# Information Technology Governance for Tunisian Universities (ITG4TU)

561614-EPP-1-2015-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP





Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

# **EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT: PROJECT APPROACH**

**ITG4TU CONSORTIUM** 





Version 1.2

#### **AMENDMENT HISTORY**

Version	Revision	Date	Author	Modification
1	0	10 July 2018	Ricardo Colomo-Palacios	Initial Version
1	1	01 Oct	Fatma Makni	External quality assessment
1	2	14 Oct	Fatma Makni	Typo corrections

This project (Project number: 561614-EPP-1-2015-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP) has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.





Version 1.1

### **CONTENTS**

1.	Intro	duction	1
2.	Ехре	rt Identification	1
3.	Asse	ssment	.1
	3.1.	Project Management	1
	3.2.	Consortium	3
	3.3.	Project design and implementation	4
	3.4.	Impact	5
4.	Your	opinion about the project	6





External Assessment: Project Approach

Version 1.1

#### **TABLES**

No table of figures entries found.

This project (Project number: 561614-EPP-1-2015-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP) has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.





### **1. Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to gather the opinion of a recognized expert in the field with regards to the developments made under the umbrella of ITG4TU.

This document reflects the opinion of an individual and can be considered as a supplementary material to assess the overall impact and of the project.

There are two kind of assessment forms for this project. The first one is devoted to assessing the technical side of the project, namely the impact of IT Governance aspects and the second one, taken from an EU Erasmus<sup>+</sup> perspective. This document is the report of one expert from the later viewpoint.

In what follows main aspects of this external assessment are presented to be filled by external assessor.

Name:	Makni Fatma
Affiliation:	Cmf expertise
Nationality:	Tunisian
Affiliation:	
Experience in	
EU Projects:	8 years' experience in EU project. I have submitted and participated in project under ENI, ENPI CBCMED, ERASMUS <sup>+</sup> , Italy-Tunisia cross-border cooperation program, etc.

# 2. Expert Identification

### 3. Assessment

#### 3.1. Project Management

Is there a clear effective project	⊠Yes
management structure?	To some extent
	□No
Describe project management	From the beginning, a Project Management plan has
mechanisms implemented	been done in order to describe such partner





External Assessment: Project Approach

Version 1.1

	responsibilities, roles, deadlines, deliverables in all the steps of the Project
	So that, the project structure of the partnership will be defined as follows:
	-Project Coordinator
	-Project Manager.
	-Steering Committee (one representative for each
	partner, chaired by the Project Coordinator. The project
	manager participates as Secretary without right to vote) -WP leaders (WP1 UAL, WP2 UGB, WP3 OUC, WP4 USS,
	WP5 UIB)
	-Researching team (main staff)
	We find two types of partners :
	1-the Europeans partners who provide knowledge,
	trainings and experiences; and 2-the Tunisian partners who study the best practices of
	the European partners and implement the results of the
	development
	Each partner has his tasks described in the project plan
Have partners developed the project	⊠Yes
with a division of tasks and effort as	To some extent
expressed in the project proposal?	□No
Describe your main concerns about	The project management structure is clearly defined in
task division	fact such partner has his tasks (Work Package).
	There is a clear division of tasks between all partners.
	However, I realise that distribution of tasks was
	unequal between partners.
	In fact, the level of implication has been different between them.
	But the most important thing is that each partner has
	his deliverables. And this fact makes possible to
	evaluate and attest that the work done referring to
	these deliverables.
Is there a clear and effective	⊠Yes
problem-solving strategy?	To some extent
	□No
Describe problems occurred and	Many problems have occurred during the realisation of
mechanisms triggered	this project.
	In each case, solutions were found by the consortium to
	resolve these problems.
	As a problem we found:
	-Delaying of the start of project (3months) due to the
	delay of the first payment by the agency, so that several
	activities have been delay and even not done.
	But we realise that the important activities are already
	done only some ones are merged (especially practise
	visits) to manage the time delayed.





External Assessment: Project Approach

Version 1.1

-Modification of the planned training activities due to
the events that happened in Tunisia (terrorist attacks in
Tunisia at the beginning of 2016).
As a result, the consortium took the decision to relocate
the planning training in Spain. This decision was agreed
by the programme manager office and didn't affect the
result of planned activities.

How satisfied are you with Project Management activity in the project?

 $\boxtimes$  Very satisfied

□Satisfied

□Neither

Dissatisfied

□Very dissatisfied

#### 3.2. Consortium

Have all project partners participated	⊠Yes
in the project as intended?	To some extent
	□No
Describe overall implication of project partners	All partners have done their tasks as planed and they have perfected in their work. However, the level of implication was been different between them. In fact, for the European partners their implication has been very satisfied. But for Tunisians partners the level of implication was different from a partner to another and the completeness of deliverables also. We realise that the partner UTM has a moderate level of
	implication and some researches are missed. However, he has even done and respect all tasks.

How satisfied are you with Consortium activity in the project?

⊠Very satisfied

□Satisfied

 $\Box$  Neither

 $\Box$  Dissatisfied

□Very dissatisfied





External Assessment: Project Approach

Version 1.1

### 3.3. Project design and implementation

Rate the achievement of project object	tives		
Perform specialized training modules	⊠Achieved		
for building ITG models in Tunisian	Partially achieved		
universities	$\Box$ Not achieved		
Perform training to employers in IT	⊠Achieved		
sector	Partially achieved		
	□ Not achieved		
Build ITC frameworks adapted to			
Build ITG frameworks adapted to each institution	⊠ Achieved		
	Partially achieved		
	□ Not achieved		
Build the skills and tools to ensure	⊠Achieved		
the sustainability of government IT	Partially achieved		
project beyond	□Not achieved		
Set the value chain of IT in HEI and its	⊠Achieved		
КРІ	Partially achieved		
	□Not achieved		
General comments on objectives:	We can say that all the objectives planned for the		
·····	project have been done and achieved		
	So we realise that :		
	<ul> <li>ITG frameworks adapted to Tunisian HEI was</li> </ul>		
	building and deploying for such Tunisian university.		
	The training activities have been successfully		
	performed, increasing as such the ITG skills		
	and knowledge of participants, and tools (web		
	platform, ITG framework, training material) and		
	have been developed and implemented and so		
	contribute to ensure the sustainability of ITG after		
	the project's end of life.		
	<ul> <li>The value chain of IT in the Tunisian HEI with their</li> </ul>		
	respective KPIs are described and implemented		
	through specific ITG framework deployed in each		
	HEIs.		
Has the project been managed			
according to planned project			
	To some extent		
management methods?	No		
General comments on project	The project management was efficient so that all		
management:	objectives were realised as attended.		
	Besides, we can consider that all tasks and activities		
	were done. Even the regular meetings have been done		
	as planned.		
	Moreover, a project management plan has been		
	published and the quality monitoring and control was		
	already implemented		
Has the project been financially	□Yes		
managed according to plans?	⊠To some extent		





External Assessment: Project Approach

Version 1.1

	□No
General comments on financial	The project was managed financially according to plan
management:	(budget).
	When we exam the budget, we realised that for (UGB)
	an amount (5000EURO) was provided to translation of
	materiel to French, however this amount wasn't payed
	(or reported).
	We inform you that the translating was done.
Has the project been managed	⊠Yes
according to planned quality	□To some extent
management methods?	□No
General comments on quality	We can consider that the quality of the work was
management:	very good.
	In fact, in this project an importance was allowed to the
	quality. In the reality it was provided a work package to
	quality management. So many deliverables should
	indicate the level of the quality.
	We find the quality review and validation of the
	training materiel that choose a performed level.
	Moreover, a quality management plan has been
	produced. Besides, quality monitoring and control
	procedures have been implemented.

#### 3.4. Impact

Has the project reached its impact	⊠Yes
objectives?	□To some extent
	□No
General comments on project impact	We can consider that the project has attend his long
(Long term and Short Term):	and short terms.
	In fact, according to the training parts, the objectives were performed, and the results were the attending for all Target groups/potential beneficiaries (IT staff,
	Managers, Board of Tunisian HEIs, University
	Professors, Graduate students and young
	researchers).
	Regarding the long Term, the implementing of specific
	framework by all Tunisian partners was done and the
	exchange of European performs and experiences was
	successfully done through the research visits done by
	Tunisian partners to the European ones.
Is there an established and shared	□Yes
dissemination and exploitation plan?	⊠To some extent
	□No
General comments on dissemination	For Tunisian partners there was no a consolidated plan
and exploitation plan:	for dissemination and exploitation each partner has his
	owner plan.

5





External Assessment: Project Approach

Version 1.1

	However, the exam of reports and materials produced by all partners let us realise that discrimination and communication activities have been done successfully.
Is there an established and shared	□Yes
sustainability plan?	⊠To some extent
	□No
General comments on sustainability	Sustainability was considered as an important aspect,
plan:	in fact it is one of the main objectives of the project.
	In contrast, there wasn't an established plan that
	consolidated all the project. Each partner has his
	individual plan.

### 4. Your opinion about the project

When I review the work done in ITG4TU, I conclude that this project has succeed.

In fact, all objectives were been satisfied and achieved although the problems happened during the realisation of the project specially the delay from the beginning.

So, this success is due to the consortium efforts and their abilities to manage the problems within affecting the objectives, the budget and the plan of activities.

Besides, we can say that the experience developed by the European partners regarding the ITG was very well transmitted to Tunisian partners and helps them in building their ITG frameworks adapted to each Tunisian university HEI.

More than the efforts allowed by Tunisians partners in implanting their special frameworks and deploying it was very important, except one partner who presented a modest level of effort.

Furthermore, this project can be considered as a way or an opportunity to exchange knowledge and experiences especially for Tunisian partners. It permits them to develop networking activities.

However, the delay of the beginning of project didn't affect the results of the projects but it affected the quality of communication and dissemination.