

# 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 – UIB CONSORTIUM*



### ***AMENDMENT HISTORY***

<b>Version</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Modification</b>
1	0	03/05/18	Beatriz Gómez	Initial Version
1	1	05/05/18	Carlos Juiz	Minor corrections
2	0	23/09/18	Beatriz Gómez	Second review
2	1	23/09/18	Belén Bermejo	Minor corrections



## **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>
3.1. IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT - UNIVERSITY OF SFAX.....	2
3.2. IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT - UNIVERSITY OF GABES.....	3
3.3. IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT - UNIVERSITY OF LA MANOUBA.....	4



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 2.1

---

## ***FIGURES***

**NO TABLE OF FIGURES ENTRIES FOUND.**



***TABLES***

TABLE 1-1. 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 the Tunisian Universities and presented in the document to describe it. The assessment is performed by personnel from Universitat de les Illes Balears 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):

All universities have presented the report of their framework based on the Spanish GTI4U ITG framework. After previous meetings, they have followed the guidelines and suggestions from EU partners. In general, there are some inconsistencies in providing the results after the self-assessment done in each university, maybe because there is a misunderstanding between current best practices and maturity model or just because there was no an internal consensus. Anyway, some revisions should be done in order to better adequate the quality of these reports. By this assessment some improvements could be done based on several suggestions explained below in addition to a few formatting and typo corrections. This report represents the second revision of the deliverabled frameworks.

## 3. Detailed comments

### 3.1. IT Governance framework Assessment - University of Sfax

In section 3.3 they describe the composition of their ITG group, but it should be included which are the tasks of each role.

At the end of section 4.2 there is a figure resulting from the self-assessment related to best practices. This figure is showing the current situation of the University of Sfax in terms of IT governance. It should be better to add an explanation about the figure and what is representing.

In the annexes, the word “consensus” should be deleted or changed by a more specific one in the tittle of each principle.

There are several formatting issues throughout the document:

- Change Version 2.0 to Version 2.2 in the header of the document.
- Delete page III, it is blank.
- Page 5: insert some spaces in “responsibilitieswithrespect”.
- Page 5: insert an intro in “enforced.6.Human Behaviour”.
- Page 5: insert some spaces in “atoolkit”.



- Page 6: in the table, the justification of the dean “make” should be “made”.

There are several typos throughout the document:

- Section 3.1: first line, “Study” is in uppercase and should be in lowercase.
- Calde-Moir should be Calder-Moir
- Page 7: “formwork” should be “framework”
- Page 7: “follow” should be “following”

### 3.2. IT Governance framework Assessment - University of Gabes

In section 4.1 the word “consensus” should be deleted or changed by a more specific one in the title of each principle.

In section 4.2, above the *Table 1: Best practices current situation for the University of Gabes*, there should be an explanation indicating that these best practices are only part of the whole proposition in the framework and that the figures below show the percentages of best practices already satisfied by the University of Gabes.

In section 5.3 there is a table showing the current maturity level. Please, add under each principle the current level for the whole principle. For example, in case of Responsibility, it should be 1 because it is the lower level among *evaluate*, *direct* and *monitor*. Include this number for all principles in this table.

In this same table, even though the current level is 0, please write the aspects included in the framework for level 0.

In the picture showing the maturity goal in section 5.4, the strategy principle is in level 0 but above it is indicated level 1. Review that because there is a mistake in this part or in the previous one. The same with acquisition and human behaviour principles, numbers are incoherent.

In case of Conformance, try to achieve at least level 1 in order to improve the current situation.

In section 6.4.4. when explaining the monitoring and controlling activities, specifically in the table of KPIs, it should be added as an output:

- Responsibility: list of members of the new committee and also the person who plays the CIO role.
- Strategy: list of developments the university needs to achieve, the IT policy aligned with the strategy.
- Acquisition: the providers policy or procedures to work with them.
- Performance: list of all the indicators of the catalogue.





- Conformance: person who is responsible in terms of conformance, list of laws the university should satisfy, list of standards already in use or that should be in use.
- Human behaviour: the human behaviour principle is missing in the table.

There are several formatting issues throughout the document:

- In page 11, jump the table to next page to be all the information in the same page.
- In page 14, jump the figure to the next page to see all the information in a view.

There are several typos throughout the document:

- In section 4.2: comity instead of committee.
- In section 5.4 it says 5 principles and should be 6.

### 3.3. IT Governance framework Assessment - University of La Manouba

The section 3.2 is incomplete. They should research about international ITG frameworks and include also those studied in both trainings in addition to several literature the EU partners provided them.

In section 3.3 it is showed the ITG group. It should be better to explain further the ITG team tasks.

In section 4.2 they show the self-assessment regarding ITG in their organization. The explanation of the existing best practices should be expressed in an affirmative way and not like questions. Furthermore, in the principle acquisition it seems to be no consensus in the first best practices. Maybe need more explanation or more engagement of the participants.

At the end of this section there is a table with the consensus of the best practices for each principle and a spider net figure. It should be better to add a few lines explaining the meaning of this figure. What do the numbers mean? In which way will it affect your future plan? By which part will you have to begin? By the way, consensus is not a good word to be expressed here.

In section 5.3 the current maturity level is explained through a table. In the responsibility principle, the description for evaluate seems to be the one for direct and on reverse. Furthermore, please add the description for monitor. In the same table, please provide the description for the acquisition principle and for human behavior already included in the Spanish framework.

In section 5.4 after the illustration showing the desired maturity goal to achieve, there is a table of plans by each principle. Please, provide an explanation about why you just



selected three principles and not six, and why those three. In any case, some principles are at level 0 and at least the desired goal should be 1.

The section 6.4.1 is incomplete. Please, provide the description about each aspect.

There are several formatting issues throughout the document:

- Correct the Version number in the header.
- In section 4.1.1.5 add a point at the end of the sentence.
- Delete the dot in section 4.1.4.1 and in section 4.1.4.3.

There are several typos throughout the document:

- “The GT need” should be “needs” along the whole report.
- Page 5: “Is the GT” should be “The GT”.
- Page 5: “The GT needs to assign an amount for this” include “an amount of budget for this”.
- Page 5: strategic should be strategy.
- Page 6: “The GT needs set” should be “needs to set”.
- Page 7: “GET” should be “GT”.
- Page 7: “have met the planned objectives this a clear procedure to analyses” should be “have met the planned objectives with a clear procedure to analyse”.
- Page 8: “lows” should be “laws”.
- Page 13: “comity” should be “committee”.
- Page 13: name of universities should be in uppercase.
- Page 26: the name of principles should be in uppercase and the name of the university too.
- Page 26: “validate” should be “validated”.
- Page 26: “Evaluate”, “Direct” and “Monitor” should be in uppercase.