) to all employees, on all salaries, from 1 April 2019.

Understandably, many members want to know what the employers' proposed benefit reform will mean to them. *Good!*Universities UK (UUK) has worked with its advisors, Aon, to estimate how much members would save towards their pension under the employers' proposals. Aon's modelling is based on USS scheme data to ensure the credibility of the information provided. Aon's modelling demonstrates that through the employers' proposal, competitive and generous pensions will

Is this true? Or did they say something slightly different? Please check!

Not true! You've used different investment forecasts, remember? Remove this:

Overall comments: A good start to addressing the kinds of questions people will have, but at best misleading and at worst just incorrect. Feel free to see me to discuss. There's still time to put this right!

remain even though the scheme faces significant funding challenges. You can view the modelling on the Employers

Pension Forum website.

Perhaps link instead to Mike Otsuka's blog (Google "Otsuka UUK sow's ear").

While a defined contribution scheme does not offer the same guaranteed pensions as defined benefits, it does have advantages to members such as greater flexibility and choice.

Do you think members prefer security or flexibility? Any thoughts? All members will have their own retirement savings account that they and their employer pay into. These savings will be invested in funds selected by the Trustees, with choice for members if they wish, and employers will pay the costs of investment charges, unlike with many other schemes.

Employers will continue to pay their current contribution of too little 18% towards USS; that is our pledge. Employers also propose to avoid allowing members to pay lower contributions than the current in 8%. This means more employees can afford to save for their retirement? Elaborate pension, and more options for members to choose how much they save. Nice 'pledge', but not very honest! Only 13.25% actually goes into individual pensions... the rest is things like 'deficit

USS offers very valuable life assurance alongside ongoing recovery' benefits for family and other beneficiaries. It also offers substantial benefits in the event of ill-health. Employers recognise just how important these benefits are, and propose to maintain them. Good! But retaining these benefits also comes out of the 18% above, so perhaps you shouldn't claim

The employers' proposal would not involve closing the defined credit benefits structure entirely; it could be reintroduced if the twice financial outlook for the scheme improves at future valuations.

"... and we agreed to it". Perhaps mention here that you can always ask for increased de-risking to make it look like the valuation has deteriorated if you so wish.



5 FACTS: USS PENSIONS

THE BENEFIT REFORM PROPOSALS ARE BEING **CONSIDERED BY EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVES** Perhaps "... have been roundly rejected by employee representatives" is better.

Any potential changes to member benefits or contributions are negotiated within the Joint Negotiating Committee (JNC), and once decided upon in the JNC any proposed changes will be subject to a full consultation with all affected employees. The JNC is made up of equal numbers of representatives from the employer representative body (UUK) and from the member representative body (UCU), together with an independent chair.

"would ideally" These discussions are still ongoing, but decisions must be taken by the end of the year to meet the Pensions Regulator's statutory timetable to complete the valuation by 30 June 2018. Internal deadlines always slip!

UUK has met with UCU 28 times since January 2017. Despite externally imposed, and that could (this, the union has so far felt unable to engage on the detail of be extended with the Pensions Regulator's the employers' proposals, or suggest other ways that the scheme approvalcould be made sustainable.

This is categorically untrue, yes? Perhaps take it out (Could it be considered libel?)

THE PENSION BENEFITS YOU'VE BUILT UP CANNOT **BE CHANGED**

There can be no changes to the pension benefits that members have already earned, both under the USS rules and pensions law. Any change to future pension benefits is not expected to come into force until 1 April 2019. This is the best section! No problems here Well done

Probably should mention that this statutory consultation is meaningless.

It's only the 30 June one that's

Only a handful of times since the valuation was finalised and this proposal presented! Perhaps amend to talk about the meetings since then.

FURTHER INFORMATION

Information on the reasons for the proposed changes is available on the Universities UK website:

- http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/ Pages/pensions.aspx
- http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/blog/Pages/pensionsimportance-getting-it-right.aspx

The Employers Pensions Forum has published a Q&A document addressing the most frequently asked questions for USS scheme members:

 http://www.employerspensionsforum_o.uk/uss*y*aluation-ga

The USS website has information to help members understand the scheme:

• https://www.uss.co.uk/how-uss-is-run/valuation

Definitely have to sort out the rest of this document if you want people to trust these sources! Plenty of work to do. I think...

This information has been issued by Universities UK, which represents over 350 USS employers.

