

Standing Orders for the Oversight Group (OG) of the Support Needs Taxonomy project

Initial Members

Year 1 will be different because the initial composition cannot be decided by election. We need to be transparent about the mechanism by which representatives from various constituencies have been chosen.

Membership and constituencies

The Oversight Group shall have the following members

- Representing lived experience communities, 3-5 members
- Representing institutions that implement support needs for members of the public (such as service providers, utilities, retailers, public services, healthcare providers, educators) 3-5 members
- Representing charities or advocacy groups that work with and on behalf of those with lived experience 3-5 members
- Representing organizations that have already implemented systems based on the support needs taxonomy up to 5 members

The OG shall be able to co-opt a further 3 members should it wish, in an advisory capacity. These might, to give a non exhaustive list, include experts on regulation or technology, or have knowledge of the legal framework or practice outside the UK.

Members will be defined as individuals, but where a member represents a group, they may for any meeting nominate an alternate to attend for them should they be unable to.

There is no prescription for how members should be chosen in terms of the variety of communities or organisations they represent, but consideration should be given to providing

- A wide range of experience and expertise;
- Representation of those areas most likely to feature in discussions happening during the period of membership;
- Diversity on as many different axes as possible

The first OG will decide the process for electing subsequent members

Officers

In any one annual discussion cycle there will be two co-chairs, elected from different constituencies. One of these will chair each meeting by agreement between them. Chairs will serve for one year at a time and may serve up to two consecutive years.

The first OG will decide the process for electing subsequent chairs

Chairs will be responsible for conducting each of the meetings of the OG and ensuring every member of the meeting is given a fair hearing. Their primary role is to ensure that meetings are held, and decisions at those meetings taken, in a manner that reflects the principles of the project. Guidance on chairing accessible meetings will be provided.

Chairs will not be responsible for providing papers or taking minutes (the OG will be serviced by the project administration) but they will be responsible for

- Ensuring that meetings do not end without clarity as to what decisions have been taken, what questions have been requested for asking to the project communities, and what support needs have been added to, taken from, or amended in the stable version of the Support Needs Taxonomy;
- Ensuring that elections of the next OG membership are held in a proper manner

Chairs may alternate chairing of meetings or may share the chairing of the same meetings as arranged among themselves, with the proviso that every effort will always be made to ensure a disabled chair is provided with the support they need to chair, including being able to choose to chair only a part of a meeting.

There may be up to 2 deputy chairs (also provided with training) who will provide cover if needed, one of whom will be elected to stand should a chair step down before the end of their term.

Term

Membership will be for a period of 2 years. Representatives may serve for 2 consecutive terms of 2 years each.

Should a member step down before the end of their term, the mailing list will be contacted and volunteers/nominations sought. If necessary an election will be called by one of the chairs. It will not be necessary to replace resigning members but it will be possible.

Remit and meeting business

The OG will be responsible for

- Ratifying new stable versions of the support taxonomy at annual meeting according to the principles set out in these standing orders;
- Deciding at annual meeting which area(s) should be the focus for the next year's updated stable version;
- Putting specific questions to the project community to help stimulate the best discussion;
- Receiving suggestions from the project community as the basis for interim meetings and annual meeting and, in the case of interim meetings, providing useful feedback to the community that will aid subsequent contributions;
- Providing, as members become aware, information that might help the community provide suggestions - for example, technological advances, or regulatory changes
- Deciding the membership of the next committee

Each of these will form a standing item of business. The other standing item of business will be "policy on disability, equality, and representation" to reflect the ethos of Valuable 500, which requires this to be a standing item in Board meetings. Any Other Business should pay particular regard to items that might fall under "other decisions" in these standing orders.

Decision Making Process and Quoracy

1. Should any vote be tied, the chair of the meeting will have casting vote.

2. A meeting will be quorate if 50% or more of the Oversight Group is present. Should members leave during a meeting the Chair will be able to ask the remaining members to vote (by simple majority) to suspend quoracy rules in order to carry out remaining business.
3. An agenda is shown in advance of congress based on suggestions over the year as collated by the project administrators, and based on the summaries of the interim groups. OG will agree this agenda by circulation over the period of a week (it, and suggested amendments from OG members will be presumed to be agreed in the absence of objection. Where there is an objection, if agreement is not reached by the end of the week, there will be a vote). OG members may add items and questions to the agenda which will then form the basis of the call for participants in the annual congress - this will ensure that congress gives the most useful feedback possible to help OG makes its decisions
4. The final suggested additions, subtractions, and amendments to the stable version will come from congress, compiled by the project administrators
5. There will be a presumption of agreement to all changes, subject to the following process, in the following order
6. Lived experience members may at this point and based on discussions they have been involved in or witnessed to that point make additional suggestions (though this would not be the usual place to do so)
7. Charities may advise on areas of concern over any measures
8. Members representing existing users of the taxonomy may give advice based on that experience
9. The advice in 4 & 5 may include noting institutions who are able to implement these needs but aren't represented at the meeting
10. Institutional representatives may veto any proposal that they do not believe is able to be implemented within the next year. They may do so only if there is no current ability they know of to implement it and there is unlikely to be one in the following year.
11. All changes not vetoed will be made to the previous stable version and will become the ratified stable version.
12. Lived experience members may write an appendix to the stable version where suggestions have been vetoed. This appendix may set out suggestions not able to be implemented yet but which would be genuinely useful. The appendix will form part of the public taxonomy with a view to shaping the direction of future engagement and development

Frequency of Meeting

There shall be an annual meeting following annual congress of the project community. At this meeting a new stable version of the taxonomy will be agreed.

There may be up to two interim meetings, evenly spaced during the period between annual meetings.

Other decisions

A quorate meeting of the Oversight Group will have the ability to make the following decisions in addition to confirming a new stable version of the taxonomy.

1. Changing these standing orders, in particular as the scope of the taxonomy grows and activity and membership may need to grow with it.
2. Updating accessibility policy and the code of conduct.

3. Co-opting members for their expertise in special areas.
4. Vetting and potentially vetoing possible sources of funding which might damage the reputation of the project.
5. Scrutiny of the work of the project administration, or matters the administration refer. This may include:
 - Budget and funding
 - Complaints and disciplinary
 - Promotion and marketing
 - Use and impact of the taxonomy
6. Other items covered in the “remit” section.

Conflict of Interest Policy

Conflicts of interest should be declared. It is not expected that people stand down or withdraw from debate because of an interest, but it is expected that interests will be transparent

Accessibility Policy

Meetings will be as accessible for all members as is possible within the funding provided. It is expected that participation by multiple communication channels will be provided; that meeting documents will be accessible; that captioning will be provided; and that this accessibility policy will develop as need arises.

Privacy and Conduct Policy

See the code of conduct on the website.