

Q1 response content - Salary Threshold Increase	Q2 response content - Accrual Rate Increase	Q3 response content - Higher Cap on Future Pension Increases	Q4 response content - Do you have any alternative suggestions?	Q5 response content - Contribution above the salary threshold to the Investment Builder	Response by	Review date	Submission date	Verification date
I support this proposal I support these changes I agree with the proposal I support this.	I support this proposal I support these changes I agree with the proposal I support this.	I support this proposal I support these changes I agree with the proposal I support this.	No No further suggestions.	I agree with this proposal. However I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the performance of the defined contribution part of the scheme compared to other (global) pension funds. I would like to see greater transparency and accountability to members for how this part of the scheme is managed. I support this change I fully support this part of the proposal If employers will get so much more benefit from the likely contribution rate cut, I think they should contribute more to the DC pot than 60%. If the usual split (for DB) has always been 70:30 (with small changes split 65/35), why is this not mirrored here?	Active member	04-10-2023	02-10-2023	02-10-2023
I fully agree with this proposal. A defined benefit pension is very important to me and restoring the higher threshold for this part of the scheme provides greater reassurance for my retirement. I support this change I fully support the proposal.	I fully agree with this proposal. I support this change I fully support this part of the proposal	I agree with this proposal. High inflation as has been experienced recently has a serious capacity to erode the value of pension savings and impact on the financial wellbeing of those in receipt of a pension. The 2.5% cap was too low. The proposals represent a fairer approach. I support this change I fully support this part of the proposal	The rate of contribution for both employees and employers must be sufficient to ensure stability and sustainability for the pension fund. I am aware of the concerns expressed by the UCU that the proposed contribution rate is possibly too low to achieve this goal. I would urge that careful consideration be given to the ultimate rate of contribution set in light of this concern.	I agree with this proposal. However I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the performance of the defined contribution part of the scheme compared to other (global) pension funds. I would like to see greater transparency and accountability to members for how this part of the scheme is managed. I support this change I fully support this part of the proposal If employers will get so much more benefit from the likely contribution rate cut, I think they should contribute more to the DC pot than 60%. If the usual split (for DB) has always been 70:30 (with small changes split 65/35), why is this not mirrored here?	Active member	22-11-2023	18-11-2023	18-11-2023
I support these changes. I need a guaranteed retirement income so increasing the salary threshold in line with inflation is vital for me to plan for a secure retirement. I support the proposed changes to the threshold.	I support these changes I support the proposed changes to the accrual rates.	Retirees are vulnerable to inflation, as by default they cannot earn more money when living costs rise. I am very glad to see protection being restored to 2022 levels I support the proposed changes and the reinstatement of the cap.	Cutting contribution rates sounds great but it benefits employers much more than us employees, as they get 2/3 of the saving. I would like better benefits or to pay a lower split of contributions, rather than helping out employers.	This seems acceptable, though it is not clear to me why it comes after "Any other suggestions". I am in favour.	Active member	27-09-2023	26-09-2023	26-09-2023
This seems acceptable. I am in favour.	This seems acceptable. I am in favour. I very strongly support an increase in the accrual rate, and in particular the associated increase in the lump sum. I note however that the accrual rate remains worse than the TPS and other schemes and I would like to see a further improved rate for USS. I fully support the proposal.	This seems acceptable. I am in favour.	Not at this time.		Active member	09-11-2023	03-11-2023	03-11-2023
I would like to receive a guaranteed retirement income so, for me, it is a priority to: retain a defined benefits pension; increase the salary threshold in line with inflation. I would like to see the uprating of the salary threshold so it is not capped at 2.5% in a period of high inflation. I fully support the proposal.	I support these changes I support the proposed changes to the accrual rates.	I support an increase in the uprating of inflation protection and protection against inflation restored to 2022 levels. I also support a return to the soft cap but would like to see this improved further. I fully support the proposal.	I want to see a sustainable contribution rate No.	I just want a DB pension as this is far more predictable and would help me plan for retirement. I fully support the proposal. Given that USS finances have been proven to be highly robust, no detriment to members can be justified.	Active member	11-10-2023	06-10-2023	06-10-2023
I am not impacted by this. This sounds very sensible .	I am happy with this change. I would welcome this. Again, pleased previous benefits are being restored which makes the pension and thus university working a solid career and attractive environment.	I am happy with this. I would welcome this	no	I assume this change may fund the other reversals and employee contributions to this element increase. A modest increase would be ok to fund the other elements in my view.	Active member	01-11-2023	30-10-2023	30-10-2023
I'm pleased this punitive change is being reversed			There was talk of the changes also being backdated - is that hearsay? Still on the table?		Active member	22-11-2023	20-11-2023	20-11-2023
I like that the salary threshold to start contributing to the defined part of the scheme will be increased as it was until 2022. This reduces the risk of not actually earning a pension, as the value does not depend on the fund investment strategy. What will happen the defined benefit contributions I have already accumulated up to now (from 1st April 2022 to this change) is unclear to me. Increasing the threshold means that I will probably go back to not contributing to defined benefit part of the scheme. I did not remember about the 10% cap that we had before 1st April 2022, and how that cap was changing with inflation. I think that 2.5% cap is already a very good YEARLY increase in future contributions by employees, but also understand that up to 5% inflation rate, the increase in contribution might be matched. The main issue here is the fact that the employees salary is NOT increasing in line with inflation, that makes any additional annual increase (even up to 2.5%) unaffordable over time.	I support this change, because we will go back to the value that it was until 1st April 2022.	I support this proposal. The benefits received should be adjusted in line with inflation. Again I think that up to 2.5% annually would be feasible but above that it might not be affordable/sustainable for members. The main issue is that the employees salary is NOT increasing in line with inflation.	Put members (employees) at the centre of any change, so that there are more benefits for members to remain in the scheme.	I support that the 20% remains the same. However, I do not support at all the procedure described here to post-phone the split of the allocation rate among employers and employees, even if this will be done later on by JNC. I think that we should be consulted on defining a proposed split, if the rate of the split is changing from the current split (20% as 8% and 12%). I feel that this point is not consulting on a clear proposal. It seems not fair, not equal and not inclusive to just ask to employees to basically delegate such an important decisions to JNC and, on top, this decisions will be based on a rate determined by the Trustee, so the JNC would have not first responsibility on the choice of the rates.	Active member	27-09-2023	26-09-2023	26-09-2023
I support this change	I support this change	I support this change	1. I would like USS to consider 'making good' the loss of DB benefits arising from the 1 April 2022 to April 2024 salary threshold reduction to £40,000, and to restore the benefits in the gap up to £59,883.65. 2. I support consideration of Conditional Indexation. Though in principle the sharing of benefits and adverse impacts between employers/employee members and pensioners is fair, it should be made clear what the ratio is of the "share" (both positive and negative) between current contributing members vs pensioners. It should be remembered that early careers members have far more time to adjust their pension planning to account for adverse funding compared to already retired pensioners.	no comment	Active member	22-11-2023	20-11-2023	20-11-2023