

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

ITG4TU CONSORTIUM



AMENDMENT HISTORY

Version	Revision	Date	Author	Modification
1	0	07/05/18	Antonio Fernández Martínez	Initial Version



CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. OBJECTIVE	1
1.2. SCOPE	1
1.3. TARGET AUDIENCE	1
1.4. ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS USED	1
1.5. REFERENCES.....	1
2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT	2
3. DETAILED COMMENTS.....	2
3.1. IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT - UNIVERSITY OF SFAX.....	3
3.2. IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT - UNIVERSITY OF GABES.....	4
3.3. IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT - UNIVERSITY OF TUNIS EL MANAR	4
3.4. IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT - UNIVERSITY OF LA MANOUBA.....	5



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

Version 1.0

FIGURES

NO TABLE OF FIGURES ENTRIES FOUND.



TABLES

TABLE 1-1. ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS.....	1
TABLE 3-1. BEST PRACTICES IN SFAX	3
TABLE 3-2. EXPECTED MATURITY LEVEL TO ACHIEVE IN SFAX.....	3
TABLE 3-3. CURRENT MATURITY LEVEL IN GABES.....	4
TABLE 3-4. EXPECTED MATURITY LEVEL TO ACHIEVE IN GABES.....	4
TABLE 3-5. CURRENT MATURITY LEVEL IN MANAR.....	4
TABLE 3-6. EXPECTED MATURITY LEVEL TO ACHIEVE IN MANAR	4
TABLE 3-7. BEST PRACTICES IN MANOUBA.....	5
TABLE 3-8. CURRENT MATURITY LEVEL IN MANOUBA	5
TABLE 3-9. EXPECTED MATURITY LEVEL TO ACHIEVE IN MANOUBA	5



1. Introduction

1.1. Objective

The objective of this document is to present the assessment of the ITG Framework developed by the Tunisian Universities and presented in the document to describe it. The assessment is performed by personnel from Universidad de Almería assigned to the project.

1.2. Scope

The scope of this document is the IT4GTU project the assessment of the ITG Framework developed by Tunisian Universities.

1.3. Target Audience

This document shall serve all the project partners in the project, but especially it will be key to Tunisian Universities 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 1-1. 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
- Major Revision
- Reject

Summary of the assessment (Max 150 words):

Overall the documents are presenting the framework that has been designed by each Tunisian University following the guidelines explained in previous meetings. Generally, there are some misunderstandings in regards of the current maturity level already achieved and the expected maturity level they wish to achieve. The Spanish GTI4U framework provides a tool to calculate the current maturity level collecting several best practices organized by principles. Some more work on the tool should be useful in order to better understand and adapt the best practices to each specific situation in the Tunisian Universities. By this report it is intended to better explain some concepts about the Spanish framework in addition to reconduct their own way of indicate and show their results, in a more understandable and readable manner.

3. Detailed comments

Regarding the objectives the Tunisian Universities have selected based on the Spanish framework, they only refer a few among the totality. GTI4U had 17 objectives in its initial version but afterwards it was modified and right now it has, for each principle, Maturity Models in the second level and an ITG Best practices catalogue in the third level. Thus, as all the Tunisian universities have selected the Spanish framework (GTI4U) to perform their own framework, they should add the following explanation:

“Three different layers compose GTI4U framework:

- *First layer is the ISO 38500 model and its 6 principles.*
- *Second, 6 Maturity Models (one per each principle) that are used to establish the current ITG maturity level and the future goals of maturity.*
- *And, a catalogue of IT Governance Best Practices for each principle that universities must satisfy.”*

Furthermore, they should add an explanation about why they finally selected this framework. The reasons could be:

- Only JISC model and GTI4U are focus on universities, rest of them are general models.



- GTI4U includes the model and principles of the ISO 38500 and JISC don't include them.
- More than ten Spanish universities have implemented GTI4U and so there are a lot of information about these experiences.
- The creator of the GTI4U is a member of the research team and partner of this project, so he can help the partners to understand and use this model.

3.1. IT Governance framework Assessment - University of Sfax

In section 4.2. they have specified for each principle a list of best practices in form of question. It should be better to write them in form of an affirmation, so that they reinforce their selection. Thus:

Table 3-1. Best practices in Sfax

Instead of:	Should be:
<p><i>For the principle Strategy:</i></p> <p><i>The following questions receive a positive response</i></p> <p><i>EE8 Does the GT plan IT acquisitions in a timely manner and are they included in the next year's budget?</i></p>	<p>For the principle Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Team plans IT acquisitions in a timely manner and are they included in the next year's Budget.

In section 5.3. there is a table with maturity levels explained by action (3 levels for each principle) but it is not explained the final maturity level for each principle. It should be better to provide another spider net graphic from value 0 to value 5 and show there the six principles with its respective maturity explained above.

In section 5.4 they express their desire to achieve the following maturity level for each principle:

Table 3-2. Expected maturity level to achieve in Sfax

Responsibility	Strategy	Acquisition	Performance	Conformance	Human Behaviour
2	2	0	2	2	1

At least, they should try to achieve a level 1 in Acquisition. Maybe, just changing in the framework the definition about "GT decides about major IT acquisitions" for "GT proposes major IT acquisitions". In the particular case of Tunisian policy, with the second view, they are proposing (maybe to their ministry) a list of acquisitions and the ministry is the entity who definitely decides about it but at least the GT previously analyses the better acquisitions they really need and prioritize them.



3.2. IT Governance framework Assessment - University of Gabes

In section 5.3. there is a table indicating for each action its maturity levels but there is not indicated the final maturity level for each principle, in whose case should be:

Table 3-3. Current maturity level in Gabes

Responsibility	Strategy	Acquisition	Performance	Conformance	Human Behaviour
1	1	0	0	0	1

As in previous university, it should be better to provide a spider net graph from value 0 to value 5 showing the six principles with the maturity indicated before.

In section 5.4 the following maturity levels for each principle are proposed to achieve:

Table 3-4. Expected maturity level to achieve in Gabes

Responsibility	Strategy	Acquisition	Performance	Conformance	Human Behaviour
2	2	0	2	2	1

Again, they should try to achieve at least level 1 in acquisition. Maybe, just by changing the definition on “GT decides about major IT acquisition” to “GT proposes major IT acquisitions”, like in the previous university, regarding the specific situation of Tunisian policy.

3.3. IT Governance framework Assessment - University of Tunis el Manar

In section 5.2. there is a table indicating the maturity levels for action (three levels for principle) but it is not indicated the final maturity level for each principle, in whose case it should be:

Table 3-5. Current maturity level in Manar

Responsibility	Strategy	Acquisition	Performance	Conformance	Human Behaviour
1	1	1	0	0	0

Like the two previous universities, it should be better to show this information in a spider net graph.

In section 5.4 they express their wish to achieve the following maturity levels for each principle:

Table 3-6. Expected maturity level to achieve in Manar

Responsibility	Strategy	Acquisition	Performance	Conformance	Human Behaviour
1	1	1	2	1	1

They should try to improve the principle *Human Behaviour* at least until level 1, and maybe try to improve also another one, not just *Performance* and *Conformance*.



3.4. IT Governance framework Assessment - University of La Manouba

In section 4.2 they have expressed their best practices as questions instead of in affirmative form. It should be better to change it to affirmative sentences to reinforce their selection:

Table 3-7. Best practices in Manouba

Instead of:	Should be:
<p><i>For the principle Responsibility:</i></p> <p><i>The following questions receives a positive response</i></p> <p><i>RE1 Does the faculty's Governance Team (GT) regularly review which IT assets should be monitored centrally and which should be delegated?</i></p>	<p>For the principle Responsibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The faculty's Governance Team (GT) regularly review which IT assets should be monitored centrally and which should be delegated.

In section 5.2, like in previous cases, there is a table indicating for each principle, its maturity level for action but there is not indicated the final maturity level for principle, in whose case should be:

Table 3-8. Current maturity level in Manouba

Responsibility	Strategy	Acquisition	Performance	Conformance	Human Behaviour
1	1	0	0	0	1

It should be better to use a spider net graph to show this information.

In section 5.4 they express their wish to achieve the following maturity level for each principle:

Table 3-9. Expected maturity level to achieve in Manouba

Responsibility	Strategy	Acquisition	Performance	Conformance	Human Behaviour
1	0	1	2	1	0

This is inconsistent with the current maturity level indicated before. It is not possible to express a wish to be in level 0 when the current maturity level is in fact in level 1 (**how can you wish to be in level 0 in Human Behavior when the framework already shows a 71% of best practices achieved in this principle?!**). Besides, the idea is to improve the current level so at least change from level 1 to level 2 in the rest of principles.