

**SCR BUSINESS GROWTH EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**17<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2018**

**BROAD STREET WEST, SHEFFIELD**

No.	Item	Action
1	<p><b><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u> Neil MacDonald (LEP) – CHAIR Laura Bennett (LEP)</p> <p><u>In Attendance</u> Tim O’Connell (RMBC) Chris Scholey (LEP) Ed Highfield (SCC) Jennefer Holmes (DMBC) Kevin Kerrigan (SHU) Yasmin Knight (TUoS) Alexa Greaves (LEP) Mark Lynam (SCR Exec Team) David Grimes (SCR Exec Team) Helen Lazarus (SCR Exec Team) Lee Viney (SCR Exec Team) Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p> <p>+ Simon Hooton (Regeneris) – for item 6</p> <p>Apologies were received from Diana Terris (BMBC), Andrew Denniff (BRCoC), Julie Kenny (LEP), Peter Dale (DMBC), Scott Cardwell (DMBC), Damien Wilson (RMBC), Sarah Want (TUoS)</p>	
2	<p><b><u>Declarations of Interest</u></b></p> <p>No specific declarations of interest in relation to the matters to be discussed on today’s agenda were noted.</p>	
3	<p><b><u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u></b></p>	

	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> June were agreed to be an accurate record.</p> <p>Regarding the SCR’s aspirations for ‘better data collection’ (a matter which arose at the previous meeting in relation to the Growth Hub Review item), it was confirmed discussions to address current deficiencies are in place, aligned to the refresh of the SCR SEP.</p> <p>Regarding the South Yorkshire Investment Fund, it was reported that instead of convening the previously suggested stand-alone ‘Steering Group’, some consultation had taken place and future efforts will i be invested in ensuring adequate and effective SY representation on the group to manage the wider Yorkshire and Humber “Fund of Funds” led by Finance Yorkshire.</p> <p>It was noted the proposals for the Fund of Funds is currently with the Y&amp;H LEPs and MCHLG, with an expectation the Fund will become operational by the end of 2018/19 Q3. A more detailed sequence of events was provided.</p> <p>All actions were noted as complete.</p>	
4	<p><b><u>SCR Growth Hub Ranking</u></b></p> <p>A report was received to update the Board in relation to the recent ranking exercise undertaken by Government (BEIS) across all 38 Growth Hubs across the country.</p> <p>It was noted the exercise was undertaken to assess and benchmark Growth Hubs based on a wide range of criteria, including the quality and efficacy of reporting data, delivery performance, financial performance, quality of delivery, customer satisfaction and the effectiveness of delivery model.</p> <p>It was noted BEIS undertook a full evaluation through the Enterprise Research Council (ERC) which reviewed all the reported information and data from each Growth Hub over the previous 2 years. It was reported the SCR Growth Hub was ranked ‘In the top half of the upper quartile of all Growth Hubs’ in the country.</p> <p>It was noted the evaluation process had identified a number of highlights including SCR being an exemplar in reporting and information provision to BEIS, the efficacy and volume of data and information provided for reporting, the effectiveness of the overarching delivery model and the positive, supportive approach to engagements with BEIS and national programmes.</p>	

	<p>Regarding areas for potential improvement, it was noted the report highlighted that a) not all non-aggregated data is currently provided to BEIS for all companies supported via Growth Hub funds, and b) a lack of information being provided in respect of the provision of financial evidence of defrayal of funding. It was noted that Growth Hub funded project leads including from Launchpad, RISE and the Enhancement Project, have not provided firm level data to the Growth Hub, requested by BEIS for future reporting.</p> <p>The Board was assured that both the areas for improvement are being addressed and requests made to all delivery partners to supply firm level data. In addition, Finance will be providing a full list of defrayal evidence every quarter from April 2018.</p> <p>Members discussed the past lack of provision of firm level data from the districts and were advised where protocols had been strengthened.. The Board asserted its expectance project leads will acknowledge and adhere to the BEIS requirement.</p> <p><b>Action: ALL project leads to provide the requested non-aggregated company data as a means to ensure compliance with BEIS reporting standards</b></p> <p><b>Action: Dave to report to the Board any instances of failure to comply with the above action</b></p> <p>The Board considered whether any proactive marketing should be taken to reporting the SCR being ranked within the ‘top half of the upper quartile’ of all Growth Hubs’.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board notes the content of the report based on direct feedback from BEIS on the performance and ranking of the Growth Hub.</b></p>	<p><b>Local Authorities</b></p> <p><b>DG</b></p>
5	<p><b><u>SCR Enterprise Accelerator</u></b></p> <p>A report was received to update the Board on the progress made towards developing the concept of an SCR accelerator programme, to help overcome the issues highlighted by the ONS business demography data around start-up and business survival, since the presentation of the Start-up and Scale-up report at the April meeting. . The report therefore provided further details on potential models for accelerator programmes, what they do and why they are needed. The report also provided information on similar activities that have been delivered in the region to-date (‘Y Accelerator’, IoT Tribe etc) noting why additional programmes are required to fill identified gaps in accelerator provision.</p>	

	<p>Kevin advised the Board on development of SHU's 'Virtual Incubation Accelerator Network' programme, ambitions to develop an incubation co-working space at Aspect Court and a new masters' level course.</p> <p>Members supported the concept of co-creation with private sector backing, and encouraged the suggestion of a challenge-based approach with both corporate and public-sector partners. A history of short-term projects was noted and Members proposed that any investment of funding should seek to be long-term to maximise impact and link accelerator projects with 'routes to market'.</p> <p>It was noted the outline business case for an accelerator programme would be presented to a future meeting.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board endorses the development of an outline business case for an SCR wide accelerator programme.</b></p>	
6	<p><b><u>Growth Hub Review Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>The Board welcomed Simon from Regeneris who delivered a presentation on their findings and recommendations following their independent review of the SCR Growth Hub and its activities.</p> <p>It was noted this presentation is a precursor for the full report, which is due to be received shortly, and which will be updated in light of any comments received from the Board members as a consequence of this presentation.</p> <p>Simon reiterated the original questions asked of the Review and noted the process had been informed by the input of the SCR and the Local Authorities, business and also external stakeholders.</p> <p>The Board was informed that a determining the recommendations, a number of important lessons had been distilled, these being: that buy-in and consensus are essential; the need to be realistic from the outset; the need for continual engagement to maintain buy-in; recognition that it is a difficult concept to deliver and co-ordinate; recognition that the overlapping functions (with the LAs) creates a space for conflict; and the possibility that a perfect system may not exist.</p> <p>It was suggested the Review finds that the Growth Hub is essentially working well, is achieving a lot and has a basic structure that is fit for purpose. It also finds that it needs to</p>	

maintain its focus to meet the needs of its client base and the need to deliver its services efficiently.

The Board was advised the Review would be making 7 recommendations. Those being the need: to affirm a realistic ambition with shared objectives; to maintain delivery and co-ordination of functions; to steadily reduce instances of duplication of effort; to have clearer market targets and segmentation; to boost awareness and penetration of the Growth Hub offer; to build a reputation with networks and referral flow; and to better use intelligence to enhance the client experience.

The future model as proposed the Growth Hub should be the principal [semantics of this word debated] access point for information for all businesses and should focus on delivering services to growth-oriented businesses, and suggested the Growth Hub should lead on the collation of intelligence. Growth-oriented support services should include business growth, innovation, supply chain development, access to finance and export and trade.

It was suggested this offer would be complemented by the offers of the other market place 'players' and the LA key account management functions, providing localised expertise support to businesses in respect of planning, start up support, property searching, business rates, compliance and regulation and inward investment.

The presentation diagrammatically explained the suggested flow of referrals between the Growth Hub, the LAs and the market place.

Information was presented regarding the concept of growth-oriented clients, how these may be identified and what more might be done to support these businesses. Thoughts were requested on what more the SCR Growth Hub can (cost effectively) do to access priority businesses, utilising existing networks and a strong web presence

The Board was advised of the intended sequence of events, including the delivery of the Review presentation to the LEP Board and scheduling of opportunities for the Growth Hub Operational Board to consider and respond to the recommendations.

Members agreed that the outputs of the stakeholder workshops had been appropriately represented in the findings of the Review.

Consideration was given to the extent to which the recommendations differ from the existing aims and objectives of the Growth Hub. It was suggested they aren't materially different and this is a sharpening up of the current approach to ensure the Growth Hub is more focused on its core remit. It was suggested the Growth Hub also needs to recognise that it is different things to different clients but need to balance this reality with BEIS's expectation that Growth Hubs provide 'support for all'.

It was acknowledged the Growth Hub could not become the region's single source of support services to all businesses and there is therefore a need to understand the various business support offers of the market place and representative bodies. . It was acknowledged all LAs business support functions operate in a slightly different manner

It was suggested the collation of better business intelligence, and more actions being determined as a consequence of this information, could help set priorities and inform activity for all partners.

The Board considered whether there is a link between this agenda, and the SCR's ambition to encourage more inclusive growth in the Region. It was acknowledged there is no single agreed definition of inclusive growth.

It was suggested there needs to be a metric for determining whether any recommendations have been effectively assimilated within an agreed timescale (e.g. 6 months).

Regarding how the Review's findings might be best communicated to the LEP Board, it was suggested this may need to acknowledge that whilst there is unlikely to be absolute consensus on all aspects of the role and remit of the Growth Hub, this recommendation is the right thing to do.

It was suggested officers (Growth Hub and LAs) should be tasked with looking at the practicalities of the recommendations and what changes can be easily implemented. Members were asked to cascade the recommendations of the Board to their teams.

**The Board endorsed the recommendations being taken forward to the LEP Board, with Board members' comments incorporated.**

**7** **Trade and Investment Board**

	<p>An update was tabled on key matters under consideration by the Trade and Investment Board.</p> <p><b>It was suggested the Board would benefit from a more detailed review of the SCR's inward investment priorities at the next meeting</b></p>	ML / HL
8	<p><b><u>Business Investment Fund Panel</u></b></p> <p>An update was tabled regarding the last round of investment decisions taken by the Panel.</p>	
9	<p><b><u>Growth Hub Operational Board</u></b></p> <p>An update was provided on key matters arising at the last meeting of the Growth Hub Operational Board.</p>	
10	<p><b><u>Delivery Plan Dashboard</u></b></p> <p>The latest version of the Delivery Plan Dashboard was provided for information.</p> <p>The Board was advised there had been no progress in respect of the British Business Bank (BBB) approving the usage of NPIF to support growth-potential start-ups. On the recommendation that it is unlikely this position will change, it was agreed to remove this action from the Dashboard.</p> <p>Members cited the BBB issue as a good example of why the Delivery Plan and Dashboard should be viewed as 'live' documents and subject to regular change.</p>	
11	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>Members revisited the concept of 'inclusive growth' and considered the need to look at this matter in more detail. It was noted the Mayor is committed to undertaking an economic review of the SCR and is likely to develop some policies which relate to this matter (aligned to the refresh of the SEP).</p>	
11	<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b></p> <p>Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2.00pm at Broad Street West, Sheffield.</p>	