



THE CONSORTIUM
ACADEMY TRUST

Shaping Positive Futures

The Primary Local Board of The Hessle Academy

Minutes of the Primary Local Governing Board
Penshurst Primary School
Thursday 15 January 2026 at 5.15pm

PRESENT:

Mr D Grainger (Chair, DG), Mr D Garton (DGa), Mrs A Jessop (AJ), Mrs E Lucid (EL), Mr M Peck (MP), H Rushton (HR), Mrs C Shiels (Headteacher, CS), Mr D Thomas (DT), Mrs C Thorley (CT)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Mrs M Adams (DSL, MA), Mrs C Davies (Assistant Head, CD), Mrs S Hornby (Assistant Head, SH), Ms. N Loveridge (Acting SENDCO, NL), Mr J O' Brien (Director of Improvement and Standards, JOB), Mrs G Stafford (Clerk, GS)

Throughout these minutes a question is indicated by Q followed by the initials of the questioner and a comment is marked by C.

30 WELCOME

DG welcomed everyone to the third meeting of the academic year.

31 APOLOGIES

E Collins

Resolved: Consent was given for the absence of the above governor. Emma had submitted questions in advance of the meeting.

32 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No declarations were made specific to this meeting.

33 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2025 were confirmed as a true and correct record and signed by the Chair, DG.

34 MATTERS ARISING

- 34.1 **ACTION: SEN support and EHCP pupil numbers to be shown per year group in SEND Reports - complete**
- 34.2 **ACTION: Behaviour procedures to be shared with governors and sent out to parents - complete**
- 34.3 **ACTION: CD and CS to reword the PP Strategy and send out to governors for approval by 15.12.2025 – brought to this meeting for approval, minute 37**

34.4 ACTION: E Collins, D Grainger, A Jessop and M Peck to complete the suspensions and exclusions module before the January meeting - complete

34.5 ACTION: CD to revise the Homework Policy and send out to governors for remote approval - brought to this meeting for approval, minute 42

35 SAFEGUARDING SUMMARY

The report summarised the data from the autumn term.

- 21 Operation Encompass alerts
- 11 cases of a child being physically restrained
- 41 child on child logs

Q: (DT) How often do the safeguarding curriculum meetings take place and why is there not a record of the last such meeting?

MA: I think half termly, but I am not involved. I will seek the views of other DSLs.

SH: It's covered in the PSHE curriculum – trends are identified and there are discussions how we inform the children of any risks etc.

Q: (EC) How are Year 1 staff supported with the high number of physical restraints?

MA: SLT assist and one member of the Year 1 team is Team Teach trained.

CS: The important part is there are measures in place to avoid having to use physical restraint.

Q: (EC) How does the school monitor the use of physical restraint?

SH: After each incident we complete a Trust proforma, logging all details of the incident. We also log the event on CPOMs.

Q: (EC) Are there opportunities for staff reflection after a physical restraint incident?

SH: Yes, SLT check in with the member of staff and offer support.

Q: (EC) How do the child-on-child numbers compare to other years and other schools?

SH: I don't know about other schools, but they are high as every single incident of pushing or shoving is recorded.

Q: (DT) What is the threshold for a child-on-child incident?

MA: A push. Year 1 are still learning how to play and frequently it maybe they are fighting over toys.

Q: (DG) Of the 10 children and 15 logs in Year 1 how many were significant in terms of causing actual harm?

MA: A very small minority. There are lots of SEND pupils and children under Early Help in Year 1.

Q: (MP) What is the reason for the increase in Operation Encompass alerts?

MA: Christmas – alcohol and football matches. This is typical over Christmas and New Year.

C: (JOB) Can I suggest that the Safeguarding Governor looks over some CPOMs cases of child-on-child logs and physical restraint logs to gain assurance of the level of reporting.

ACTION: MA to query with the DSL group what should be covered in safeguarding curriculum meetings

ACTION: D Thomas to review CPOMs with the DSL to gain assurance of quality of reporting of child on child and physical restraint logs

MA left the meeting at 5.25pm.

36 SEND REPORT

- 2.7% of pupils (13) have an EHCP (national is 4.7%)
- 14.1% of pupils (65) have SEND support (national is 14.8%)
- Year 6 has the highest number of SEN support (18) and pupils with an EHCP (4)

Q: (DGa) Does the TA in Year 6 support a child on a one-to-one basis or do they carry out interventions?

NL: They are assigned to a high-level child but can support other pupils too but not carry out group interventions. There is also an HLTA who delivers interventions and covers teachers to deliver interventions.

CD: We have split Year 6 into 3 classes of 22 – mixed ability groups.

Q: (DG) Year 5 and 6 are our priority year groups, both with very high levels of SEN. How many of the EHCP pupils in these year groups have a one-to-one? Can we be assured we are meeting the EHCP need?

NL: EHCPs are categorised by funding M1 to M6 according to need. We are meeting the need. In Year 5 there are 2 EHCP pupils; one child accesses the Den and the two classes share a full time TA and a TA in the mornings. In Year 6 there are 4 EHCP pupils, one has a full time one to one. The other 3 pupils have lower needs. A full-time TA has been deployed into Year 5 and Year 6 is now split into 3 groups to ensure there is adequate support.

Q: (DG) What is the split of SEN support and EHCP pupils between the two classes of Year 5 and 6?

NL: They are split evenly to minimise impact.

Q: (DG) Are staff given any extra training for the high level of need in Years 5 and 6?

NL: We have experienced staff in those years, carrying our quality first teaching. We provide additional training – for example dyslexia training, East Riding hearing and Oakfield are also keen to support. I would also like to think that staff would approach me with any specific training need.

NL left the meeting at 5.48pm.

37 PUPIL PREMIUM STRATEGY

At the last meeting there was a discussion around the wording of the strategy used last year to split Year 6 into smaller classes, with interventions taking place for the lower attainers. The wording around this has now been revised.

CT requested that the detail of the lessons learned around the use of the Behaviour Support team is developed further. Once this is addressed, governors were content to approve the Strategy.

Resolved: Governors were content to approve the PP Strategy

38 PERFORMANCE DATA REPORT

The outcomes from the November mocks were discussed in detail. The headlines were:

- 69 pupils (each 1.45%)
- Since the end of Year 5 tests, significant improvements have been seen in all disciplines; the percentage of pupils achieving expected in maths has risen by 16%, percentage achieving in grammar, punctuation and spelling has risen by 14% and in writing by 10%. Percentage achieving in reading has increased by 31% in the 95+ bracket

	Expected (100+)	Target	Greater Depth (110+)	2025 national
Reading	62%	79%	23%	66%
Writing	59%	79%	4%	69%
Maths	48%	73%	6%	64%
GPS	56%	79%	15%	54%

An in-depth discussion regarding the November mocks took place in part B of the meeting.

39 ATTENDANCE AND BEHAVIOUR SUMMARY

39.1 Attendance (current data)

- Attendance for 'all' is 94.2% (national average 95.4%). This is a 0.8% drop from this time last year
- Attendance of PP children is 90.3%, SEND support is 90.6%, EHCP 89.8%
- Boys' attendance is over 1% lower than girls (93.6% compared with 94.8%)

39.2 Behaviour

- There have been 17 suspensions this academic year (2024/25 YTD 7)
- 7 of the suspensions have been from Year 6 pupils
- All are boys
- Spike in suspensions seen in December

At present, only four members of the Board have PowerBI access. It was agreed that either all governors need access or the Attendance and Behaviour Report needs to provide all the data necessary to hold the Lead to account. This question will be posed at the next LGB Chairs' meeting.

Q: (DG) *There have been 2 suspensions seen in Reception. Do they have additional needs?*

SH: *Yes.*

Q: (DG) *The number of suspensions in Year 6 is alarming.*

SH: *The 7 suspensions are for 4 boys.*

Q: (DG) *What would the staff tell us about behaviour in the school?*

SH: *They would say behaviour is having a really big impact on them. They would say the behaviour is from a small minority of pupils. Most behaviour is verbal abuse / defiance. It is so difficult to teach if there is a defiant pupil in the class. The tiered behaviour response system can fall down if the staff at the early stages are not available. For example, due to staff absence at stage B1, one of the office staff had to step in to assist.*

Q: (DG) *What is the plan to resolve this?*

SH: *We are seeking external support.*

Q: (DG) *Are some staff struggling as SLT are not coming at an early stage?*

SH: *Yes, some.*

C: (CT) *This is about empowering the staff to deal with incidents themselves without being over reliant on SLT.*

Q: (AJ) *How has the new Behaviour Policy been received by parents?*

SH: *We have only received one negative comment.*

Q: (AJ) *Is the system working better?*

SH: *We are using the Thrive approach and there is still confusion with the children over the consequence, sometimes a simple conversation can be powerful enough.*

Q: (AJ) *Are staff taking ownership of the system?*

SH: *Yes, it is working better but it is still early days. SLT are called if there is a serious incident but sometimes seeing SLT can cause an escalation in behaviour.*

Q: (DGa) *The warn, move, remove approach – if a pupil is asked to move to another class but refuses to leave, how does this affect the rest of the class?*

SH: *This is about how the message is delivered – they need to know this is a strategy for them. We try and remove them to the shadow class so that they do not miss work. If they refuse to leave, then a Teams message is sent out requesting another member of staff to address. If they still do not leave, then the behaviour is 'refusal to accept a consequence.' Calling for another member of staff on Teams has mixed results as messages get lost. We are looking to move to the Arbor alert messages.*

Q: (DG) *Is the rise in the number of suspensions during December seen as positive?*

SH: There has been a huge rise in suspensions as we are seeing a massive increase in disrespectful often threatening way that staff are spoken to, mainly in Year 5 and 6. We have tighter sanctions so we are suspending more pupils but this will lead to better behaviour eventually. We sought external expertise from Ash Chapman who delivered assemblies on respectful communication and the expectation of respect in preparation for transition to the High School. Following these assemblies we adopted Hesse's stepped response for verbal disrespect. CS: Out of 400 pupils only 10 have been suspended.

Q: (DG) Does research suggest that suspensions work?

SH: It is not necessarily the suspension itself that has the impact it's all the work behind the behaviour and the support given. I have invited the PCSO in to talk to the pupils and Oakfield are keen to support anti-social behaviour.

Q: (CT) Do parents engage when they are contacted about their child's behaviour?

SH: Parents talk to me but not all support, even though we all want the same thing – children to feel safe and happy in school.

ACTION: PowerBI access roll out to be discussed at the LGB Chairs' meeting in March

ACTION: A Jessop to look over suspension records with S Hornby to see if appropriate

40 COMPLAINTS DATA – Autumn term

- 52 formal complaints were received across the whole Trust in the autumn term (2024/25 there were 64)
- 1 was from a PPS parent, just 0.23 complaints per 100 pupils

CS: As far as possible we talk to parents to diffuse any concerns at an early stage.

41 GOVERNANCE UPDATES

All governors have completed the Safeguarding for Governance: Refresher 25/26 module. The Suspensions and Exclusions module is still to be completed by EC and DGr.

HR has completed a Teaching and Learning Link visit in December which focused on teaching in Years 5 and 6.

ACTION: E Collins and D Grainger to complete the suspensions and exclusions module ASAP

42 POLICY UPDATES

Q: (EC) How has parent feedback from surveys been considered to amend the Homework Policy?

CD: Results from the Endurio survey have been used. Most parents want their child to have weekly homework and spellings to learn.

Resolved: The Homework Policy and the Intimate Care Policy were approved.

43 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

44 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 19 March 2026, 5.15pm.

45 AGREED ACTION POINTS

- 45.1 ACTION: MA to query with the DSL group about what should be covered in safeguarding curriculum meetings (minute 35)**
- 45.2 ACTION: D Thomas to review CPOMs with the DSL to gain assurance of quality of reporting of child on child and physical restraint logs (minute 35)**
- 45.3 ACTION: PowerBI access roll out to be discussed at the LGB Chairs' meeting in March (minute 39)**
- 45.4 ACTION: A Jessop to look over suspension records with S Hornby to see if appropriate (minute 39)**
- 45.5 ACTION: E Collins and D Grainger to complete the suspensions and exclusions module ASAP (minute 41)**

Part A closed at 6.20 pm.