

Appendix A



**Central
Bedfordshire**

**Children Services Operations
Quality Assurance**

Independent Reviewing Officers Annual Report

April 2012-March 2013

Author(s):	Isabel Wilks Team Manager QA/CRS
Date agreed:	07.05.2013
Agreed by:	CSMT

1.0 Introduction

The Contribution of Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) to Quality Assurance and Improving Services for Children in Care

- 1.1 The IRO Handbook – Statutory Guidance for Independent Reviewing Officers and Local Authorities on their functions in relation to case management and review of Looked After Children (LAC) states that the IRO Manager should be responsible for the production of an annual report for the scrutiny of the members of the Corporate Parenting Panel.
- 1.2 This report provides an opportunity to highlight areas of good practice and areas which require improvement, identify emerging themes and trends, describes areas of work which the service has prioritised during the year, and will prioritise in the coming year,

2.0 Purpose of Service and Legal Context

- 2.1 The responsibilities of the Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) in relation to the review of cases of Looked After Children are defined within Section 26 of the Children Act 1989, which was subsequently modified by s.118 of the Adoption and Children Act 2002 and s.10 of the Children and Young People Act 2008. Statutory Guidance, *The IRO Handbook*, was issued in April 2010, and came into force in April 2011.
- 2.2 In Central Bedfordshire the Independent Reviewing Officers' (IRO) function is undertaken by Review Managers in Conference and Review (CRS) within the Quality Assurance Service. Review Managers undertake two main areas of work: Chairing of Child Protection Conferences and Looked after Children's Reviews. In addition they chair a small number of short break reviews when short breaks are provided under s.20 of the Children Act (primarily for children with disabilities).
- 2.3 The statutory duties of the IRO are to:
 - Monitor the performance by the local authority of their functions in relation to the child's case;
 - Participate in any review of the child's case;
 - Ensure that the ascertained wishes and feelings of the child concerning the case are given due consideration by the appropriate authority; and
 - Perform any other function which is prescribed in regulations.
- 2.4 The IRO's primary focus is to quality assure the care, planning and review process and to ensure that the child's wishes and feelings are given full consideration. IROs are qualified social workers with sufficient practice and supervisory experience to undertake this authoritative professional role.

The Review Process

- 2.5 The review will typically comprise a meeting chaired by the IRO and attended by all the relevant people in the child's life. The social worker, child, carers, parents, teacher, health representatives and other involved professionals may all attend, or some

information may be sought prior to the review in order for the meeting to be child centred and involve only the key people.

- 2.6 The IRO will usually meet with the child before the review and the child will also have the opportunity to complete a consultation leaflet. The leaflet asks a series of simple questions about the child's views and wishes and can be completed by them with the assistance of their carer or social worker ahead of the review to enable them to express their views as part of the review process.
- 2.7 The leaflets have recently been revised by the participation officer in consultation with IROs and the CICC (Child in Care Council). They will now be available in five age-appropriate versions (ages 4-7, 7-9, 9-12, 12-15 and 16+) and are to be sent out with the review invitation.
- 2.8 The review is a review of the Care Plan. The purpose is to ensure the Care Plan fully reflects the child's current needs, and that the actions it sets out are consistent with the Local Authority's legal responsibilities towards the child as corporate parents. The plan must set out the long term plans for the child's upbringing and the arrangements made to meet the child's developmental needs in relation to health, education, emotional and behavioural development, identity, family and social relationships, social presentation and self-care skills. The review documentation includes the Care Plan and a record of the review process which includes a report from the social worker, a record of the meeting and the recommendations made, which is completed by the IRO. This will identify who needs to do what and when, review progress made against previous recommendations, and consider contingency plans.

3.0 Quantitative Information about the IRO Service

- 3.1 On 1 April 2009 when Central Bedfordshire Council became a unitary authority, there were 132 looked after children & young people. The numbers of Looked After Children have risen steadily since that time. The population at 31 March 2011 stood at 176. The population as at 31 March 2012 stood at 208. As at 31 March 2013 the LAC population was 254, this represents a rate per 10,000 of 45, compared to 37 as at 31 March 2012. This also compares to the 2012 national and statistical neighbour average at 31 March 2012 which were 60.7 and 45.4 respectively.
- 3.2 The increase can be attributed to two main factors – the increase in referrals in line with national social care activity, and the application of more rigour than the legacy authority in applying thresholds and intervening to ensure children are protected from harm.
- 3.3 There were 669 reviews held in respect of 307 children during the year from April 2012 to March 2013. The number of reviews held in respect of any individual child or young person is determined by when they became looked after, in accordance with statutory timescales and any changes of circumstances requiring an additional review.

3.4 Composition of the Looked After Children Population. Total 254

Ethnicity

	White	Mixed	Asian	Black	other
CBC Local School Population	89%	5%	2%	2%	1%
National Funded School Population 31/01/12	78%	4%	9%	5%	2%
CBC Children Looked After 31/03/13	82%	10%	2%	2%	4%
National Children Looked After 31/03/12	78%	9%	4%	7%	2%

Age

Age at 31 March 2013					
	BOYS	GIRLS	Total CBC	% CBC	National 31/03/12
Under 1	9	14	23	9%	6%
1-4	31	29	60	24%	19%
5-9	35	20	55	22%	19%
10-15	35	35	70	27%	36%
16-17	29	17	46	18%	20%
18 & over and placed in a community home	0	0	0		
TOTAL	139	115	254	100%	100%
CBC %	58%	42%			
31/03/12 National %	56%	44%			

Legal Status

Legal Status at 31 March 2013			
	CBC	% CBC	National 31/03/12
Care Orders Interim	97	38%	20%
Care Orders Full	60	24%	40%
Voluntary agreements under s.20 (single period of accommodation)	76	30%	29%
Placement Order	21	8%	11%
On remand, committed for trial, or detained	0	0	-
Emergency orders or police protection	0	0	-
TOTAL	254	100%	100%

Placement

Placement at 31 March 2013			
	CBC	% CBC	National 31/03/12
Foster placement with relative or friend Inside local authority	34	72%	75%
Foster placement with relative or friend Outside local authority			
Placement with other foster carer Inside local authority	148	11%	9%
Placement with other foster carer Outside local authority			
Secure Unit	2		
Homes and hostels	26		
Hostels and other supportive residential placements	0		
Residential schools	3	1%	1%
Other residential settings	12	5%	1%
Placed for adoption (including placed with former foster carer)	8	3%	4%
Placed with own parents	7	3%	5%
In lodgings, residential employment or living independently	14	5%	5%
Absent from agreed placement	0	0%	-
Other placement	0	0%	-
TOTAL	254	100%	100%

Staffing and Workload

- 3.5 At 31 March 2012 the review manager establishment was 4.8 fte with an effective 0.5 of additional cover provided by an agency worker covering a combined Allegations Manager/Review manager role; the permanent Allegations Manager post holder having returned from maternity leave to work half-time.
- 3.6 In response to a rise in the number of Looked After Children and Child Protection during the previous year and a review of the workload in respect of allegations management, the review manager establishment was increased to 6.3 fte, recognising the 0.5 hours being undertaken by the combined post and creating an additional growth post. This additional capacity has been covered primarily by agency staff, due in part to difficulties in recruiting to the permanent post and in part to other staffing changes within Conference and Review, which are explained below.
- 3.7 A permanent member of staff on a 0.5 contract left the service in August 2012. In October 2012 the 0.5 Allegations Manager went on maternity leave and the Allegations Manager work was fully taken up by the agency review manager who had covered this role previously. Managers brought in another full-time agency worker who had worked for the service previously to cover the vacancies created. In addition the Family Group Meeting (FGM) Manager took a 0.5 post as a Review manager after a re-structure of the

FGM arrangements. In December 2012 a long-standing permanent part time Review Manager went off sick and is expected to be on sick leave until at least August 2013.

- 3.8 The above changes and planned changes of staff in May 2013 has led to the need to recruit further agency staff in the short term with two workers starting in April 2013. Managers shall recruit to the permanent vacancies and anticipate the members of staff on sick leave and maternity leave will return in August 2013. In addition to agency staff the Service has five permanent members of staff who have continued their employment with Central Bedfordshire and provided good continuity to the young people for whom they are the IRO. Inevitably with changes of staff some children have had a change of IRO, but this has been kept to one change and in some cases it has been possible to change to another known IRO.
- 3.9 The make-up of the team has a good gender balance comprised of 4 male workers and 5 female workers. All workers have as required, a considerable number of years' experience. Within the group there is a wide range of experience, with IROs previous roles including front line social work with Children with Disabilities, Looked After Children and Child Protection, supervisory and managerial experience, residential experience and previous work as Children's Guardians.
- 3.10 Several of the team live locally, others in neighbouring authorities. There is a good knowledge of the local area within the team. Workers come from a range of backgrounds but do not fully reflect the ethnic mix of the population. Ideally the workforce would reflect the diversity of the Looked After Children population it is serving, but within a small group a wide representation is not achievable. Within the social work teams there is a wider range of ethnic and cultural backgrounds represented.
- 3.11 The IRO Handbook provides guidance on caseloads, detailing expectations of the IRO role and advising factors to be taken into account. It estimates that a caseload of 50 to 70 Looked After Children would represent good practice in the delivery of a quality service.
- 3.12 In Central Bedfordshire all review managers undertake both the IRO role and that of chairing Child Protection conferences. This allows flexibility within the service given the relatively small numbers of staff. The rising numbers of both children looked after and children on child protection plans have led to a review of workloads. Caseloads had become higher than the guidance stipulates which does place a strain on the provision of a quality service. A business case to recruit additional permanent staff has been agreed.

4.0 Qualitative Information about the IRO Service

The Timeliness of Reviews

- 4.1 The timing of reviews is specified in regulation. The first review has to be held within 20 working days of the child/young person becoming looked after, the second within 3 months of the first. Subsequent reviews at intervals of no more than 6 months. Reviews will in addition be held if there is a significant change of circumstances or of the Care Plan.
- 4.2 Performance in respect of timescale has previously been reported against a national indicator, whilst reporting requirements have changed this indicator is still a good measure of performance i.e. ***"of those children who had been looked after for at least 20 working days, the percentage whose Reviews had all been on time over the past year"***. This indicator excludes children placed for adoption and only looks at reviews in the current reporting year (since 01 April). Timescales depend on when the

child started to be looked after. The performance target for 2012/13 was 95%. The outturn was 243 /247 which equates to 98.3% of reviews held within timescales.

- 4.3 There were 4 children and young people who were reported having a late review at the end of the year:
- Child A born March 2012 remained in hospital after birth due to experiencing drug withdrawal. Child A moved to foster care on 18.04.12. A notification was sent to CRS on 23.04.12 informing that the child had become looked after and subject to an Interim Care Order on 18.04.12. Child A's Review was arranged and held on 15.05.12. At the Review the IRO became aware that the child had actually been made subject to an order whilst still in hospital. The social worker had not understood this meant the child was looked after from that date. This issue was addressed, but the recording of data correctly showed that the Review had been held late due to incorrect notification.
 - Child B, subsequent LAC Review booked and arranged for October. The review was cancelled on the day because the social worker was absent on sick leave. On checking the due date an administrator made a mistake mixing up the review dates with those of a sibling. The IRO and Social worker re-arranged on the basis of this incorrect information. As a result the Review was held late.
 - Child C became looked after in October 2012. Child C's initial LAC Review should have been due held by 31.10.12. Unfortunately an administrator made a mistake and advised the due date as being 01.11.12. The Review was held on that date and is marked as late all be it by one day.
 - Child D previous review held 11.9.12; next review booked for 4th Feb. Social worker was off sick so it was agreed to cancel and re-arrange on return. An administrator identified the wrong information in respect of the due date for the review and the review was held late. The management information system only picks up the error once it has occurred. All review managers and administrators have been advised to double check due dates of reviews.

Children's Participation

- 4.4 The IRO handbook states that it is expected that the child if s/he is of sufficient age and understanding will be present for the whole of the Review, but this will depend on the circumstances of each individual case. The IRO may decide, in consultation with the social worker that attendance of the child is not in the child's best interests. If the child does not attend, other arrangements should be made for their involvement. It is one of the specific responsibilities of the IRO to promote the voice of the child and to ensure their wishes and feelings are represented. It may be appropriate for a younger child to be observed or for the IRO to interact with that child through play or reading in a placement setting. If the child's first language is not English, as for example with the unaccompanied asylum seeking children an interpreter will be provided. A child with disabilities may perhaps be observed in school or placement and their needs and feelings be discussed with their carers if a direct conversation is not possible.
- 4.5 The Review Record will include information on how the child participates and how their wishes and feelings were included. Participation is monitored by recoding a participation code. Children aged under 4 are excluded. For all other children it is expected that they should attend, or that their views should be represented.
- 4.6 An audit was undertaken in October 2012 in respect of twenty four children and young people who had become newly looked after during May to July 2012 and were aged 4 or

over at the time of becoming looked after in order to assess compliance with the expectations that:

- The IRO is required to speak to the child in private prior to the first review;
- The IRO must ensure that the child's current wishes and feelings have been established and taken into account;
- The child (if of sufficient age/ understanding) will be present for the review.

4.7 In the majority of the cases the IRO did meet with the child separately (15/24). For four children this meeting was immediately before the Review and this is recorded within the review document. For eleven children a separate contact visit took place. In all cases the child's wishes and feelings were ascertained and recorded as part of the review process. Audit findings were fed back to the individual IROs and discussed at team meeting to share good practice. A re-audit will be undertaken in June 2013.

Attendance at the Review meeting varied according to the age of the child

Age Group	4-8 years	9-12 years	13+
Attended	2	2	11
Did not attend	8	1	0

4.8 Participation is considered an important performance indicator. The PAF C63 Indicator records children and young people who communicated their views specifically for each of their statutory reviews as a percentage of the number of children and young people who had been looked after at 31 March for more than four weeks. The monthly reporting data for March 2013 shows that $149/171 = 87.1\%$ children and young people participated in their Review. Excluding recording errors the percentage of children who participated in their review was $166/171 (97\%)$. A target of 95% participation in reviews was set and hence the target for participation was met.

4.9 There are 20 children and young people recorded as having neither attended their Review nor having been represented. Of these 15 are recording errors. An explanation of these and of the five young people who did not participate is given below:

- There are a group of cases (11) that were reviews undertaken by an IRO who then went off sick and did not complete the fwi monitoring forms but the children had participated.;
- A sibling group of 3 young children, which review took place at the final Review Child Protection Conference and the wishes and feelings of the children were considered throughout the meeting. The IRO omitted to record a participation code;
- One young person who did not attend his Review by met with his IRO in his placement following the meeting. The IRO omitted to record a participation code;
- One unaccompanied asylum seeking young person went missing prior to an updated age assessment being undertaken. The UK Border Agency believed she might be using an alias, having been age assessed as an adult elsewhere. All necessary notifications to the Police and the UKBA have been made and to date the young person has not been traced or located.
- Four young people aged over 16 who chose not to attend. The comments recorded under their views are as follows:

1. "R has refused to express his views, attend the LACR or complete a consultation form."
2. "C did not attend today's meeting, he deliberately avoided all contact with professionals is not engaging with Key work sessions or in sessions with his Social Worker C was phoned by the Social Worker did not respond. The IRO phoned C on his mobile 08.11.12 - No response. Text sent 09.11.12 - No response, 13.11.12 phone and text requesting he make contact - no response"
3. "T did not attend his review or complete a consultation form. His views are therefore difficult to ascertain."
4. "Chair met with N at home a few days after the review meeting as he had refused to attend. "

Parental Participation

4.10 The IRO handbook advises that the IRO should seek the views of birth parents and any other adults with parental responsibility and other significant persons in the child's life, for example extended family members. The record of the review notes those attending and those consulted as part of the review process. The Review Manager also completes a monitoring form which includes qualitative feedback on the quality of practice in respect of appropriate involvement of parents and extended family. The previous case recording system we had until April 2012 did not report on parental attendance. In response to the requirements of the IRO handbook we created a monitoring form to capture information on participation of parents and connected persons, which enable us to report last year on attendance at 181 reviews over a four month period. The case recording system that was introduced on 01.04.13 (Frameworkki) includes recording of parental attendance within the IRO monitoring form. It had been expected that this would provide an appropriate report for this year and the previous form was replaced by the one within Frameworkki. Unfortunately at present reporting is not possible. A solution is being pursued by the Children's Case Management System programme manager.

Service User Feedback

4.11 IROs are required to respond immediately and informally to questions and queries arising from young people their parents and carers, often through a phone conversation. When a prompt explanation and response is given this will usually resolve the matter so a complaint does not arise. When complaints do arise, it can be the case that a concern is in relation to the review process is part of a wider complaint about Children's Services actions in which case (CRS) have contributed to the response. Conference and Review have also responded to feedback from individual young people and from the Children in Care Council. Some issues that have arisen are:

- Young people finding it confusing that the IRO role is undertaken by review managers in CBC. This has been addressed by changing all CRS documentation – invites leaflets etc to remove the use of Review Manager term and consistently use the nationally recognised term IRO in respect of all IRO functions;
- An IRO supporting a young person to make a complaint to challenge the lack of consultation in respect of a proposed move of placement;
- Management of parental participation in the review process. The IRO handbook expects that the parents and child will be present for the whole of the Review depending on the individual circumstance. It goes on to make clear that if attendance is not in the child's interests or will be inappropriate or impractical that alternative arrangements should be made. The IRO will explain this to the parent and the Review may then be arranged as a process or series of meetings. Any

decision to manage a Review in this way will be kept under review and the IRO will record the reason within the Review Record and advise the persons involved.

5.0 The Conduct of the Organisation in Relation to the Review

- 5.1 Conference and Review (CRS) sit within Quality Assurance Service and the quality assurance role is central to the IRO's responsibilities. The IRO is responsible for monitoring the performance of the Local Authority, including effective challenge of poor practice, and has a crucial role in ensuring that the Council fulfils its responsibilities as a corporate parent for all the children it looks after.
- 5.2 The IRO completes two monitoring forms after each LAC Review. One of these sits within the Frameworki review episode and records information about the arrangements, who has been consulted, participation by parents and children, completion of required documentation, including Care Plan, Health Assessment Personal Education Plan, and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. In addition a word form gives qualitative feedback in respect of care planning, children's participation, and appropriate involvement with family and partnership working with other agencies
- 5.3 The line manager should review the monitoring form when they review and verify the record of the meeting. In addition the word monitoring forms are sent to the responsible team manager. Feedback on practice will include good practice as well as any areas of concern. The line manager will share with the social worker in supervision and if any identified actions are needed ensure these are completed.
- 5.4 In addition the Conference and Review Team Manager holds a monthly Quality Assurance meeting with each of the fieldwork team managers. The meeting with the LAC Team is also attended by managers from the Fostering Team, and from the Adoption Team, which helps to pick up any concerns within placement and to ensure permanency planning is closely monitored. The CRS Team Manager produces a summary report for each meeting, which summarises information from individual monitoring forms, gives an overview, and allows identification of any general issues or concerns. This report is also circulated to the relevant heads of service and to the Assistant Director Operations. This process ensures that feedback on practice is shared with the individual worker and manager and an overview is given to heads of service and Assistant Director.
- 5.5 The Peer Review undertaken in March 2013 found the IRO Service performs an effective quality assurance function and the monthly quality assurance monitoring meetings alongside the Dispute Resolution procedure is helping to address poor performance while also recognising and commending good examples of effective practice. The reviewers observed two LAC Reviews and reported the Chairs of the reviews were capable, competent and experienced and conducted excellent reviews.

6.0 Conduct of the Organisation in Relation to the Case

Procedures for Resolution of Concerns

- 6.1 The Central Bedfordshire Conference and Review Service focuses on immediate problem solving with social workers and team managers whenever possible and will always begin to address issues in a constructive co-operative manner. Central Bedfordshire already has in place a Quality Assurance process described above through which most concerns will continue to be raised and resolved.

- 6.2 However *The IRO Handbook*, which was issued in April 2010, and came into force in April 2011, strengthens the role of the IRO and requires the authority to have a formal Disputes Resolution Policy.
- 6.3 In the guidance, the IRO has a duty to monitor the Local Authority's performance overall, not just in respect of the review of the child/young person's case. So, the IRO should identify poor practice, and must negotiate with the Local Authority's managers up to the highest level. The IRO is required to consider a referral to the Child and Family Court Advisory and Support Service, where the child/young person's human rights have not been observed. It is not necessary for all efforts to resolve the Dispute through this process to have been unsuccessful, before the IRO does this; rather, it is anticipated that referral to CAF/CASS will usually occur when a Dispute raised through this process has not been resolved in a timely way.
- 6.4 If an IRO considers that a matter involves a breach of a child's human rights the matter should immediately be raised as a formal dispute.
- 6.5 Most other concerns will be raised with the Team Manager through the existing Quality Assurance process. A RAG system will ensure that more urgent matters are highlighted.
- 6.6 A failure to respond or a failure to resolve a concern through the QA process will lead to a formal dispute being raised, in accordance with the dispute resolution procedure implemented in 2011.
- 6.7 Most concerns continue to be raised and resolved through our quality assurance process. Concerns are identified with team managers and deputies through quality assurance meetings. Areas of concern that have required escalation have included the following issues:
- Late / poor quality case recording;
 - Timescales / responses on fwi;
 - Concerns re contact;
 - Concerns re care plans;
 - Failure to consult with IROs.

There have been a number of cases where concerns were escalated to Head of Service. These have involved disagreement about placement moves, the care plan for a young person and accessing resources for partner agencies.

- 6.8 The Quality Assurance service participates in a rolling programme of auditing across all teams.
- 7.0 Any resource Issues that are putting at risk the delivery of a quality service for Looked after Children**
- 7.1 Capacity within the IRO service had become stretched by the increasing numbers of Looked After Children, rising from 208 to 254 over the year. This has been recognised and is being addressed by appointment of an additional agency worker and application for an increase in establishment.
- 7.2 Capacity and repeated staff and management changes within the Looked After Children's Teams has also been identified as an issue contributing in some cases to a

lack of clarity or delay in respect of care planning. This too has been recognised and is being addressed.

- 7.3 The recent Peer Review reported on a Council determined to do the best for its Looked After Children commenting that ...'we met many impressive leaders, managers, IROs and staff who are all working together to deliver this aim.' Throughout 2012, the changes in leadership, the over-reliance on temporary staff and acting up arrangements have, however constrained the capacity of the service to deliver its ambitions. Nonetheless the Council is now well placed to put in place consistent management arrangements and we believe this will be the major contributor to delivering more effective outcomes for Looked After Children going forward.

8.0 Annual Work Programme of the IRO Service i.e. Priority Areas for Improvement

- 8.1 This was based on the Action Plan arising from the Ofsted Inspection.
- 8.2 Key priorities were incorporated into the Service Action Plan and into IROs' individual Personal Development Reviews. Progress was reviewed individually and through team meetings. This included work in a number of areas, as follows:
- 8.3 The objective of Improved Educational Attainment was contributed to by IROS ensuring completion and sufficiency of Personal Education Plans (PEPs) is addressed at each LAC Review and recommendations are made in respect of the use of the Pupil Premium. The Virtual Head attended a CRS team meeting and met separately with the CRS Team Manager and an effective administrative process was put in place to ensure that PEPs are sent to IROs. In addition IROs have contributed to work to ensure consistently high quality and up to date care plans are produced for every LAC review, by identifying and sharing good practice examples and identifying any remedial actions needed.
- 8.4 Ensuring the voice of the child is systematically sought, recorded and taken account of in care planning and decisions which affect the child/young person is central to the IRO's role. In addition to the IRO's own direct contact with the child, the service has ensured that the use of advocates and independent visitors is promoted where appropriate and that young people are aware of how to make a complaint. The National Youth Advocacy Service (NYAS) are commissioned by Central Bedfordshire Council to support looked after young people through the complaints process and they have attended a team meeting, an IRO attends quarterly meetings with NYAS, and all IROs have NYAS information leaflets and business cards which they give to their looked after young people. An annual review of the impact of advocacy services for Looked After Children is undertaken by Children's Services Commissioning.
- 8.5 All Looked After Children to have their health needs met, by ensuring that health assessments are held on time, regular dental checks and immunisations are undertaken and the SDQ (Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire) is completed and that identified needs are met by timely completion of actions needed. IROs routinely record compliance and make clear recommendations of actions needed and that these are completed
- 8.6 CRS Team Manager attends monthly adoption tracking meetings introduced in response to Government concerns nationally about delay. The meetings ensure effective tracking of work towards permanency. This will ensure any delay is addressed at an early stage and that overall performance is monitored and any issues are identified and addressed.

- 8.7 The Quality Assurance Service Plan for 2013/14 will incorporate further actions arising from the work strands in the Ofsted Improvement Plan. It will in addition address improvements identified by the externally commissioned Peer Review of 2013 and the revised QA framework. The IRO Service will contribute to improving the quality and consistency of the Council's services for Looked After Children and improving their outcomes.