



**Steeton Primary School Governing Body
Link Governors for Behaviour and Attitudes
Minutes of the meeting of 30 January 2026**

The meeting opened at 12.04pm

Attendance

Link Governors

Stephen Hammond
Katie Walsh

Others

Sharmyn Kennedy – Inclusion Lead (IL)
Helen Osman (Clerk)
Claire Redman – acting Headteacher (aHT)

Documents

A. Self-Evaluation Form (SEF) 2025-26: BA and PD sections	Item StBA 19/25	<i>Issued with agenda</i>
B. School Development Plan 2025-26: Behaviour & Attitudes section	Item StBA 20/25	<i>Shown on screen</i>
C. Summary of responses to Catering Manager survey of pupils' views	Item StBA 21/25	<i>Shown on screen</i>

Summary of Actions

Item StBA	Action	Person	Deadline
06/25	IL to recalculate attendance data excluding children below statutory school age and circulate to Link Governors for Behaviour & Attitudes. <i>[Clerk's note: the aHT advises that whole school attendance excluding children below statutory school age is 94.06% (her e-mail to Clerk of 09-02-2026)]</i>	S Kennedy	30-11-2025

StBA 13/25 Apologies for absence and their acceptance

- All Link Governors for Behaviour and Attitudes were present.

StBA 14/25 Notification of urgent other business

- No other business was notified.

StBA 15/25 Declarations of interest in items on the agenda for this meeting

- There were no declarations of interest in items on the agenda for this meeting.

StBA 16/25 Minutes of the meeting of 17 October 2025 and matters arising

- The minutes were agreed as a true record.***

Summary of Actions

Item StBA:	Action	Status
06/25	IL to recalculate attendance data excluding children below statutory school age and circulate to Link Governors for Behaviour & Attitudes. The requested work had been completed but not yet been circulated to governors.	Ongoing

StBA 17/25 Monitor zero tolerance behaviour from CPOMS data

5. The Inclusion Lead (IL) reported that there had been 37 zero tolerance behaviour incidents in school since the start of the school year, 30 of them in the autumn term. All had been dealt with and the parents informed.
6. Of the 30 incidents in the autumn term, 15 had been one-off incidents and the children concerned had shown no further concerning behaviours. 5 of these children had been in Reception and had not yet learned what behaviour was expected in school, or had used swear words because they 'because they were unaware of the context and meaning. For these children, such incidents were only recorded as zero tolerance if the behaviour was repeated. The same was true for the recording of incidents involving discrimination against protected characteristics. This approach recognised that children needed time to adapt to the school setting and expectations.
7. Of the remaining 15 incidents:
 - 4 related to a single Year 1 child – this child had since been permanently excluded following considerable support over time
 - 3 related to a single Year 6 child – this had been addressed through internal exclusion and there had been no further zero tolerance incidents
 - 4 to a group of Year 3 boys – the group had been disrupted by moving one of the children to a different class: this had led to a significant improvement in behaviour
 - 2 related to a Year 3 child – the child, who was usually well-behaved, had had a bad day
 - 2 related to one child on a single day – the school was working with this child, who had SEMH¹ needs
8. Of the 7 zero tolerance incidents this term, three related to the pupil who had now been permanently excluded. The remainder were one-off incidents and did not involve pupils who had been involved in zero tolerance incidents in the previous term.
9. Governors welcomed this evidence that the school's behaviour policy and systems were effective in minimising repeat incidents. **Asked** for examples of zero tolerance behaviour, the IL said that they included behaviours such as harming someone with intent, repeated swearing, dishonesty to staff. **Replying to questions**, she said that the majority of incidents occurred in unstructured time. All zero tolerance incidents were dealt with by a member of the senior leadership team (SLT).
10. **Asked** whether 30 zero tolerance incidents in a term was considered high, the acting Headteacher (aHT) said that, for a school of 260 pupils over a period of 30 school days, it was not high. **Asked** how the number of zero tolerance incidents compared with last year, the IL did not have the 2024-25 data immediately to hand. Governors noted that it would be recorded in the minutes of the January 2025 meeting². **Asked** whether Steeton was stricter than other schools, the aHT and IL confirmed that it was: Steeton had high expectations of pupil behaviour and tackled incidents of poor behaviour promptly and firmly. They reminded governors that even the most well-behaved children could have bad days, and that younger children in particular might misbehave because they had not yet learned how they should behave in school: behaviour incidents were sometimes part of the learning process. It was also important to bear in mind that children were children and should not be expected to behave as robots.
11. **Asked** how zero tolerance behaviour incidents were followed through to suspension if necessary, the IL said that this depended on the nature of the offence and the needs and circumstances of the child. Decisions to suspend or exclude a child were made by the aHT. The proximal cause of the recent permanent exclusion had been a bullying incident, though this had followed several months of other behaviour affecting the safety and wellbeing of the child and others.

¹ SEMH – Social, Emotional and Mental Health

² Clerk's note: the minutes of the LG/BA meeting of 28 January 2025 record that the number of zero tolerance incidents in the period 01 September 2024 to 28 January 2025 was 81. This compares with 37 in the period 01 September 2025 to 30 January 2026.

12. The aHT said that she had visited Park Aspire, the PRU-type³ provision that the recently permanently excluded pupil would attend from 03 February 2026. Like Steeton, Park Aspire focused on logical consequences that made sense for the needs of the child and aimed to restore proper behaviour. Steeton tried hard to avoid suspending, excluding or otherwise punishing pupils: rather, time was sent with the child and family to mend the situation. This very tailored approach to behaviour management made it challenging to draw useful comparisons between behaviour data from year to year.

a) Overview (anonymous) of any children whose behaviour is being monitored

13. The IL said that no children were currently being monitored actively in relation to their behaviour – this compared with two children at the time of the last meeting. The aHT added that one or two were hovering around the threshold for active monitoring due to silliness, such as making faces during the mock SATs tests.

14. **Replying to questions**, the IL said that the school did record a lot of information on CPOMS, perhaps more than other schools. Leaders found that full CPOMS records helped leaders to build up a clear view of patterns of behaviour and to correlate them with other information about the child. As an example, a child in one of the lower year groups had been involved in some minor incidents of unkindness and poor attitude. Because all such incidents were always recorded by the different staff who managed the incidents, the IL had been able to identify the pattern and discuss the child's behaviour with the family, who had explained that the family pet had died. The IL had therefore been able to put nurture support in place for the child. The pattern of behaviour had been the child's effort to communicate distress, and the detailed recording of behaviours had allowed the school to identify and address the issue.

15. **Replying to questions**, the IL said that YouHue⁴ was not currently showing any causes of concern. Typically, children were using it to record that, for example, they were sad because they had not liked lunch that day.

16. The IL gave an example of how the school's trauma informed approach worked in practice. On the day of this meeting, a teacher had been concerned about how a child was presenting. The teacher had spoken to the child, the IL and the parents and had referred the child for play therapy. **Replying to questions**, the IL said that the school had a contract with play therapist to come into school on Wednesdays to work with pupils. It was an important element of this support that it was provided by an external person.

17. The aHT said that Steeton had recently provided Positive Handling training at Sandy Lane for its staff and staff of other schools. It had been clear that the other schools did not provide this kind of support for pupils and were inly just starting to think about the kinds of approaches that Steeton had been developing for some years. Behaviour at these schools was challenging. The aHT thought that the school did not always give itself enough credit: it was exceptionally good at managing behaviour and supporting children. It had been interesting to discuss approaches to behaviour with the Head of Park Aspire: they used similar approaches to those used at Steeton, including soft starts, play therapy etc. He had said that it was important not to insist on perfection at all times but to recognise that some children could not do what everyone else did. Core expectation needed to be adhered to, but there needed to be sufficient flexibility to adapt to the day-to-day needs of pupils.

18. The aHT said that suspensions and permanent exclusions were used where a child's behaviour compromised their safety or the safety of other children and staff. Referring to the recent permanent

³ PRU – Pupil Referral Unit: a school that is established and maintained by a local authority to enable it to meet its duty to arrange suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils and for other pupils who – because of illness or for other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such provision. Park Aspire is described as “PRU-type” because it is run by an Academy Trust rather than the local authority.

⁴ YouHue – an online resource that pupils can use to indicate their emotional state to staff: [YouHue | Unlock Every Child's Potential](#)

exclusion, and without going into the detail of the permanent exclusion, which would be reviewed by a panel of governors in the next fortnight, governors discussed the impact on staff of the behaviour of the child concerned since September 2025. It was not always recognised that having to physically restrain a small child, for example, was distressing for staff and that they often took that distress home with them. Governors who were parents of pupils in school had witnessed the challenging behaviour of this child every morning and noted that, unlike the staff of a PRU, mainstream school staff were not trained to deal with this. **Governors asked** whether, on reflection, the aHT and IL felt that school should have permanently excluded the child sooner. The aHT and IL thanked governors for their recognition of the impact on staff – this was not always acknowledged by the local authority and others. They felt that it had been important that the school do everything possible to support the child and family. Permanent exclusion of a child was an acknowledgement of failure, and leaders had to be sure that there was no other option.

b) Case studies of any bullying incidents since previous meeting

19. The IL reported that there had been two incidents of bullying since the start of the school year, involving different pupils. Both had been addressed, the parents contacted and the matter resolved. The incidents had been classed as bullying because they had been malicious: one child had threatened to tell another's mother something and had gone on to do so the other had been internally suspended for unkindness involving discrimination against a protected characteristic.
20. Governors thanked the IL for her useful and interesting report and agreed that the next meeting would consider the process and procedures around the recent permanent exclusion, which would by that time have been reviewed by the Pupil Disciplinary Committee of the School Governing Body

StBA 18/25

Review breakdown of attendance for all groups of children

21. The IL reported that attendance for the year to date stood at 93.62%, compared with the national average of 93.36%. Attendance on the day of this meeting was 94.55%.
22. 22.93%, or 61 pupils, were currently Persistently Absent (PA). Of these, six were no longer on roll. Excluding these six pupils, 55 children, or 21.31%, were PA. **Asked** how this compared with previous data, the IL said that the proportion of children who were PA was always around 20%.
23. The IL reminded governors that PA was not a clear indicator of attendance. Of the pupils who were currently PA, two were on authorised leave to travel to India for 2.5 weeks but had previously had 100% attendance.
24. Two children were severely absent: ie attendance below 50%. One was on a flexible timetable and so the maximum attendance they could achieve was 50%: due to their health needs, their attendance was currently 42%. The other had been on a modified timetable and had recently been permanently excluded and was currently dual registered with the school and Park Aspire. The child could not be registered solely with Park Aspire because the placement was not long term: the local authority was seeking a place for this child in more specialist provision. **Replying to questions**, the IL said that this child would continue to be marked as absent on the school's attendance register.
25. **Asked** whether the need to hold a governor meeting to review the permanent exclusion, scheduled for Monday 09 February 2026, would delay the child's start at Park Aspire, the aHT said that it would not: the child would start at Park Aspire on Tuesday 02 February 2026. An EHCP application was in process for the child and permanent specialist provision would depend on the availability of places. **Asked** whether the EHCP would be processed more quickly because the child had been permanently excluded, she said that it would not. **Asked** about the timescale for the EHCP application, the IL said that work had started to compile the supporting information in September 2025; the application had been submitted in December 2025; it had been to the LA panel to be assessed, and an Educational Psychologist had arranged an initial visit. The 20-week deadline for the processing of applications would end in March or April 2026. **Replying to questions**, the aHT said that the school had one other EHCP application in progress.

26. The IL said that, since September 2025, she and the SENCo had each spent approximately 50% of their time on managing the needs of the child who had recently been permanently excluded. Governors noted the significant detriment that this had presented for other children in school.

StBA 19/25

Mid-year review of Self Evaluation Form (SEF): Behaviour and Attitudes – Document A

27. The aHT said that the SEF had been updated with year-to-date information. She highlighted the following points:
- The Federation Resources Committee had approved the proposed project for necessary improvement to the staff kitchen.
 - Responses to the recent parent survey had been positive, though one parent (2.6%) had disagreed with every question. 85% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the school ensured that pupils were well behaved, with 11% neutral.
 - Late arrival and pick-up of pupils continued to be a source of frustration and adversely affected the work of the Inclusion Lead and office staff. 70 children had been late on one morning recently: this was not typical, but neither was it unusual.
28. **Asked** how the school addressed lateness, the aHT said that it had tried every strategy it could devise. The IL conducted a termly audit of attendance and write to the families of pupils whose attendance was below 80%. She broke down the data on lateness to identify and trends, and reviewed the number of broken weeks: again, she discussed this information with the families concerned. **Asked** whether there was a correlation between lateness and factors such as distance from the school, disadvantage etc, she said that those who were habitually late tended to drive to school over some distance.
29. Governors considered the level of lateness to be unacceptable, though it recognised that the school was doing all it could to address the matter and agreed with the concern of the school not to punish children for a matter that was outside their control. The Clerk suggested that the aHT discuss the matter with the aHT at Sandy Lane, which had had some success in reducing lateness. **Asked** whether there would be merit in adjusting the start of the school day so that more of the children who arrived late would be recorded as absent, the aHT was sceptical: this would have an adverse impact on attendance data without any real likelihood of parents changing their behaviour.
30. The aHT said that the challenge related not only to late arrival in the morning but also to late collection at the end of the day. Ten children were routinely collected late and in the same order: the parents concerned appeared to expect the school to provide free childcare until it was convenient for them to collect their child. **Asked** what these children did until their parents arrived, the aHT said that they waited outside at the top gate with the aHT and Inclusion Lead. The school continued to write to families and discuss the matter with them, but to little effect.
31. Noting that the congestion outside the school might contribute to lateness, governors suggested that the problem might improve as the reduction in the school's PAN worked through the year groups, as the number of children coming into school and the anticipated increase in the proportion who lived locally led to fewer parents driving their children to school.
32. **Governors recommended** that the School Governing Body approve the updated SEF.

StBA 20/25

Monitor impact of School Development Plan (SDP): Behaviour & Attitudes – Document B

33. Link Governors reviewed the Behaviour & Attitudes section of the School Development Plan (SDP) – the key points are recorded on the updated copy at Annex A.

StBA 21/25

Review outcomes of any Pupil Surveys

34. The aHT said that the catering manager had conducted a survey of pupils' views on school meals: she showed the summary of responses on screen. Most responses related to preferred foods, some of which the school would introduce: the aHT explained why it would not introduce others. Governors

were pleased to see that pupils were broadly content with their lunches and were willing to eat them. They welcomed the evidence that the school was taking action in response to pupils' views.

StBA 22/25 Any other urgent business notified at Item StBA 14/25

35. There was no other business.

StBA 23/25 Agree the one or two key points from this meeting to be reported to the SGB

36. Link Governors agreed to highlight the following points to the School Governing Body:

- Punctuality remained an intractable issue that diverted the time of the Inclusion Lead and office staff from other work. An obvious step to address this would be to provide a Breakfast Club or wraparound care but, as previously discussed, the LA was unwilling to support an application for DfE start-up funding on grounds of local sufficiency. The school and Link Governors would continue to monitor the situation and try to identify way to address it.
- A significant proportion of the time of the Inclusion Lead and SENCo since September 2026 had been required to manage the behaviour of a child with SEMH needs. The child had not had classroom time since September 2025. The aHT had been obliged to exclude the child permanently from 23 January 2026 and the Governing Body's Pupil Disciplinary Panel would meet on 09 February 2026 to review that decision.
- **Link Governors recommended** that the School Governing Body approve the Attendance, Behaviour Safeguarding and Inclusion section of the updated SEF.

StBA 24/25 Date of next meeting

37. The next meeting would be held at **10.00am on Friday 19 June 2026.**

The meeting closed at 1.17pm.

Helen Osman Governance Services
Supporting excellent governance in Bradford