



This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document, This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Pert, Hayley and Diaz, Clive and Thomas, Nigel (2017) Children's participation in LAC reviews: a study in one English local authority. *Child & Family Social Work*. 22 (S2) pp. 1-10. ISSN 1356-7500 which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12194>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving. and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

**Pert, Hayley, Diaz, Clive ORCID logoORCID:  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2349-9479> and Thomas, Nigel  
(2017) Children's participation in LAC reviews: a study in one  
English local authority. *Child and Family Social Work*, 22 (S2).  
pp. 1-10. doi:10.1111/cfs.12194**

Official URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12194>  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12194>  
EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/1890>

#### **Disclaimer**

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document:

Pert, Hayley and Diaz, Clive and Thomas, Nigel (2014) Children's participation in LAC reviews: a study in one English local authority. *Child & Family Social Work*. [In Press]

Published in *LATHE (Learning and Teaching in Higher Education)*

Official URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12194>

Published in **Child & Family Social Work**, and available online at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12194> ISSN 1356-7500

#### **Disclaimer**

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

## **Abstract**

The aim of looked after children (LAC) reviews is to ensure that children's needs are met. A key role of the Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) is to ensure that the child's voice is heard and is part of decisions made. Although the law in England and Wales requires a child's wishes and feelings to be heard in reviews, there is limited research into how far this is achieved.

This study aimed to consider how successful looked after children and their foster carers feel that LAC reviews are in listening and including children. It also explores how far children understand the purpose of these meetings and take part in them, and what factors may prevent this. Twenty-five looked after children and 16 foster carers were interviewed.

The study found that levels of participation experienced by children and young people and observed by foster carers were minimal and the methods used largely ineffective. Participants experienced significant barriers in engaging with the review process, and the study concluded that as a vehicle of children's participation, LAC reviews were ineffective. With no substantial research in this area for over 15 years, a call is made for more attention to the views of children and young people and the effectiveness of LAC reviews.

### **Keywords**

Looked after children, child care reviews, independent reviewing officers, children's participation

### **List of Abbreviations**

LA – Local Authority

IRO – Independent Reviewing Officer

### **Introduction**

There are over 91,000 looked after children in the UK, with a significant increase in the last five years (NSPCC, 2013). It is well known that outcomes for such children are poor in comparison to their peers (Akister et al, 2010). The aim of LAC reviews is to ensure that the state consistently meets the child's needs until they reach adulthood. Tasked with overseeing this process is the IRO, with a key role to ensure that the child plays a meaningful role in the process.

The participation of children has seen a dramatic shift in the last few decades (Lansdown, 2010) and it is now widely recognised as essential to involve children in decisions made about their lives. This is particularly pertinent for looked after children, who are part of many more decisions and decision making forums than their peers (Thomas and O’Kane, 1999). Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child clearly sets out the right of children to be heard in decisions which affect them (Cashmore, 2002). The UK, as a signatory, is obliged to uphold the child’s right to express views and have them taken into account. This does not necessitate the right to make decisions or be part of the decision making process (Schofield and Thoburn, 1996); however, it does arguably represent a shift from regarding children as objects of concern (Butler-Sloss, 1988) to viewing them as citizens with human rights (Cashmore, 2002).

Section 22 of the Children Act 1989 requires that local authorities consider the wishes and feelings of looked after children when making decisions or reviewing care plans. Under the Adoption and Children Act 2002, local authorities are required to ensure that every looked after child has an Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO). The Children and Young Persons Act 2008 extended the responsibilities of the IRO with regard to care planning and performance monitoring. This was further strengthened by the Care Planning, Placement and Case Review Regulations (England) 2010 and the statutory guidance in the IRO Handbook (DCSF 2010).

There are particular arguments for the participation of looked after children, in a context where the number and type of decisions made are very different to those of other children (Thomas and O’Kane, 1999). Empowering children to participate in these decisions is particularly important in ensuring that their needs are understood, aside from the positive effects of participation in terms of confidence and self-esteem, invaluable when preparing looked after children for independence (Bostock, 2005).

The largest study to consider children’s participation in review meetings was by Thomas and O’Kane (1999). Similar research has not been carried out since the role of the IRO was introduced. Thomas and O’Kane found that only half of children interviewed attended their review meetings, and those who did frequently found them ‘boring’ or ‘scary’. Other research has suggested that children have limited understanding of the purpose and content of their reviews (Munro, 2001) and that preparation and choice are both lacking (Sinclair, 1998). A common theme (Thomas, 2011) is that children feel disillusioned with the review process and that their views are not listened to. ‘Most report that the purpose of the meeting is to talk about, rather than to, them’ (Munro, 2001: 9).

A commonly used model in the field is Hart’s (1992) ladder of child and youth participation, which distinguishes levels of participation ranging from manipulation and tokenism to partnership. Hart acknowledges that the level of participation will differ depending upon the context and the children involved. However, a key

determinant of children's participation is the commitment of adults, especially professionals, to supporting it (Welsby, 1996; Shemmings, 2000; Thomas, 2000, 2002; Bessell and Gal, 2009; Vis *et al.*, 2010).

A series of national web-based surveys by the Children's Rights Director for England explored children's views of corporate parenting (Ofsted, 2011b) and IROs (Ofsted, 2011a) and made brief mention of LAC reviews. Respondents had little understanding of the role of the IRO; only 17% felt that the IRO listened to them. Similarly, Ofsted (2013) recently explored the efficacy of the IRO role through interviewing a small sample of children across ten Local Authorities alongside IROs and parents. Findings indicated a general dissatisfaction amongst children with LAC reviews and a feeling that IROs were not fulfilling their role in supporting participation. Most recently, NCB conducted a national survey of IROs (Jelicic *et al.*, 2013). Findings suggest that IROs do not feel they have made a contribution to service improvement in improving outcomes for looked after children, and that consultation with children was generally poor. Recent court judgments have also pointed to ineffective IRO practice, including failure to ascertain, understand and take into account children's views (*S v Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council* [2008] EWHC 3282 Fam; *A and S v Lancashire County Council* [2012] 1689 Fam).

It is clearly timely for research to examine whether children's views of reviews have changed since the IRO role has been introduced.

## **The research**

The research reported here was designed to address the following questions:

1. How far do looked after children understand the process and purpose of LAC reviews?
2. How do looked after children feel about their meetings, and how far do they believe that their wishes and feelings are taken into consideration within LAC reviews?
3. What are the barriers to looked after children participating in and engaging with the review process?

Using a purposive sampling method, children and young people were recruited who had attended at least one LAC review within the local authority. The age range was 8-17 years, including roughly equal numbers of boys and girls, some sibling groups, and a mix of ethnicities representative of the local area. Potential participants were identified using the agency's database and invitations to participate were sent to children, young people and foster carers.

To ensure meaningful participation regardless of age or ability, children and young people were offered a choice of methods by which to participate including the use of

pictures, drawings and feelings cards. Examples of these are provided- see appendix. The majority of younger children chose to use these more creative methods and for many this acted as a prompt for fuller discussion. Foster carers were offered choice in where and when to hold interviews. Each participant was able to discuss the topics that mattered most to them within the confines of the study content. This allowed choice in excluding issues that may have been sensitive to them such as personal experience or information. Feedback sessions with internal and regional IRO's, social work teams and senior managers were held upon completion of the study. This was to provide insight into findings and context for service improvement suggestions.

Twenty-five children and young people were interviewed: 11 children (8-12 years) and 14 adolescents (13-17); 13 girls and 12 boys; five from a minority ethnic background; 13 placed together with siblings. The average length of time looked after was three years (range eight months to nine years). Sixteen foster carers were also interviewed, 14 female and two male; all were White British and had been approved carers for between two and 16 years.

Interviews were audiotaped (with participant permission), transcribed and analysed (along with drawings and pictures which children produced or used in interviews), by identifying key views and ideas. Five broad themes were identified:

1. Children's feelings and understanding of reviews
2. Benefit of LAC reviews
3. Preparation for LAC reviews
4. Foster carers as resources
5. The role of professionals

The findings are reported under those headings.

#### *Children's feelings and understanding of reviews*

Almost all children and young people (23) knew that they had review meetings regularly. However, their understanding of the purpose of reviews varied widely:

*'They are to check up on me'* (young woman, aged 14)

*'I think it's to do with school'* (boy, aged 8)

*'They are to see how things are going'* (boy, aged 10)

None of the children and young people interviewed suggested that meetings were to review care plans or make decisions, although one child did suggest that review meetings were to look forward to the next six months. Participants had mixed feelings about their reviews: eight of the younger children said that they felt 'OK' about their meetings but nine found them too long and boring. Just two felt that meetings were positive:

*'I like the meetings, I like to have a chat and it's nice to talk about me'* (boy, aged 10)

None of the young people reported enjoying their meetings. Adolescents reported stronger feelings of embarrassment or anger:

*'The meetings themselves are a bit scary, they are a bit daunting really, so then I'm not in the right frame of mind to talk about anything and it's just...embarrassing'* (young man, aged 15)

They were also more vocal in wishing to not attend, with specific reasons for not doing so. For the majority of children and young people it was that the content of the meetings was repetitive, boring and generalised – lacking in individuality:

*'It's just tell us about school, how's school? Tell me about your health, are you happy? Tell me about this....'* (young woman, aged 13)

Whilst children and young people were clear that they did not enjoy their meetings, all 25 attended their reviews. They spoke with a sense of resignation about doing so:

*'They are OK because....well they happen. Everything is boring but they have to be done'* (young woman, aged 16)

Participants reported using strategies to ensure that reviews ended more quickly. Some simply agreed with everything that was said; some disengaged, physically leaving the room, and others spoke as little as possible:

*'I just sit, I don't say anything. It's weird, I just want them out of the way'* (young man, aged 13)

### *Benefits of LAC reviews*

How useful children and young people found their LAC reviews was linked to their understanding of the purpose of reviews, even when this understanding was limited. For example, adolescents made comments about the value of LAC reviews when they had a specific practical task or issue they wished to resolve:

*'They are helpful in a way because you can put your point across about anything you might want to change. If you didn't have them then you wouldn't know who to see or what to do and nothing would be changed'* (young woman, aged 16)

Conversely, adolescents who had some knowledge of the purpose of reviews were also connected to the lack of value of reviews. Specifically this was linked to how settled they felt they were in placement and how long they had been 'in care':

*'I've been with X and Y (foster carers) for 8 years so it's not really like I need all of that. I don't really need anything. The sooner it comes, the sooner it's over.'* (young man, aged 16)

In terms of the long-term benefits of LAC reviews, children and young people felt largely separated from any tangible positive or negative effect upon their lives. Only two participants could remember any action points or goals. Adolescents particularly felt disassociated from the outcomes of their LAC review with high levels of either dissatisfaction or apathy:

*‘What’s the point? Nothing ever changes so there is no point’* (young woman, aged 16)

Foster carers found review meetings useful. Many commented that they welcomed a forum to raise action points and ensure that the professionals acted on them. Foster carers were clear, however, that the children they cared for appeared to gain nothing from the meetings themselves:

*‘Personally I don’t think the children get a lot out of the reviews, I think they do in the sense that I make sure what we agree actually happens and the goals are then met’* (foster carer of boy aged 11 and young woman aged 17)

Many foster carers felt that the review meetings were superficial, focusing upon health or education. Foster carers noted that action points around therapeutic intervention were subject to drift and that this was unchallenged by IROs. Significantly, there was little mention of the purpose of meetings in relation to updating care plans in preventing drift and meeting the child’s long-term needs:

*‘I’ve been to probably 20-30 LAC reviews and nobody has ever turned and said ‘Have you got a copy of the care plan? Has the care plan been updated?’’* (foster carer of young women aged 13 and 16)

Foster carers also queried the possible long-term negative effects of attending reviews, suggesting that having the meetings made children feel different:

*‘They don’t attend; they don’t like meetings at all. Their feeling is why should we have meetings? We want to be normal kids, why do we have all this paperwork, why do we have to talk to all these people?’* (foster carer of girl aged 8 and young woman aged 14 and 17)

### *Preparation*

Only two younger children suggested that their social worker visited them before the review to ask them what they would like to talk about. None of the children interviewed made mention of their IRO visiting them in between reviews.

A small number of children and young people recalled being asked for their opinion in agenda setting via a form sent in the post. Adolescents particularly disliked these forms, commenting that they were repetitive with little consideration of age or maturity. Aside from the use of forms, none of the children and young people interviewed could remember being asked what they would like to talk about at their

review. Similarly, none of the children or young people interviewed could recall being offered, on a regular basis, choice in where and when to hold the review:

*'It's always after school when I'm tired and everyone else is going to the shops and hanging out and that and I'm like oh, I've got to go home.... but they stop work at 5 so it has to be then, doesn't it? I'd have it on Sunday morning at 9am and make them get up early!'* (young man, aged 16)

When asked where they would like to hold their review meetings, 15 suggested alternative venues, including McDonalds, Alton Towers and a bowling alley.

Lack of choice and control in who attended reviews was the most emotive topic for children and young people. One child counted nine adults at her last review, and when asked whom she would like at her next review, she removed four people. This was not unusual; only eight felt comfortable with who attended their LAC reviews:

*'At my last review random people starting turning up and I was like, who are you? I didn't know who they were, it was crap'* (young man, aged 16)

Many children and young people felt confused about who attended their review meetings. In particular, this was raised in relation to foster carers' social workers. Younger children often could not remember these people's names, and suggested that they would not have them at the meeting if they had the choice. One group of siblings thought the foster carer's social worker was their foster carer's friend.

The presence of birth parents at review meetings was of huge importance to both children and young people and foster carers. Children and young people whose parents attended LAC reviews felt much more positively about them. Meanwhile foster carers felt less positive about the attendance of parents, with a feeling that the child was distracted or less engaged because of their presence:

*'Sometimes I think the IRO misses important stuff because their mother is there, she adds nothing and makes it all about her. If she wasn't there then we could actually make the meetings about the kids'* (foster carer of boy aged 11 and young woman aged 16)

### *Foster carers as resources*

The role of foster carers within reviews was highlighted as of importance to children and young people. Children and young people reported that they did feel listened to by the IRO in meetings. However, only three participants said they asked questions or initiated discussion in the LAC reviews; the majority reported that the IRO led the discussion and that the child or young person's agreement (or disagreement) was then sought. Children and young people suggested that their foster carer was key to their voices being heard:

*'She helps me to say things because....well, it's difficult... he [IRO]... speaks lots and then asks, do you want that? She (foster carer) will push me to speak up' (young woman, aged 17)*

Foster carers also reported feeling responsible for ensuring their foster child's wishes were heard and considered. This is not a simple task: foster carers noted that children could present as quiet and 'difficult' to engage within their LAC reviews; many suggested that their foster child might engage more if meetings were less professional-centred:

*'Honestly I'm not sure what they (IROs) could do, it's hard, but they could invest more time planning things instead of going through the motions. There has got to be a better way of doing it' (foster carer of boy aged 9)*

Whilst many foster carers recognised that as a forum of 'participation' the review meetings were lacking, as a 'professionals' meeting they were considered to be imperative. The foster carers interviewed clearly valued a forum in which to discuss areas for change or challenge with social workers, and felt responsibility for ensuring that their foster child's needs were accurately considered:

*'It's always me pushing and pushing. I know they think I'm difficult, so it's hard – because I'm left with [foster child] at the end of the day, so I need to make sure we all get it right.'* (foster carer of boy aged 9)

### *The role of professionals*

Participants were largely positive about their IROs. Younger children spoke of IROs playing games with them or taking them out for milkshakes as being memorable. However, six children and young people did not know who their IRO was or what their role was other than to chair the meetings. It is possible that this could be due to multiple staff changes during the interview period. However, other children and young people were dissatisfied with the social work service they had received and with the IRO response. None had considered making formal complaints; foster carers felt that there was little evidence of the IRO promoting this. Examples were given of cases where there had been extensive drift, with actions carried over multiple review meetings. Foster carers felt that not enough was done between reviews to ensure that progress was made. The starkest example was of a child who reported having had eight social workers in three years, with extremely sporadic visits. The foster carer felt that this had not been challenged and the child reported feeling 'forgotten'. Similar examples of social workers visiting children at three-month intervals were commonplace, alongside those who would only visit children at contact sessions:

*'She (social worker) comes when she feels like it! [When foster child] brought it up with her they had a big row... it's been an action point on the agenda for*

*what feels like years now and it's really not fair'* (foster carer of children aged 17 (young woman), 15 (young woman) and 8 (girl))

Some children reported having positive relationships with their social workers. Where children felt that they had got to know their social worker as a 'real person' and not just a professional they felt much more positively about them and the social work team generally:

Child: *She is quite funny really! It's just normal, I don't know like, ummm... like when she comes and we do Xbox or Wii...*

Interviewer: *So you like it that she comes and plays computer games*

Child: *Yeah, I do... it's a good thing that she comes really because things are better now, better than before'* (boy aged 9)

Those children who reported having positive relationships with their social worker also reported less negative feelings about review meetings, suggesting that the social worker-child relationship is important in how the child engages with the review process. The converse also applies: one foster carer reported that her foster children disliked their social worker so much that they hid from her. This would impede the social worker's ability to adequately prepare these children for reviews, and possibly affect the children's attendance at their LAC reviews.

The use of the advocacy service was limited (three children and young people), although many did report being offered an advocate and choosing not to use this service. Those who did, reported some difficulties in sharing information between social care, the IRO and the advocate:

*'She [advocate] came, talked to the children and I thought great, that's done but then she didn't come to the review so I thought well where are the children's views? We've lost them. She [IRO] said nothing.'* (foster carer of girl aged 8, boy aged 8 and girl aged 10).

## **Discussion**

It should be noted that this study presents the views of service users from one LA; no claims of national representativeness are made. It also focused on the views of service users, specifically children and young people and foster carers. This presents a useful, if partial, view of LAC reviews; interviews with IROs, social workers and parents would be beneficial.

In discussing the findings we return to the three original research questions.

*1. How far do looked after children understand the process and purpose of LAC reviews?*

The results of this study would suggest that the children and young people interviewed had a basic understanding of why they had LAC reviews and what their purpose was. Results were categorised as 'basic understanding' (19) or 'inaccurate' (4). Inaccuracies were exclusive to younger children, suggesting the need for explanation in a manner appropriate to their age. This is in line with earlier and more recent research (Thomas and O'Kane, 1999; Ofsted, 2011a, 2013).

All the children in this study were invited to and attended their LAC reviews, and yet their understanding of the purpose was very limited. This raises the question whether continued attendance at LAC reviews, when they are not understood, is of use to children and young people. This study also found that attendance at reviews was not always an active choice for children and young people, particularly when they reported not understanding the process and feeling negatively about them. A significant proportion of children and young people reported attending reviews because they 'had to'. The view of review meetings as 'necessary' and part of life in the care system could serve to oppress already vulnerable children and young people and exacerbate feelings of being different.

Furthermore, those children who had only a basic understanding of the purpose of reviews reported greater feelings of scrutiny and unsurprisingly felt more negatively about reviews. This accords with literature on the role of professionals in enabling or obstructing participation (Vis et al, 2010) and of children's views of child protection case conferences (Cossar et al, 2011). Not understanding the process was raised by children and young people as a barrier to participation. This study supports this finding with a link made between lack of understanding of the process of reviews and dissatisfaction with reviews themselves.

*2. How do looked after children feel about their meetings, and how far do they believe that their wishes and feelings are taken into consideration within LAC reviews?*

Despite the multitude of legislative, policy and guidance frameworks that exist to promote the involvement of children in decision making, research paints a bleak picture of children and young people being dissatisfied with the levels of participation offered to them (Barnes, 2012; Ofsted, 2013). This study supports this, but also provides evidence that children felt listened to during their meetings, if not as part of the wider process of these meetings.

Taking LAC reviews to be a process and not a single event (DCSF, 2010; Sinclair, 1998; Thomas, 2011), children and young people reported being offered little opportunity to input their views at any stage of this process. This was most acutely felt in the planning and preparation stages of the LAC review process. This study

supports earlier findings that children do not feel adequately prepared for reviews (Munro, 2001). Children and young people were also clear that the IRO came with an agenda; there was little sense that they could have a say in what was discussed, or other aspects of the process. This has implications for their self-confidence (Bostock, 2005); it is imperative that social workers and IROs try to promote the self-determination of an already vulnerable group (The College of Social Work, 2013). Better preparation of children and young people before their LAC review is necessary (Sinclair, 1998) and more emphasis should be placed upon social workers and IROs to ensure that this happens.

The environment and context of the LAC review, or any decision-making forum, is of importance in promoting the participation of children and young people (Cashmore, 2002; Murray and Hallett, 2000). This study supports earlier findings that children and young people were given little choice in who would attend or when or where the LAC review would be held (Thomas and O’Kane, 1999; Munro, 2001; Sinclair, 1998). In this way, a significant opportunity to encourage the participation of children and young people in decision-making is being lost, despite the IRO Handbook providing guidance in this area. Children and young people were forthcoming with suggestions of how they might change various contextual factors around their LAC reviews such as timing, location, how often they were held and in particular, choice of who would attend LAC reviews. A key finding was that children and young people wished for fewer people, particularly professionals, to attend their reviews. What this suggests is that an approach which emphasises on-going consultation with children and young people in how their LAC reviews are held would be more successful at encouraging participation.

Children and young people in this study reported that the IRO listened to them during meetings, in contrast to other research (Ofsted, 2011b). However, a number of young people thought that their reviews were not beneficial to them. It may be that these young people were not made aware of the actions or outcomes of their reviews, engendering a sense of apathy and dissatisfaction. Younger children did not experience the same levels of dissatisfaction, or were less engaged in the subject matter of reviews and so with the action points. This difference in opinion between younger children and adolescents is not unusual. Munro’s study (2001) also referred to greater levels of dissatisfaction among adolescents. We know that adolescents can be more critical than younger children (Beckett and Taylor, 2010). What is interesting is that professionals had made greater efforts to be creative in reviews held for younger children. Younger children spoke of reviews which involved going out for milkshakes, whilst adolescents were expected to join in normal meetings, probably with the view that they would wish to be treated in a more adult manner. However, the results of this study suggest that it may be worth exercising the same, if not greater, levels of creativity with adolescents. This could go some way to improving how far they engage with and feel listened to as part of the LAC review process.

Greater emphasis upon IRO visits between reviews, as suggested by the IRO Handbook, could undoubtedly assist with this.

Children and young people's attendance at LAC reviews was highlighted as a significant area for improvement in previous research (Thomas and O'Kane, 1999). All interviewees in this study attended at least part of their LAC reviews. This suggests that improvements have been made since the role of the IRO was introduced in 2002, although the suggestion that this is a result of IRO practice cannot be made on the basis of findings from this study. Perhaps a direct consequence of the improved attendance of children and young people in their LAC reviews is the potential attendance of their parents. Thomas and O'Kane's study (1999) found that children were less likely to participate in their LAC review if their parents had a challenging relationship with the LA. In this study, parental attendance was a significant issue for both children and young people and foster carers. Children and young people whose parents did not attend their LAC reviews were clear that they would like them to; for a significant number of children interviewed this had been requested and not granted. It is difficult to disentangle whether parents chose not to attend, or whether the IRO or LA had blocked this request. Nonetheless, this was an area in which children and young people reported feeling that their views had not been taken seriously or considered. This was supported by foster carers, who reported that children and young people were not offered the opportunity to consider who might attend their reviews and that parents were regularly requested to attend and this did not always happen.

### *3. What are the barriers to looked after children participating in and engaging with the review process?*

Children and young people in this study were clear that review meetings were long and boring; only two children enjoyed their reviews; both described them being individual, creative and memorable with just the child and IRO present. All the other children and young people, whose reviews were held with many professionals present (up to nine was not unusual), felt the meetings did not include them and were boring; they saw them as essentially a meeting for adults.

Foster carers agreed (all 16). They suggested that the benefit to children and young people came from professionals taking action post-review. This accords with earlier research (Munro, 2001; Thomas and O'Kane, 1999; Sinclair, 1998) in which authors report children finding LAC reviews to be adult-centric, albeit focussed upon the child. The important point here is that whilst professionals find LAC reviews of use in helping them fulfil their role toward the child, children and young people feel party to a professionals' meeting. Perhaps it is time to consider how possible it is to carry out LAC reviews in a manner which is child friendly and performs all of the necessary statutory functions.

Looking back to Hart's (1992) ladder of participation, few children in this study were offered genuine opportunity to influence any aspect of the meeting. This was felt in how their views were sought (the use of forms), which were felt to be unsatisfactory, and also in how the meetings were carried out. Inadequate choice, control and lack of information have been highlighted as significant barriers to child and young person participation (Thoburn, 2010; Hill, 2006; Cashmore, 2002; Murray and Hallett, 2000). These results are perhaps related to the tension between protection and participation in social work practice (Shemmings, 2009). In feedback sessions with professionals and foster carers, it was evident that professionals did try to protect children from adult conversations, including decision-making forums. IROs suggested that children struggled to understand significant decisions and that often teenagers did not want to participate. This is not supported by research which emphasises the desire of children and young people to participate in decisions about their care (Thoburn, 2010; Cashmore, 2002; Murray and Hallett, 2000). The strength of feeling from the participants in this study confirms that children and young people do not enjoy not being part of adult centric decision-making forums. Reviews were enjoyed when they were more child friendly, where they had choice in how they were run and in which they did not feel embarrassed or overwhelmed (Thoburn, 2010; Bostock, 2005). It is logical to expect that when children enjoy decision-making forums, they may be more likely to engage with them. Furthermore, children and young people in their feedback sessions agreed that reviews could be more 'fun' and would be of more use if they had greater ownership of them.

The lack of perceived action following reviews is also a significant finding. Foster carers reported extensive drift, with actions carrying over across multiple reviews. This study found that only two children and young people interviewed could recollect any action points or goals from their LAC reviews. This disassociation with the potential benefit of the LAC review process, coupled with apathy about change, suggests that children and young people do not believe that the LAC review is useful to them; this accords with previous research in this area (Thomas, 2011). This is thus a significant challenge for IROs and social care staff to ensure that children and young people engage in decisions made about their lives.

Children and young people demonstrated limited understanding of the IRO role. This builds upon research drawn upon in the literature review (Ofsted, 2011a;b). The study conducted by Ofsted (2011a) demonstrated that children had some understanding of the role of the IRO in chairing meetings and reviewing their care plan. A quantitative study using multiple-choice answers, it is possible that this does not wholly reflect the true understanding of those children interviewed. The children and young people interviewed in this study did not understand key task functions of the IRO role: namely challenging poor social care practice and ensuring the child wishes and feelings are heard. Furthermore, the foster carers interviewed within this study raised concerns that IROs allowed actions to drift and gave stark examples of poor social

care practice going unchallenged. This draws parallels with recent Ofsted (2013) research into the IROs ability to challenge, in which the same LA was inspected. Findings were consistent with this study in that IROs demonstrated ineffective challenge. This is pertinent to social care policy with the role of the IRO due to be reviewed in 2015 (Jelicic et al, 2013). The study would suggest that ineffective IRO practice not only fails to ensure care plans are reviewed (Ofsted, 2013) but also that a lack of understanding of the IRO role and ineffective challenge by the IRO is a key barrier to children and young people engaging with and participating in their LAC reviews.

## **Conclusion**

The aim of this study was to explore service users' perspectives of LAC reviews. The views of children and young people and their foster carers were strikingly similar to the conclusions of research from 15 years ago. Little appears to have changed with regard to children and young people's views of the efficacy of reviews in 'hearing' their voice, despite the introduction of the IRO role and a plethora of guidance reinforcing the participatory focus of LAC reviews.

The lack of engagement reported by interviewees around all aspects of their review meetings suggests that children feel that meetings are done *to* them rather than *with* them, tokenistic involvement in terms of the 'ladder of participation'. It is clear that foster carers value LAC review meetings as an opportunity to discuss and review key aspects of the child's life. In this sense, a key function of the review is being met. However, it appears that the participation of children is still being sacrificed for a more procedural approach to ensuring that statutory requirements are met. This means that decisions about their care are not being informed by the views of children and young people.

## **References**

- Akister, J., Owens, M. and Goodyer, I.M. (2010) Leaving care and mental health outcomes for children in out-of-home care during the transition to adulthood. *Health Research Policy and Systems* **8** (10).
- Barnes, V. (2012) Social work and advocacy with young people: rights and care in practice. *The British Journal of Social Work* **42** (7), 1275-1292.
- Bath and North East Somerset Council. (2013). *Data Protection and Freedom of Information*. [online]. Available at: <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/your-council-and-democracy/data-protection-and-freedom-information> [Accessed 12 January 2013].

- Beckett, C. and Taylor, H. (2010) *Human Growth and Development*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bessell, S. and Gal, T. (2009) Forming Partnerships: The Human Rights of Children in Need of Care and Protection. *International Journal of Child Rights* **17** 283-298.
- Bostock, L. (2005) Improving the lives of fostered children and young people, *CC Inform* [online]. Available at: <http://www.ccinform.co.uk/articles.aspx?liArticleID254> [Accessed 22 June 2013].
- Butler-Sloss, E. (1988) *Report of the Inquiry into Child Abuse in Cleveland 1987*. London: HMSO.
- Cashmore, J. (2002) Promoting the participation of children and young people in care. *Child Abuse and Neglect*. **26**, 837-847.
- Cossar, J., Brandon, M. and Jordan, Peter. (2011) *'Don't Make Assumptions' Children's and Young People's Views of the Child Protection System and Messages for Change*. Office of the Children's Commissioner. Norwich: CRCF.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2010) *IRO Handbook: Statutory guidance for independent reviewing officers and local authorities on their functions in relation to case management and review for looked after children*. London: HMSO.
- Department of Health (2001) *Consent- what you have a right to expect: A guide for children and young people*. London: HMSO.
- Hart, R. (1992) *Children's Participation: from Tokenism to Citizenship*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- Hill, M. (2006) Children's Voices on Ways of Having a Voice: Children's and young people's perspective on methods used in research and consultation. *Childhood* **13** (1), 69-89.
- Jelicic, H., Hart, D., La Valle, R., Fauth, R., Gill, C. and Straw, C. (2013) *The Role of Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) in England: Findings from a National Survey*. London: NCB.
- Lansdown, G. (2010) The realisation of children's participation rights: critical reflections In: B. Percy-Smith and N. Thomas, ed. *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation: Perspectives from Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 11-24.
- Munro, E. (2001) Empowering looked-after children. *Child and Family Social Work* **6**, 129-137.


- Murray, C. and Hallett, C. (2000) Young People's Participation in Decisions Affecting Their Welfare. *Childhood* 7 (1), 11-25.
- NSPCC. (2013) *Statistics on looked after children*. [online] Available at: [http://www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/resourcesforprofessionals/lookedafterchildren/statistics\\_wda88009.html](http://www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/resourcesforprofessionals/lookedafterchildren/statistics_wda88009.html) [Accessed on 2 June 2013].
- Ofsted (2011a) *Children on Independent Reviewing Officers. A report of children's views by the Children's Rights Director for England*. [pdf] London: Ofsted. Available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/childrens-views-independent-reviewing-officers> [Accessed 27 December 2012].
- Ofsted (2011b) *Having corporate Parents. A report of children's views by the Children's Rights Director for England*. [pdf]. London: Ofsted. Available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/having-corporate-parents> [Accessed 2 January 2013].
- Ofsted (2013) *Independent Reviewing Officers: taking up the challenge?* [pdf]. London: Ofsted. Available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/Independent-reviewing-officers-taking-up-the-challenge> [Accessed 23 June 2013].
- Schofield, G. and Thoburn, J. (1996) *Child Protection: The voice of the Child in Decision Making*. London: IPPR.
- Shemmings, D. (2000) Professionals' attitudes to children's participation in decision making: dichotomous accounts and doctrinal contests. *Child & Family Social Work* 5, 235-243.
- Sinclair, R. (1998) Research Review: Involving children in planning their care. *Child and Family Social Work* 3, 137-142.
- The College of Social Work. (2013). *Code of Ethics*. [online] Available from: [http://www.tcsw.org.uk/uploadedFiles/TheCollege/Members\\_area/CodeofEthicsAug2013.pdf](http://www.tcsw.org.uk/uploadedFiles/TheCollege/Members_area/CodeofEthicsAug2013.pdf) [Accessed 06 June 2013].
- Thoburn, J. (2010) Looked after children- care planning, placement choice, and review, *Community Care Inform* [online] Available at: <http://www.ccinform.co.uk/articles/article.aspx?liArticleID=1548> [Accessed on 12 June 2013].
- Thomas, N. (2000, 2002) *Children, Family and the State: Decision-making and Child Participation*, Macmillan, Policy Press.
- Thomas, N. (2011) 'Care planning and review for looked after children: fifteen years of slow progress?', *British Journal of Social Work* 41(2), 387-398.
- Thomas, N. and O'Kane, C. (1999) Children's participation in reviews and planning meetings when they are 'looked after' in middle childhood. *Child and Family Social Work* 4, 221-230.

Vis, S.A., Holtan, A., and Thomas, N. (2010) Obstacles for child participation in care and protection cases: Why Norwegian Social Workers find it difficult. *Child Abuse Review* (21), 21-43.


Welsby, J. (1996) 'A voice in their own lives' in De Boer, G. (ed.) *Children's Rights in Residential Care in International Perspective*. Defence for Children International, Netherlands.

## Children's Pictures and Drawings

The table in this picture represents the LAC review, while the pictures represent who currently attends this child's LAC review.



The child was then asked if they would like to add or remove anyone from the table for their next LAC review.



**Child drawings: feelings about LAC reviews**

