**Proposal to Provide a Hard Copy Signposting Directory**

1. **Rationale**

1.1 Healthwatch Rutland Community Interest Company is commissioned by Rutland County Council to provide the Healthwatch Rutland function

1.2 The Grant agreement includes within Schedule 1 ‘The Specification’ the need to “be governed by […] principles” including at 3.1. Bullet point 4:-

“**Information**: able to signpost people to good quality information to help them make choices about health and social care services; with access to established networks to gather comprehensive patient views; establishing strong connections within the wider voluntary and community sector. The Recipient is expected to link into the Funder’s ‘Rutland Information Service’ (an online directory of services provided by Rutland County Council).”

* + 1. and including at the final Bullet point in 3.1:-

“**Economical:** an organisation that makes the best use of its resources by seeking to avoid duplication with other bodies in the local authority area, and where possible, work creatively with them to deliver the most cost effective solutions to achieve its chosen priorities”

1.3 We know from our engagement with the public that there is general concern around the perceived over reliance on electronic communications and that as a consequence groups may become marginalised and not as well informed as they might otherwise be.

1. **Proposal**

2.1With the creation of a hard copy signposting directory Healthwatch Rutland hopes to close the gap and provide an opportunity for people to become more informed. Please see Appendix 1

2.2The directory would be available at a variety of outlets including pharmacies and dental surgeries. These outlets have already been approached and indicated their agreement should this proposal be accepted.

1. **Costs**
	1. Printing costs differ according to the required level of quality
	2. We need and are statutorily required to be mindful of expense and to not spend unnecessarily, as we are funded by the Public Purse
	3. We need to be mindful of our branding and reputation – literature ‘speaks’ about an organisation’s level of investment in a product and we need to balance carefully the need to not only care but to be seen to care and the acute need to provide value for money
	4. Appendix 2 shows the estimated printing costs
	5. Despite being the slightly more expensive of the two options, Option 2 is strongly recommended as the most appropriate option for the reasons stated in 3.3 above
2. **Alternatives to consider**
	1. A guide to the information available electronically could be produced (attached appendix 3)
	2. This would be less expensive to produce (approx. £150)
	3. It would require the manual copying of written details into a browser, with the need to have access to a computer and the ability to use it to navigate the information source or have support to do so
	4. This replicates the service being offered through the council’s own website and the volunteers already in place at local libraries to assist, which does not support the principles stated at 1.2 and 1.2.1
	5. It does not recognise the call from members of the public for hard copy information to be made available
	6. I do not believe it fully meets the need to provide a signposting service that is fit for purpose
3. **Timeline**
	1. This will vary quite widely according to the route chosen
	2. Appendix 1, printed professionally could be ready by end May whilst Appendix 3 could be in place by the end of next week
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