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### Context

| Numerous stakeholders involved in social housing and social integration | The ultimate goal being to increase social utility | French government delegates to private organizations the production of social services |

### But…

- Collaboration between different organizations is complex in this sector
- Assessment of services adequation to users needs is difficult / not systematically done

In 2015, the French government decided to implement a shared diagnosis tool (so-called 360°) that would be:
  - A decision support tool
  - A cooperation easing tool
Did the actors in charge of the 360° manage to preserve the core philosophy of this tool?

- Has the approach been perverted into a rationalization tool of past decisions rather than a useful knowledge production support for the community?
- Did this assessment process result in the expected creation of relationships between actors?
I. The 360° diagnosis

- A French government *centralized* initiative *autonomously* deployed in each region.

- The originality of these shared diagnoses, as claimed by the promoters, is characterized by three principles:
  1. A global inventory process that takes place with the same temporality in every region of the country,
  2. A will to involve dynamically all stakeholders in the same struggle against poverty and social exclusion,
  3. A detailed methodology, assigned to local players that will enable them to aggregate all evaluations into a final output, on a national level.
II. Methodology

Collaboration with a non-profit organization (YSOS), involved in the social housing and social integration

Two case studies were conducted on the Eure and Orne territories belonging to the same French region of Normandy

We mobilized mostly secondary data

These two case studies resulted in comparisons
## 2 case studies: Eure & Orne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORNE</th>
<th>EURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental regional decentralized services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis process management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-management by two governmental regional agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis process facilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental regional decentralized services</td>
<td>NPO YSOS + consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Orne, the animation method and the results validation process in workshops was soft and centralized. It was a simple animation method: a "centralized and streamlined approach"

In the Eure, the facilitation method was sophisticated, time consuming and based on the involvement of many actors from different structures: a "outsourced and deep approach"
III. Theoretical background

**Management tools**
- (Berry, 1983; Girin, 1983; Hatchuel, 1994; Moisdon, 1997; David et al, 2000)

**Distortions of the evaluation process**
- (Leca, 1993; Kirk & Reeves, 2007; Le Bourhis & Lascoumes, 2014)

**Management tools in public policy dynamics**

- **Process of tools appropriation** (Lorino, 2002; Grimand, 2012)
- **Relationships between tools & organizational dynamics** (Rabardel, 1988; De Vaujany, 2005; Grimand, 2006; Martin and Picceu, 2007; Oiry, 2011)
- **Symbolic dimension of tools** (Laufer & Burlaud, 1980; Chatelain-Ponroy, 2010; Meyer, 1986)
- **Management tools encountering public organizations** (Hood, 1991; Moisdon, 1997 & 2005; Lascoumes & Le Gales, 2007)
- **Policy evaluation instruments** (Weiss, 1999; Sanderson, 2002; Damart & Roy, 2009; Verdung, 1997; Kessler et al, 1998; Jacob, 2005; Givord, 2015; Spenlehauer, 2016)
IV. Discussion

- The processes, regardless of the territory, have produced relatively similar results in term of data collection…
- But their effects differ:
  - In the Orne, the process initiated projects and a kind of collective dynamics
  - In the Eure, by contrast, no particular appearing and immediate signs of change

- The data obtained were affected by:
  - the local competitive environment: Eure, territory where several service providers are in competition, has suffered from this context, collaboration and information sharing between stakeholders being limited or denied by the actors.
  - the socio political context and intentions that actors perceive as associated with the tools, interfere with the process of appropriation.

- In practice, actors’ strategies and diversions of the tool have emerged, as part of a socio-political process. The symbolic dimension is probably also present, the use of the 360° legitimizing actors in their dialogue with the government.
Implications & conclusion

- Long-term support appropriation processes
  - It is important to establish multi-year targets to enable actors to restructure themselves, the annual pace of the 360° diagnosis not to induce short-term logic;
  - If French government wants management tool be a facilitator of collaboration, it is important to organize a permanent animation, not a one shot evaluation;
  - The coordination between different levels of public services must be anticipated;
  - Government services must go with the change induced by the introduction of a new management tool.

- Conclusion: the 360° diagnosis may have an effect on social innovation only if cooperative logics develop between the actors, which requires both time and a network of actors
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