

Government Actuary's Department: terms of business

Published 23 May 2018

Last updated 11 June 2021 [+ show all updates](#)

1. 11 June 2021

Minor changes and clarifications – UK GDPR update, conversion to accessible HTML.

2. 31 January 2020

Format updated.

3. 26 June 2019

Updated GAD terms of business

4. 23 May 2018

First published.

Vast differences exposed in graduate outcomes

New data published today shows the wide variation in graduate outcomes depending course and institution.

Vast differences exposed in graduate outcomes

Universities need to address the ‘stark disparities’ that see students get significantly different earnings and employment outcomes at different institutions despite doing the same subjects, the Education Secretary has said today (26 June).

[New data](#) released today show the wide variation in average earnings and

employability by course and institution 1, 3 and 5 years after graduation, and reinforces to prospective students completing their A Levels this week that where they choose to study really matters.

Damian Hinds has praised the universities that are leading the way for student outcomes, including future earnings and employability, but expressed his concerns at those delivering similar courses and not yielding the same results.

Last month Mr Hinds expressed concerns over courses not offering value for money for students and taxpayers, and today's data shows that some universities aren't giving students the same positive outcomes that other students on similar courses benefit from. Previous research by the IFS has shown that variation in outcomes cannot be solely attributed to differences in students' prior attainment and social background.

Expected salaries are only one of the drivers when it comes to choosing a university and course. Today, Mr Hinds has highlighted the importance of courses that contribute to the UK's rich and diverse culture and society.

Education Secretary Damian Hinds said:

Studying at university has the potential to expand horizons, enrich understanding and transform lives, and we have more data available than ever before to help students make the right decision to achieve that. We know that potential earnings is a driver for many when it comes to choosing a university, and today's data will help thousands choose the right course for them.

Of course, future earnings aren't the only marker of a successful degree, we need to also look at employability, social impact and the important cultural value which enriches our society.

What I am concerned about though is how a course at one university can generate drastically different outcomes and experiences compared to another one offering the same subject, whether that's potential earnings, employability and even teaching quality.

It cannot be right that students studying the same subjects at different institutions, and paying the same fees, are not getting the same positive outcomes which are evidently achievable. All students should feel they are getting value for money and the stark disparities between some degrees show there are universities that need to improve and maximise the potential of their courses.

Last year [analysis](#) by the Institute for Fiscal Studies showed that women who study at the lowest returning course earn on average 64% (approximately £17,000) less than the average degree after graduation. For men, this figure is 67% (approximately £21,000) less.

This month a [student survey](#) from the Higher Education Policy Institute showed

that more than a third (36%) of students said they would have made a different post-18 choice if they were given the opportunity again. These options included choosing a different institution (12%) or course (8%), both (6%), or choosing an alternative route such as an apprenticeship (4%).

The Government has transformed student choice by increasing the data available and the data today will help students opening their A Level results on 15 August find the right course and institution for them.

Two new apps launched earlier this year, backed by Government funding, which use graduate outcomes data to help prospective students make better choices about where and what to study. ThinkUni, created by [AccessEd](#), works as a personalised digital assistant to access information, while [TheWayUp!](#) created by The Profs, is a game where players can simulate career paths.

Universities Minister Chris Skidmore said:

Deciding where and what to study at university will be one of the biggest choices young people will make, so we want students and their parents to have the best possible information about higher education.

This data is an invaluable tool to help prospective students when deciding on the next stage of their lives, though clearly graduate outcomes are not the only measure of importance when deciding which subjects to study.

While there is more to do to ensure that we recognise the social value and wider importance of subjects upon which graduate earnings are not always an accurate measure, I hope the next generation of students will take advantage of all the new data this government has made available to help them start their career on the right path.

The department's flagship rating system, the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF), which awards universities with a Gold, Silver or Bronze rating encourages high-quality teaching and provides another tool to help students make informed decisions on their post-18 options.

Last month the independent panel for the post-18 education and funding review published its recommendations to the Government, with a focus on delivering value for money for students and taxpayers. The Government will now consider the panel's recommendations before concluding the review at the Spending Review.

The universities regulator, the Office for Students (OfS), has placed a condition of registration on providers to deliver successful outcomes for all of their students. The OfS has the power to take action where a provider is not meeting this criterion, including imposing sanctions, and in the most serious cases deregistration.

We urge Iran to continue to implement its commitments under the JCPOA

Thank you very much Mr President and thank you very much to our briefers this morning. Mr President, the United Kingdom welcomes the Secretary General's seventh report on the implementation of Security Council resolution 2231 of 2015. We offer our thanks to the Secretariat for their continued professionalism and the support they provide to the Secretary General in producing a thorough and well-evidenced report.

Mr President when I last addressed the Council in this format in December, I explained that the policy of the United Kingdom towards Iran was motivated by three objectives. The first, and most critical, was to uphold the global non-proliferation regime and prevent Iran achieving a nuclear capability that would threaten the Middle East and Europe beyond it.

The United Kingdom participated in negotiations on, and we remain committed to, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). We believe is the best way to prevent the emergence of a nuclear-armed Iran. The JCPOA is an essential part of the global non-proliferation architecture and it is critical for our national security and for the shared security of our partners and allies.

We therefore once again express our regret at the US decision to leave the JCPOA, to re-impose sanctions on Iran, and not to renew fully waivers for nuclear non-proliferation projects in the framework of the Plan. These actions are contrary to the goals set out in the Plan and in resolution 2231. We continue to work hard to operationalise INSTEX to ensure that legitimate business with Iran can continue. We have also participated in core projects within the deal, including taking on the role of co-chair of the Arak Modernisation Project.

Mr President, so long as Iran remains in full compliance, the UK will do everything we can to support the deal. We are working extremely hard with E3 partners on INSTEX. We welcome the latest International Atomic Energy Agency reports of February and May and the Secretary-General's report, which confirm that Iran continues to uphold its commitments under the JCPOA as we heard from our briefers this morning. But Mr President we are deeply concerned that this meeting takes place just as Iran threatens to cease performing its commitments under the JCPOA by exceeding its low-enriched uranium stockpile limit. If Iran does go over these limits, the non-proliferation benefits of the deal will be eroded. I therefore urge Iran not to undertake activity which will go beyond the limits specified in the JCPOA and to continue to implement its commitments in full.

The second UK objective Mr President, that I shared with the Council in December was the necessity to constrain Iran's actions, which threaten the

stability of the region. I made clear that, while SCR 2231 was an endorsement of the JCPOA, it was understood by all in this Council at the time of adoption that it was designed not just to address nuclear issues, but to continue to impose binding restrictions to curb Iran's ballistic missile and proliferation activity, which as I said earlier, threaten the region and beyond.

Mr President, as we also heard this morning, Iran continues to conduct ballistic missile activity that is inconsistent with SCR 2231. Iran has denied that these activities are inconsistent with 2231 because it claims it does not intend to put a nuclear weapon on these missiles. As the Secretary-General's report notes, the UK, France and Germany have set out clearly in letters to this Council how these missiles are designed to be capable of delivering a nuclear payload. To be clear, 'designed to be capable' means having the capabilities by virtue of technical design. The stated intent is irrelevant.

As our letters set out, we use MTCR Category 1 to make our assessment of nuclear deliverability. The technical specifications under MTCR Category 1 constitute the only widely internationally accepted definition of nuclear deliverability. In addition to the 35 states participating in the MTCR, these criteria have also been widely adopted amongst non-MTCR Governments with respect to implementing obligations under Security Council resolution 1540. It is therefore the most objective criteria available to assess consistency with Security Council resolution 2231.

And just to quote from the criteria Mr President; In the context of resolution 2231, and consistent with the MTCR criteria, 'designed to be capable of delivering a nuclear weapon' means "capable of carrying a payload of 500 kg or more over a range of 300 km or more".

Iran has also Mr President transferred missiles to a number of armed groups, in violation of several Security Council resolutions, including resolutions 2231, 2216 and 1540. The latest report from the Secretary-General contains concerning information regarding the firing of a surface-to-surface missile in January from the area of Damascus towards the Golan Heights and the transfer of technical know-how for UAV production to Iraq, in violation of arms transfer restrictions. It also mentions the attack on Abha airport on 12 June, although the type of projectile used in the attack has yet to be determined.

The United Kingdom considers the transfer of such weapons to be in contravention of Security Council resolutions 2231 and 2216. There is firm international consensus that such proliferation of missile technology to non-state actors is destabilising for the region and it escalates already high tensions. Mr President we call on these activities to stop.

The actions are part of a pattern of Iranian behaviour that poses a serious danger to peace and stability in the region. On Monday, I told the Council in closed consultations that, following our own assessment of a range of evidence, the United Kingdom concluded that it was almost certain that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps carried out attacks on two tankers on 13

June. We are also confident that Iran bore responsibility for the 12 May attack on four oil tankers near the port of Fujairah.

Mr President, there can be no justification for attacks on maritime traffic that contravene international rules on freedom of navigation and maritime transport and that further threaten peace and security in the region. Current tensions and instability serve no one. As the Secretary-General has made clear, the world cannot afford a conflict in this region. And therefore Mr President I want to therefore once again call for de-escalation, for dialogue, and for full respect for international rules.

Mr President, the final objective I set out in December was the hope that Iran could normalise its economic and diplomatic relations with the region and beyond and assume its rightful role as a prosperous, responsible power constructively engaged. We still believe that this is possible.

And United Kingdom will continue to play our full part alongside international partners to find diplomatic solutions to reduce the current tensions and to uphold the landmark JCPOA nuclear agreement. And I urge Iran to join us and do the same.

PM's speech on housing: 26 June 2019

Thank you very much, Gaby, and good afternoon everyone.

It is a pleasure to be here with you all today, at Europe's largest housing festival.

I have to say, I was a little apprehensive when I saw where you were meeting this year.

The last time I visited this venue it was hosting the 2017 Conservative Party conference – when, it is fair to say, I had one or two problems with my speech.

But I have checked that the backdrop is good and solid.

There is someone backstage with my cough sweets ready.

And if anyone is planning on running on stage waving a P45.

You are a little bit late.

Because of course, in a few weeks from now I will be stepping down as Prime Minister.

And it will fall to a new leader, a new government, to continue the vital work of making this a country where each and every person has a safe and

secure home to call their own.

Doing that was one of the challenges I set myself when I spoke from the steps of Downing Street a little under three years ago.

And three years on, there is still much to do.

But I am immensely proud of what you and I have achieved together.

Because hand in hand, step by step and piece by piece, the government and the sector have begun to turn around the crisis in British housing.

In our 2015 manifesto we promised to deliver a million new homes by 2020, a promise we restated at the general election two years later.

Commentators and critics said it could not happen.

But it is happening.

Last year alone saw more additional homes delivered than in all but one of the previous 31.

Since I became Prime Minister, the number of net additions has been growing right across England.

Here in Greater Manchester the number of extra homes being created has risen by more than 12 per cent.

In Nottingham, by 43 per cent.

In Birmingham, by an enormous 80 per cent.

The notable exception is London – where housing policy is in the hands of the Mayor, and the number of new homes being created has actually fallen by a staggering 20 per cent.

But nationwide, the picture is bright.

The number of affordable housing starts has been increasing year-on-year.

And the latest projections show that, by this autumn, a million homes will have been added to our national supply in less than five years.

A million homes for young families, for hardworking professionals, for downsizing retirees.

A million homes giving more people the safety and security that many of us take for granted.

A million homes that show that our promises are more than just words.

It is a great achievement and one of which everyone involved should be proud.

But it was never intended to be the final goal.

The housing shortage in this country began not because of a blip lasting one year or one Parliament, but because not enough homes were built over many decades.

The very worst thing we could do would be to make the same mistake again.

So while it has taken a huge effort to get this far, we are only just getting started.

The job is not done, the work is not over.

And that is why, in contrast to previous administrations, the reforms I have concentrated on over the past three years have not just been about addressing the immediate shortage.

Because, important though that is, we must also fight long-term structural problems with long-term structural action.

And that means creating the conditions that guarantee a lasting supply not just of the homes we need today, but of the homes we will need tomorrow.

For the first time in almost half a century we have a Ministry of Housing dedicated to that task – and, under its excellent Secretary of State, it is making exceptional progress.

Our reforms of planning rules have made it easier to get more of the right homes built in the right places.

For example we have given local authorities greater freedom to make the most of brownfield sites.

We have standardised the way we assess the need for new homes in different areas.

And we have made developers more accountable for delivering on their commitments.

The £5.5 billion housing infrastructure fund is making it possible for developers to build on sites that were not previously viable, and giving new communities the infrastructure they need in order to thrive.

Our funding for Garden Towns and Villages supports local authorities and developers as they create vibrant communities where people will be able to live, work and play for generations to come.

And the Community Housing Fund is helping local people come together to plan and build the homes and facilities they want and need in their areas.

Of course, there's no point building the homes we need if nobody can afford to live in them.

That is why we are restoring the dream of home ownership for a new generation – giving more than half a million households a step up the housing ladder

with schemes like Help to Buy, and taking 80 per cent of first time buyers out of stamp duty altogether.

It is no accident that the number of first-time buyers is at its highest level for more than a decade.

So I am immensely proud to be leaving office with home ownership resurgent.

After all, the idea of the property-owning democracy has been at the heart of Conservative thinking since Noel Skelton and a young Harold Macmillan first spoke of it almost a century ago.

But too many governments – including, I am not afraid to say, the one in which I served as Home Secretary – have concentrated solely on boosting home ownership, as if supporting those struggling to find a home to rent was somehow contrary to such an aim.

Under this government that attitude has changed.

We recognise there are people for whom home ownership will never be a realistic aim.

That there are others for whom renting is an unavoidable reality at one time or another.

And that some people simply choose to rent, especially if it allows them to live in an area they would otherwise struggle to afford.

Being able to choose to rent a decent home in the place that suits you best is a vital part of a healthy housing system, one we see in every major developed economy.

Across England, more than 18 million people from every walk of life woke up this morning in a rental property.

And no government should ignore the needs of so many of its citizens.

So yes, I want to see as many people as possible enjoying all the benefits of home ownership.

But that should not stop us working to improve renting too – and this government has taken real action to do just that.

First, we have moved to increase the supply of affordable rental properties in order to meet the rising demand.

We have ended the forced sale of high-value council properties.

Put £2 billion of extra funding into the Affordable Housing Programme with an explicit provision for building homes for social rent.

And abolished the HRA cap so that local authorities are free to build once more.

We are already seeing the results – just last week came the news that Liverpool is to start building council housing for the first time in three decades.

Five year rent certainty has given housing associations the financial security they need to borrow, invest, and build.

And changes to the National Planning Policy Framework, first announced in our ground-breaking Housing White Paper, have encouraged private sector developers to create more “Build to Rent” properties.

But our truly radical reforms, our biggest breaks with the past, have come in our work to support those who rent.

We are rebalancing the relationship between tenant and landlord, making major changes that will make an immediate and lasting impact on the lives of millions of families.

In the private sector we have already capped the size of rent deposits and abolished letting fees, cutting the amount tenants have to find up front and making it harder for landlords and agents to take advantage of desperate house-hunters.

Now we are going further.

Because, if you rent a property it might not be your house but it is still your home.

And to me, that means that if you pay your rent, play by the rules and keep the house in good order, your landlord should not be allowed to throw you out on a whim.

It is simply not fair.

So we are bringing to an end the practice of so-called “no-fault” evictions, repealing section 21 of the 1988 Housing Act.

A consultation on the changes will be published shortly, with a view to introducing legislation later this year.

For tenants in England’s four million social homes we have scrapped the so-called “pay to stay” policy and confirmed that this government will not pursue plans to abolish lifetime tenancies for new council tenants.

We have retained supported housing in the welfare system – listening to those who know best about how to protect our most vulnerable citizens.

And, most important of all, with our Social Housing Green Paper we are delivering a once-in-generation package of reforms and support for social housing.

The fire at Grenfell Tower was a human tragedy on an unprecedented scale.

But it also shone a much-needed light on the issues facing social housing and the people who live in it – not just within the Lancaster West estate, but right across the country.

This year marks the centenary of what became known as the Addison Act, the post-war “Homes fit for Heroes” legislation that first provided government funding for council housing.

Yet in recent decades and under successive governments, social housing became another victim of the single-minded drive for home ownership.

The results were all too clear – both in the testimony we have heard from Grenfell tenants, and in the 8,000 conversations and submissions that informed the green paper.

Across the country, people complained of living in substandard or unsuitable housing – and said they felt ignored and disrespected by their often remote and unaccountable landlords.

I have always been clear that this green paper must not be simply an intellectual exercise highlighting the nature of the problem.

It must be the practical first step in actually fixing it.

So today I can announce that the next stage in the process, our action plan and timetable for implementing wide-ranging reforms of social housing, will be published in September.

It will include the creation of a stronger consumer regulation regime for social housing, enhancing tenants’ rights and making it easier to enforce them.

Changes to the way complaints are resolved, so that tenants know exactly how to raise concerns and can be confident their voices will be heard and acted on.

Empowering residents still further by requiring landlords to demonstrate how they have engaged with their tenants.

And a commitment to further boost the supply of high-quality social housing through the Affordable Homes Programme and other funding.

A hundred years after the introduction of Britain’s first council houses, I want to see not just homes that people have to live in but homes they want to live in, homes they can be proud to live in.

And that drive for greater quality, for higher standards, should extend right across the housing industry.

For too long we have allowed ourselves to think there must be a trade-off between quality and quantity, that raising one means reducing the other.

It is simply not true.

I do not accept that, in 2019, we can only have sufficient and affordable housing by compromising on standards, safety, aesthetics, and space.

That is why I asked the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission to develop proposals for embedding beautiful, sustainable and human-scale design into the planning and development process.

I look forward to reading the interim report next month.

It is why the Ministry of Housing will shortly be launching a consultation on environmental performance in new build homes, with a Future Homes Standard that will give all new homes world-leading levels of energy efficiency by 2025.

And it is why I want to see changes to regulations so that developers can only build homes that are big enough for people to actually live in.

It was the Addison Act that brought modern space standards to English housing law for the first time.

During the Bill's second reading, the architect of the standards, Sir Tudor Walters, urged MPs to "take care that the houses planned in the future are planned with due regard to comfort, convenience, and the saving of labour".

It is a message we would do well to return to today.

Because in the years since, the pendulum has swung back and forth between regulation and deregulation, leading to a situation today where England does have national standards – but ones that are largely unenforceable and inconsistently applied.

Some local authorities include the Nationally Described Space Standard in their local plans, making them a condition of planning permission.

But others do not.

And even where they are applied, as planning policies rather than regulations they are open to negotiation.

The result is an uneven playing field, with different rules being applied with differing levels of consistency in different parts of the country.

That makes it harder for developers to build homes where they are needed most.

And it leaves tenants and buyers facing a postcode lottery – if space standards are not applied in your area, there is no guarantee that any new homes will be of an adequate size.

Now I am no fan of regulation for the sake of regulation.

But I cannot defend a system in which some owners and tenants are forced to accept tiny homes with inadequate storage.

Where developers feel the need to fill show homes with deceptively small furniture.

And where the lack of universal standards encourages a race to the bottom.

It will be up to my successor in Downing Street to deal with this.

But I believe the next government should be bold enough to ensure the Nationally Described Space Standard applies to all new homes.

As a mandatory regulation, space standards would become universal and unavoidable.

That would mean an end to the postcode lottery for buyers and tenants.

And an end to the era of too-small homes that keep the housing numbers ticking over, but are barely fit for modern family life.

I reject the argument that such a change will make building less likely.

In fact it will have the opposite effect – a more strictly applied minimum would remove the commercial disincentive to develop sites in areas with stricter standards.

And by providing a clear and uniform national standard it will increase the possibilities for the kind of off-site manufacturing we see being pioneered here in the Northern Powerhouse.

Thanks to this government and the people in this room we are already building more.

Now we must build bigger.

We must build better.

And we must build more beautiful.

The measures I have set out today will help achieve that.

But while many of the programmes introduced over the past three years have laid the foundations for building the homes of tomorrow, it will of course fall on my successor as Prime Minister to see the job through.

To maintain and build momentum.

To keep the pressure on planners, developers, builders and, yes, the rest of government.

And, when asked how to bring an end to the housing crisis in this country, to answer not just with numbers, but with ideas.

To set out what homes will be built where and why.

How they will be funded.

What infrastructure will be needed to support them.

What standard they will be built to.

How local people and local councils will be persuaded to support them.

And how you will protect, enhance and enforce the rights of the people who live in them.

Because few other areas of public policy better demonstrate the rule that politicians who propose simple answers to complex problem are seldom being entirely honest.

Promising to build however many homes is easy.

But as you all know, getting the right homes built in the right place is considerably harder.

There is no single silver bullet.

No button to press or lever to pull that can magically make millions of homes appear overnight.

It requires concerted action on many fronts.

A thousand small changes that, when taken together, bring about the revolution we want and need to see.

It is the political world's focus on the grand gesture rather than incremental change that is partly responsible for the crisis we are dealing with today.

Successive governments were unwilling to get into the detail of housing policy, so simply sat back and relied on the industry to build enough homes.

Under this government that attitude has changed.

There has not been a single, big bang moment.

No one measure to grab the front pages and silence the critics.

But quietly, step by step and day by day, we have been working with you to bring an end to the housing crisis.

And the results speak for themselves.

We promised a million more homes, we delivered a million more homes.

We promised a better deal for renters, we have started to deliver a better deal for renters.

We promised a whole new approach to social housing, and we are delivering a whole new approach to social housing.

Because this is a government with a bold vision for housing and a willingness to act on it.

A government that has delivered radical reforms for today, and the permanent structural changes that will continue to benefit the country for decades to come.

There remains much to do.

But over the past three years we have shown what can be achieved.

Everyone in this hall can look back with pride at the change that has already taken place.

And everyone in this country can look ahead to a future in which each of us has a safe, affordable place to call home.