

**SCR BUSINESS GROWTH EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**15<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2016**

**BROAD STREET WEST, SHEFFIELD**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	<p><b><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u> Paul Houghton, LEP / Grant Thornton – Chair Diana Terris, BMBC Cllr Julie Dore, SCC</p> <p><u>In Attendance</u> Andrew Gates, SCR Executive Team David Grimes, SCR Executive Team Richard Holmes, SCC / SCR Executive Team David Campbell-Molloy, SCR Executive Team Lee Viney, SCR Executive Team Ruth Adams, SCR Executive Team Julie Kenny, Pyronix Lloyd Snellgrove, SHU Simeon Leech, RMBC Andrew Denniff, BRCoC Edward Highfield, Sheffield CC Chris Scholey, Doncaster Bassetlaw NHS Foundation Trust Giles Searby, Keeble Hawson Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p> <p>+ Philip Kelly (Enterprise Growth Solutions) for item 7 and John Till (Thinking Place) for item 8</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Lewis Rose (DDDC), Gavin Baldwin (LEP), Dan Swaine (LEP), Rachel Clark (SCR Executive Team), Steve Mawson, Peter Dale (DMBC) and Keith Jackson (JRI)</p>	
2	<p><b><u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u></b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> October were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting.</p>	

	<p>The following matters were noted as arising:</p> <p>5. <u>Growth Hub Full Business Case</u></p> <p><b>Action: Andy to circulate the Full Business Case for information</b></p> <p>8. <u>Spoke Updates</u> Lloyd sought assurances regarding where and how updates on Innovation were to be reported to the Board. It was agreed to make this one of the standing matters on future Spoke Update reports.</p> <p><b>Action: David G / Lloyd to incorporate into future reports</b></p> <p>9. <u>Quarterly Inward Investment Update</u> It was noted work will be undertaken in due course to provide the Board with a means of receiving regular Inward Investment updates, possibly incorporated into the performance dashboard reports.</p> <p>10. <u>Glass Futures</u> It was noted further information is still awaited from Glass Futures to address questions raised by the assessment panel.</p>	<p><b>AG</b></p> <p><b>DG / LS</b></p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b><u>Declarations of Interest</u></b></p> <p>No declarations of interest in relation to the items on today's agenda were noted.</p>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b><u>Urgent Items / Announcements</u></b></p> <p>No urgent items were requested.</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b><u>MIPIM Cannes Planning</u></b></p> <p>Andy provided a presentation on plans in development for MIPIM 17. It was noted this is a key opportunity to build global awareness of the SCR and to generate international inward investment opportunities.</p> <p>It was noted that a steering group, supported by a lead officer and representative of all public and private sector partners, has been convened to oversee activities. Counter Context have again been engaged to assist with some bespoke activities including attracting the 'right people' to SCR's events.</p> <p>It was noted engagements will be based around the 6 key SCR messages (reliable, practical, straightforward, strong business</p>	

	<p>culture, great place to live and enterprising).and will focus more tightly on the tangible investment opportunities afforded by AMID, DSA and urban regeneration. Activities will all be co-ordinated from SCR HQ where most events, briefings, meetings etc. will be hosted.</p> <p>Cllr Dore questioned usage of the above key messages, noting these had been accused by the CA and LEP of not being snappy, strong or ambitious enough. It was suggested the key messages will be interpreted more positively for the MIPIM audience.</p> <p>Cllr Dore asked how MIPIM success is measured and whether year on year improvements can be identified. It was suggested that statistical achievements are hard to quantify as MIPIM is just part of the approach and successes are more anecdotal.</p> <p>It was confirmed that funding for MIPIM comes from the core SCR revenue budget.</p> <p>Members were asked to remember that MIPIM is essentially a property conference and it was suggested that messages to potential investors should be couched in terms that property investors would expect. i.e calls to action. It was therefore suggested that we need to be armed with enough information for each of the target projects to address any questions from prospective investors.</p> <p>It was suggested that the MIPIM UK event held in October was a useful undertaking and presented a number of ideas that will be benefited from ahead of the main MIPIM event.</p> <p><b>Action: ALL questions regarding MIPIM to be sent to Andy</b></p>	<p><b>AG</b></p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b><u>Porto / Sao Paulo Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Lee presented the Board with feedback from recent fact finding engagements with international places that have the same regenerative and growth ambitions as the SCR.</p> <p>It was noted a number of good lessons and ideas have been picked up which will feed into supporting our business growth activities. These include thoughts around branding and identity, innovation, international connections and inventive financing models.</p> <p>Noting these examples, it was suggested the SCR is actually already making strides towards achieving similar goals and is reasonably well placed to achieve success.</p> <p>To ensure we build on the effort undertaken to look at international</p>	

	<p>examples of regeneration and growth, it was requested that the findings be distilled down into a number of key actions the SCR should be recommended to take forward.</p> <p><b>Action: Lee to present to the next meeting and circulate a copy of the presentation</b></p>	<p>LV</p>
<p>7</p>	<p><b><u>Exporting for Growth</u></b></p> <p>The Board welcomed Philip Kelly from Enterprise Growth Solutions (EGS) who delivered a presentation on their ERDF funded work undertaken on behalf of the Department for International Trade (DIT) to support the capacity of the SMEs to grow in regional, national and international markets</p> <p>It was noted the Export for Growth work is funded for 3 years and covers the Sheffield, Leeds and Hull city region geographies.</p> <p>It was noted EGS are working closely with the SCR Growth Hub team and have an officer embedded in the team as an export co-ordinator. Activity covers all 9 SCR districts and in respect of the East Midlands overlap, a partnership agreement has been put in place with DIT East Midlands to provide non-SY districts with access to both programme opportunities.</p> <p>It was confirmed that output targets for investment (number of businesses benefitting etc.) have been set by government</p> <p>It was noted that funding investment will be appropriately profiled for the programme and delivery emphasis will be on supporting clients where a genuine difference can be made, rather than merely chasing spend.</p> <p>Julie K informed the Board this is at least the 6<sup>th</sup> iteration of a similar government initiative she have been involved in over the last 20 years and questioned why the UK is stuck in a perpetual cycle of winding up and winding down exporting initiatives.</p> <p>The Board discussed the utmost importance of communicating opportunities to businesses. It was noted the SCR Export Centre of Excellence group will be key to work. The Board was informed, however, that William Beckett has recently stood down from the group and new Chair will be appointed shortly.</p> <p>It was noted that Experian data suggests there are up to 2,000 businesses in the SCR capable of exporting so there is potentially a lot of work to do in this area.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><b><u>Growth Hub Narrative and Messaging Research</u></b></p>	

The Board welcomed John Till from Thinking Place who delivered a presentation on their recent study into how the SCR Growth Hub narrative and marketing plan might be improved.

It was noted that Thinking Place's primary research was undertaken via a number of interviews with businesses across the SCR geography who are not yet engaged with the Growth Hub.

Key findings from these interviews noted:

- There is limited knowledge of the Growth Hub
- Businesses currently receive support from a number of places
- Some businesses may pay for Growth Hub support, depending what that support might be
- Businesses don't want to be proactively contacted / 'petered' but do want to know how to contact the Growth Hub easily if they need to.
- The support most needed is mentoring and softer skills (HR, business planning, sales, signposting)
- Networking events may be a waste of time unless they are focussed.
- The biggest challenges experienced by businesses are attracting the right skills, cash flow and other specific matters.
- Regarding nomenclature, the 'SCR' name is problematic as it isn't widely familiar and usage of the term 'Growth' may unintentionally repel start-ups.
- The SCR needs a 'champion' to help generate awareness of opportunities.
- More should be learnt from other Growth Hubs regarding usage of language and positioning.
- The SCR lacks a coherent profile and is often misperceived as just being Sheffield.
- Businesses understanding Yorkshire and South Yorkshire but not the SCR.
- There needs to be greater clarity and promotion of what the Growth Hub is there to deliver, and for whom.
- **The Growth Hub may benefit from being more arms length and being seen less as a Local Authority service.**

In addition to the interview based research, it was noted that benchmarking against other Growth Hubs suggests there are opportunities for a better, jargon free website, the convening of an increased number of more thematically focussed events, for activities to feel more private sector led and inclusive of all businesses and for the change of the 'SCR Growth Hub' name to 'SCR Business Support'.

The Board noted broad endorsement for the presented findings

	<p>and agreed these present the SCR with a number of challenges and opportunities. It was suggested there are some quick wins available and that we should perhaps be less focussed on how many businesses we engage and more assured that businesses know how to contact us when they need to.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that some of the findings, particularly in respect of SCR brand awareness and visibility, and SY v SCR transcend the Growth Hub and are important to the whole SCR initiative. It was agreed these should ideally be addressed via the other governance reviews currently underway and the Growth Hub should focus attention on matters of specific relevance to business growth.</p> <p><b>Action: David G to present a Growth Hub development action plan to the next meeting.</b></p>	<b>DG</b>
<b>9</b>	<p><b><u>Growth Hub Performance Dashboard</u></b></p> <p>The Board was presented with the performance dashboard. It was agreed to defer detailed discussion on this item to the next meeting.</p>	
<b>10</b>	<p><b><u>Science and Innovation Audit Implications for the Board</u></b></p> <p>A report was presented to remind Members that the SCR, in conjunction with Lancashire LEP, was one of five LEP regions to be shortlisted by Government to undertake a first round Science and Innovation Audit (SIA), the purpose of SIAs being to analyse and evidence regional strengths, and identify mechanisms to help realise their potential. The report also confirmed our SIA was submitted to Government in September 2016 demonstrating the SCR's global leader status in high value manufacturing as part of a broader 'Northern Advanced Manufacturing Corridor' that stretches to Lancashire.</p> <p>It was noted the full implications of the Science and Innovation Audit are to be considered by each of the SCR's respective Executive Boards with a fully comprehensive report being considered by the LEP and Combined Authority once all of the Executive Boards have had an opportunity to consider and debate the implications for their respective agendas.</p> <p>The Board discussed whether it was worthwhile the Executive Boards discussing the report in detail if this is to be repeated at CA and LEP. It was suggested that the Boards should ideally be presented with their respective thematic components to enable consideration of matters in more detail than time at CA / LEP meetings would afford.</p>	

	<p><b>Action: ALL comments on the report to David C-M</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board notes that the implications of this Audit for the business growth agenda.</b></p>	<b>ALL</b>
<b>11</b>	<p><b><u>SPOKE Updates (including TechTown)</u></b></p> <p>A report was received inviting the Board to note the SPOKE updates and identify further issues for attention.</p> <p>The information provided covered Access to Finance, New Business and also TechTown</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board notes the contents of the report</b></p>	
<b>12</b>	<p><b><u>Forward Plan</u></b></p> <p>Provided for information.</p>	
<b>13</b>	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>No further matters noted.</p>	
<b>10</b>	<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b></p> <p>Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2017, 2.00pm at Broad Street West, Sheffield.</p>	