

LEADERSHIP BOARD

Meeting held at Cavendish House, Stockton
at 10.00 am on Monday 17th February 2014

ATTENDEES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Sandy Anderson (SA) | Chair |
| Councillor Bill Dixon (BD) | Leader, Darlington BC |
| Ray Mallon (RM) | Mayor, Middlesbrough BC |
| Councillor George Dunning (GD) | Leader, Redcar & Cleveland BC |
| Councillor Bob Cook (BC) | Leader, Stockton on Tees BC |
| Nigel Perry (NP) | Chief Executive, CPI |
| Alastair MacColl (AMc) | Chief Executive, BE Group |
| Professor Graham Henderson (GH) | Vice-Chancellor, Teesside University |
| David Soley (DS) | Executive Chairman, Tenergy, Wilton Group, Camerons Brewery, ERS |
| Tim Grant (TG) | Principal, Darlington College (FE representative) |
| Naz Parker | Interim Executive Officer, HCA |
| Ian Kinnery (IK) | Independent Adviser |
| David Robinson (DR) | Group CEO, PD Ports |
| Amanda Skelton (AS) | CEO Redcar and Cleveland BC |
| Richard Alty (RA) for Ada Burns | Darlington BC |
| Gill Rollings (GR) | CEO Middlesbrough BC |
| Damien Wilson (DW) for Dave Stubbs | Hartlepool BC |
| Linda Edworthy (LE) | Tees Valley Unlimited |
| Neil Kenley (NK) | Tees Valley Unlimited |
| Gill Rollings (GR) | CEO Middlesbrough BC |
| Amanda Skelton | CEO Redcar and Cleveland BC |
| Stephen Catchpole | Tees Valley Unlimited |

| | |
|----------|---|
| 1 | Chair's Welcome SA opened the meeting and welcomed Naz Parker, HCA who is replacing David Curtis on the Board. |
| 2 | Apologies Alison Thain, Councillor Christopher Akers-Belcher, Paul Booth, Margaret Coates, |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | Graham Pendlebury and Neil Schneider. |
| 3 | Conflicts of Interest None |
| 4 | Minutes of previous meeting and any matters arising In the meeting notes of 22 nd January a comment from Professor Graham Henderson, regarding UVEC should have read NUMEG/OTC (Northern Universities Military Education Group/Officers Training Corps and Technical Enhancement Platform should have read Teesside University Open Learning (Engineering) (TUOLE). |
| 5 | <p>Strategic Priorities for the SEP</p> <p>SC introduced the item and raised two points, asking if the Board agreed with the priorities and for any ideas to move forward.</p> <p>LE went through a letter received from Greg Clark dated 13th February which shared details of emerging themes from meetings he had had with Ministers, which are relevant for all SEPs and Growth Deals. Emphasised that money from the Local Growth Fund is the only source of capital for transport schemes and that transport priorities are to be put forward for this funding.</p> <p>The proposed 11/12th February meeting with Greg Clark had been postponed. This was due to the non-availability of Ministers who wished to be involved. Twenty nine LEPs have had their challenge session with the submission of the SEP due at the end of March, we are possibly looking at week commencing 10th March for the challenge session which will probably be in the Tees Valley. This timescale does not give us a lot of time to make any recommended changes.</p> <p>LE said the Government is looking for specific actions rather than generalities.</p> <p>Comments made during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to the skills agenda and problems with careers advice for young people, GH was not convinced this was a problem. In the slide it identified 25% will require level 4 skills, but 27% of people are trained up to level 4 and GH thought we should be more ambitious with our target. • RM spoke of a real skills shortage for electricians, plumbers, joiners and to get the balance right in relation to people's aspirations. If the demand is there the colleges will produce the necessary courses. • DR – issue how the business community connects with education, need a model to make sure both private and public sectors connected to education. • TG – from a practical view when looking for new courses you have to take a view how long you can subsidise before the course becomes viable. • BD thought this is where we should be focusing attention, should we be forcing the colleges to consolidate but there is the issue of transport/travel. • TG – young people choose the college for the course and location • IK felt there was poor decision making by young people and parents. Part of the solution may be transport. Traditional careers advice not what we are looking at, need to find a mechanism involving the people, employers and education. • AMc – vast amount of practical work to be done, need integrated solutions, how we organise as a Board, for a practical period of planning against the |

priorities.

- RM felt schools do not encourage businesses to come into the schools. Need to influence early, getting the businesses into schools, provide encouragement, ideally from the final year in primary school.
- DS – the Government wants evidence, solutions to the problems. We are good in digital skills, computer skills, hairdressing etc but we do not have the basic trades. He asked how many people in these trades are from overseas.
- GH mentioned previous initiatives between industry and schools but there is no longer the funding for initiatives like these. The funding streams in place are now under threat.
- RA agreed this was the correct way at looking at the problem, quantify the problem, there is evidence e.g. Foundation for Jobs, need to change behaviors in a way that is beneficial.
- DR said the skills agenda has to include up to the ages to 50/55.
- BD - In capital builds that we fund or part fund BD felt we should insist on local labour clauses involving the CITB (Construction Industry Training Board)
- SA felt there was plenty of data around but it is about the presentation, we have to have a positive image of industry.
- In reply to a point made by RM, SC did not think construction was a blind spot, it was down to supply and demand, we are talking about general trends. We have to try to get practical solutions, a consistent pattern of numbers, a big element being around upskilling. 3 / 4 sectors, short term, advanced manufacturing/engineering. How we equip for a general base of activity underpinned by desire to get closer to industry to make a difference.
- BD spoke of all the local authorities releasing vast tracks of land for housing across the 5 Boroughs, there is no time to put through training, need to upskill.
- DR spoke of the chemicals industry and lack of skills, projects not completed on time, not a good track record.
- TG – parents/young people make a decision on the information given. It is important how we get info out of where the jobs are to the children/parents to have any influence.
- SA – felt this an issue of local needs, upskilling a real demand, perhaps a battle we should continue with Government.

SA summarised by stating we need specifics/evidence base. More willingness for industry/business generally to work on.

LE went through the summary paper on the key priorities for the SEP and asked for any reflections on what we need to address.

SA asked if the group agreed with the five areas.

LE said the Growth Deal asks are similar to City Deal, we are not asking for extra money but a policy change or a way of spending existing money in a better way. Some potential to negotiate. On the skills agenda we have been knocked back so many times. Few LEPs have been successful on skills even with the NELEP pilot scheme having to exclude apprenticeships.

- BC enquired if money can come out of ERDF/ESF. LE confirmed it could.
- SC said we should persist with over 25's and work based learning and look to putting a page together with the ideas rebadged. It is then Greg Clark's choice to say yes or no.
- IK – felt it was a structural problem, a mismatch. In a position to improve the mechanism, mentioned Darlington's Foundation for Jobs, could ask for assistance to roll out.
- NP felt the Vision was missing, Tees Valley can do this for UK Plc, sell to central Government, European monies are transformative, pull the Tees Valley behind them. We could be the Centre for Biologics Research or Low Carbon. NP mindful of the chemical growth partnership to increase GVA – GVA from industry £190 billion to £300 billion by 2030.
- SC felt the vision is out there, some ideas rejected/some accepted. One immediate issue – growth in construction, 4,000 jobs, locals skilled to do this, we can create more.
- SC – the key task – engage with CITP, 2 Board members to take responsibility for the group, prepare a detailed action plan, TG's idea of a construction centre. Concentrate on skills, 4 most important sectors to us, comprehensive approach. Board member lead, 3 / 4 Task Groups, enterprise, small businesses etc.
- On priorities AS felt there was nothing in there about building, housing/places. We are not being consistent in prioritising. One of the key great strengths is quality of life/cultural offer. In the Growth Plans we need to grow places, otherwise we will lose people, will not capture spend.
- LE – European strategy – looking at the digital sector – retaining capital wealth in the area.
- AS felt our cultural facilities an undeveloped strength at the moment, even if not funded still a priority.
- RM felt it was a compelling narrative from AS, a big priority. Government might embrace, Government want to see growth. Felt Government looking for quick wins where construction concerned.
- SA felt Place encaptured in Objective 2. The problem is identifying priorities, not sure how we include AS's comments. AS said we have to sharpen targets/Land Based Plans.
- NP – establish demand for skills, go through local papers/radio saying the Tees Valley needs a number of people, NP certain supply side can grow very quickly.
- TG – powerful argument to put to Government, we have to be clear about Asks. Felt it important to work to a Framework. Ensure wealth we create stays in the Tees Valley.
- BC – asked that mention is made of freight, Middlesbrough to Teesport.
- SC spoke again of setting up 4 Task Groups to look at how to stimulate demand/what practical steps can be taken, the skills requirements. The Task Groups would cover Construction, Low Carbon/Biologics, Health Care and Finance and Business Services and would involve Board Members taking a lead, LA reps, and experts from other professions in order get a better understanding and to prepare detailed operational plans.

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC felt European money is an opportunity. When we have an Action Plan we can put in some resources. • SA – we can demonstrate to Greg Clark we are taking responsibility for managing rather than asking for money. • TG asked that we be clear about number of replacement jobs. • SC clarified that the group were happy with the priority areas and confirmed the report will be sharpened up and will be submitted to the Investment Panel and Leadership Board before submission. • Greg Clark visit w/c 10th March, when known the date will be circulated to Board members to see who might be available to attend. |
| 9 | Any Other Business None |
| 10 | Dates of next meetings 26 th March 2014 30 th April 2014 23 rd July 2014 |