

The ethics of human rights as a foundation for evaluating organizations with social purposes

Author: Hardy Joffroy, Enseignant-Researcher-Trainer at HELMo-ESAS, associated researcher at LABOCS

Summary :

The management and evaluation methods used in organizations with social purposes currently aim primarily to instruct the institutional logic of neoliberalism in the social field (Wacquant 2015), under the pretext of efficiency, effectiveness, and quality (Chauvière 2008). They contribute to a loss of meaning for the actions of actors in organizations with social purposes. On the one hand, by disembodiment of the relationship of organizations to the rights they embody and, on the other hand, by preventing actors from thinking (in the sense of acting) about what they are doing. These management and evaluation methods are utilitarian in nature (Le Galès 2007). This ethic is based on an idea of purpose, aggregation, maximization, and it carries within it a sacrificial logic (Rawls 1971). It considers that justice results in maximizing the good defined as increasing the happiness of the greatest number. For example, slavery may be good for the bad by virtue of the principle of aggregation (Rawls 1971). The good being imposed within organizations with social purposes through objectives and indicators to be maximized. Justice then resides in the actors' ability to maximize the prescribed good. The relationship with the law is thus disembodied. Sen (2009) proposes to oppose the utilitarian ethic with that of human rights. They are for him in competition and offer different modes of representation of the knowledge we have of "reality". The research project that I have undertaken follows these observations. It was carried out with the aim of participating in the construction of different modes of apprehension of reality from those proposed by neoliberal ideology. The question of evaluation seemed to me to be an interesting entry point. It contributes to the knowledge we have of reality and has become one of the key control tools of neoliberalism, control through ranking being one of its fundamentals (Le Galès 2007). It was therefore necessary to undertake research work from a dialectical perspective. In order to propose an evaluation tool for organizations with social purposes based on the ethics of human rights, I referred to numerous theoretical tools (democracy viewed as an exercise of public reason (Sen 2003), human rights viewed as an ethic (Sen 2009), the concept of indignity proposed by the Afrodecolonialist movement (Ajari 2019), cultural rights (Meyer Bisch 2008) and capability (Sen 1998)). I also made an epistemological choice (constructivism) and chose a methodology, that of constructive evaluation (Conan 1998). I then created an evaluation tool and carried out a test of this tool. During my presentation, I will briefly show the theoretical and methodological tools that the tool refers to. I will show in more detail how I conducted the tool test. The evaluation aimed to question the capability of students in precarious situations to enjoy their right to education. Two groups were formed. One with the social workers of the social service of HELMo and another with eight students in precarious situations. We started from each person's representations of what reduced the students' capability to enjoy their right to education. We identified themes of indignity and chose to work around one of the identified themes. We put the constituents of indignity into perspective with the rights of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (the just). We then thought about how to enable students to increase their capability in general (desired freedom) and with regard to the functioning of the social service (freedom to act). This evaluation led the social workers to thoroughly review many of their practices. It also helped to restore some dignity to students in precarious situations by starting from their

Bibliography :

Ajari, N. (2019). Dignity or death: Ethics and politics of race. La découverte.

Chauvière, M. (2008). Too much management kills the social: Essay on a discreet commercialization. La découverte.

Conan, M. (1998). Constructive evaluation: Theory, principles and method elements. L'aube.

Faucher-King, F., & Le Galès, P. (2007). Tony Blair (1997-2007): The assessment of reforms. Presses de Sciences Po.

Hardy, J. (2018). Social work facing contemporary socio-political challenges. Coll mobilisation sociale, CGAGI.

http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/08846d_80460b7cbede4cd19438265be777009c.pdf

Hardy, J. (2015). Social work and capabilities. FOPES, Université de Louvain-la-Neuve.

<https://cdn.uclouvain.be/groups/cms-editors-fopes/documents/memoires-en-ligne/MEMOIRE%20JOFFROY%20HARDY.pdf>

Meyer-Bisch, P. (2008-2009). Fundamental rights (No. 7, pp. 29). www.droits-fondamentaux.org

Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Seuil.

Sen, A. (1998). Rethinking inequality. Seuil.

Sen, A. (2009). The idea of justice. Flammarion.

Sen, A. (2003). The democracy of others. Rivage poche.

Wacquant, L. (2015). The prisons of poverty. Raisons d'agir.

Watzlawick, P. (1988). The invention of reality: Contributions to constructivism. Editions du Seuil.