

# 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

## Governance Framework Assessment UTM

*ITG4TU CONSORTIUM*



### ***AMENDMENT HISTORY***

<b>Version</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Modification</b>
1	0	20/4/18	Ricardo Colomo-Palacios	Initial Version



## **CONTENTS**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. OBJECTIVE .....	1
1.2. SCOPE .....	1
1.3. TARGET AUDIENCE .....	1
1.4. ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS USED .....	1
1.5. REFERENCES.....	1
<b>2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. DETAILED COMMENTS.....</b>	<b>2</b>



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



**Information Technology Governance for Tunisian Universities**

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

Governance Framework Assessment UTM

Version 1.0

---

## ***FIGURES***

**NO TABLE OF FIGURES ENTRIES FOUND.**



***TABLES***

TABLE 1. ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS ..... 1



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Objective

The objective of this document is to present the assessment of the ITG Framework developed by Université de Tunis El Manar and presented in the document to describe it. The assessment is performed by personnel from Østfold University College assigned to the project.

## 1.2. Scope

The scope of this document is the IT4GTU project the assessment of the ITG Framework developed by Université de Tunis El Manar.

## 1.3. Target Audience

This document shall serve all the project partners in the project, but especially it will be key to Université de Tunis El Manar as an assessment to its activities inside ITG4TU. It will be useful to the project officers to verify quality management activities performed to check the quality of the frameworks developed by Tunisian Universities in the scope of the project.

## 1.4. Acronyms and Definitions Used

Table 1. Acronyms and Definitions

Acronym	Description
-	-

## 1.5. References

Ref.	Title
[1]	ITG4TU Proposal Release 1 (Final Version)



## 2. Summary of assessment

Reviewer Recommendation (underline your selection)

- Accept (with routine editing)
- Minor Revision X
- Major Revision
- Reject

Summary of the assessment (Max 150 words):

Overall the document is presenting the framework that has been designed by means of the guidelines provided and the mentoring provided in the visits. There are several low level errors and typos that must be addressed, but the most important change to be developed by project team is the sound description of the actions taken and the discussion of values present in tables given by the tool. This will improve the readability of the document, but also the tasks of adopters, external assessors and, eventually, other universities in the country. Examples of the text to be explained are section 4.2 as a whole and tables in 5.2, figure 2 and plan in 6.4.2. Risks must be also identified and managed and this part is not developed as intended.

## 3. Detailed comments

- On pages 17 and 18 there is a Table 1 and a Figure 1 that must be explained in the text. These are aspects crucial to understand the whole model and the assessment performed.
- Figure 2 must be explained in the text
- In “6.4.1. Initiating” there is a need to divide the second bullet.
- Figure in page 28 is very hard to read and must be explained in the text
- In page 32 there is a text on risk monitoring in yellow and there is not a risk monitoring aspect. (See other universities)
- At the end of page 32 there is a need to divide the bullets.
- There is an annex with the title “Título” (More than one, I fear).
- Context section of Annex 4 (Named Annexe) 5 and 6 are not well generated.
- Overall, I see a problem in annexes, I would suggest performing a paste as image of each page to avoid format problems.



There are several formatting issues throughout the document:

- Page 4. From “Meet the needs of stakeholders” Bullets present different font and there is a need to a new line.
- Page 5 at the begin of the page different font but also there is a need to perform indentation of the second level of bullets.
- Page 5. From “Responsibility” different font.
- Page 5. From “Evaluating the current” different font.
- Page 6 From “• the upper level contains” different font.
- Page 12 “The GT is aware of the importance of IT Governance”.
- Page 13 “The GT has designed” different font.
- Page 14. Point 16 and 17 different fonts.
- Page 15. Conformance 5 different font.
- Table 2 presents different kinds of fonts.
- Page 34. Font is different from the rest.

There are several typos throughout the document

- Artifacts
- Calde-Moir should be Calder-Moir
- Behavior should be Behaviour on UK English
- Departement (Many times throughout the document)
- Committee (same)
- IT related
- Consensus
- Repetible
- Responsibility