Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

The Need for Information Governance in Nigerian Public Universities

JIKA Saidu Muhammad, Department of Library and Information Science, Gombe State University , Nigeria, msaidujika@gmail.com, +2348039662599

SHAIBU Umar, Department of Library and Information Science, Gombe State University, Nigeria, +2347058636761,umarshuaibu1975@yahoo.com

AHMED Muhammed Bello, College Library, Federal College of Education (Technical), Gombe- Nigeria,mbahmed26@gmail.com,+2347065171412

Fatimah Sani, Department of Library and Information Science, Gombe State University, Nigeria, fatimahsani885@gmail.com, +2348084845762

Abstract
A university is a complex organization possessing a vast amount of information across all of its functions and operations. Much of this information consists of personal data or other confidential information, for which there are specific requirements and risks. It is important that the university is able to acquire, manage, make available, and dispose of the information it needs in a responsible and protected manner, in compliance with both operational requirements and the responsibilities set forth by legislation and regulation. Information management in Nigerian universities suffers from significant setbacks due to a lack of standard policies to guide the creation, usage, and disposition of records. This study aims to examine issues of records and information management in Nigerian universities as viewed by previous studies, in order to determine whether the Information Governance (IG) paradigm can transform Records and Information Management (RIM) in these institutions. The study found that Nigerian universities fall short of requirements when it comes to maintaining records that document their functions, coupled with insufficient financial backing for initiatives to provide the most necessary facilities for RIM. Moreover, no previous studies have utilized the Information Governance (IG) perspective to address the problems of record management in Nigerian universities. The study recommends that, in the event of a shortage or unavailability of funds, IG initiatives can be implemented at the departmental level on a trial basis. Several IG models were suggested for universities to assess the feasibility of IG implementation in their respective domains.

Keywords Nigerian universities, Information Governance, Records Management, Information Management

Introduction

Information governance (IG) is a "super discipline" that has emerged as a result of new and tightened legislation governing businesses, along with the recognition that multiple overlapping disciplines are needed to address today's information management challenges in an increasingly regulated and litigated business environment. Information overload, caused by the proliferation of unstructured data, documents, emails, and other unmanaged

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

information within a corporate enterprise, poses a risk in light of recent laws, regulations, and rules governing information (Dameri, 2009, cited by Smith, 2015). IG is both puzzling and fascinating to a broader audience than just the records and information management (RIM) community. Today, there is no Association of Information and Image Management (AIIM) event, e-Discovery seminar, or enterprise 2.0 conference that does not espouse the mantra of IG.

A university is a complex organization possessing a vast amount of information across all of its functions and operations. Much of this information consists of personal data or other confidential information, for which there are specific requirements and risks. It is important that the university is able to acquire, use, manage, make available, and dispose of the information it needs, as appropriate, in a responsible and protected manner, in compliance with both operational requirements and the responsibilities set forth by legislation and regulation.

Nigerian universities possess a large amount of information, which includes correspondences, accounting documents, personnel files, payroll records, minutes of meetings (Senates, University Council, Faculty, and Departmental Board meetings), students' registration, admission and examination records, lists of courses offered, timetables for lectures, speeches, legal documents, and so on. Making this information available in a timely manner to the right users will no doubt eliminate or reduce to the barest minimum some problems encountered in finding needed information to make decisions or to respond to queries.

Abdurrahman (2015) opines that the invaluable role records play in assisting managers to carry out their administrative functions through decision-making cannot be overstressed. This is because the information contained in the records helps to enlighten them regarding any issues relevant to the organization. However, studies have revealed that information management in Nigerian universities is suffering from significant setbacks. As observed by Idris (2017), there are no policies or guidelines for records appraisal, retention, and disposal in Nigerian universities.

In a similar study, Abdurrahman (2015) found that the demand for appropriate and timely information for management decisions in Nigerian universities appears challenging, adding that this is because the university system is expanding at an alarming rate. Other studies by Ukwoma & Mole (2017) and Momoh & Abdulsalam (2014) found that records may be available in an institutional repository of the university, but users are often unaware of this because access points were not provided. Similarly, the status of information management efficiency in the universities generally lacks effectiveness.

Practicing good IG is the essential foundation for building a legally defensible records management program; it provides the basis for consistent and reliable methods for managing documents and records. This paper examines issues of records and information management in Nigerian universities as viewed by previous studies, in order to determine whether the IG paradigm can change the face of RIM in these institutions. First, we ask why we need IG and

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

where it came from. Second, we present some IG models and concepts; finally, we discuss how they meet the expectations of the RIM community.

In a nutshell, after a critical consideration of the term IG, this study highlights some issues that turn out to be major challenges and obstacles to RIM, along with the possibility of adopting the IG framework within a university setting in Nigeria.

Study Background and Problem Case details

This section describes the target literature details and the situation of the problem domain. Issues related to records and information management in Nigerian universities, as well as some incidents resulting from poor information management, are outlined. Based on the literature reviewed, no studies have been conducted regarding the implementation of the IG approach to address the problems of information management in Nigerian universities; hence, the need for this research.

Records and Information Management in Nigerian Universities

Universities in Nigeria create a huge quantity and perplexing variety of records on a daily basis. These include records such as correspondences, accounting documents, personnel files, payroll, minutes of meetings (Senates, University Council), etc. Departments and faculties continuously create and use these records in their day-to-day activities. The National Policy on Education (1997), focusing on Nigerian universities, aims at social transformation, economic modernization, and the training and upgrading of the nation's total human resources, while promoting intercontinental understanding. This implies that documenting events and activities in the form of records, particularly for a university, is of paramount importance in promoting research and development for both the university and the nation at large.

Abdulrahman (2015) noted that record-keeping occupies a strategic position in the efficient and effective management of the university system; in fact, it is central to the administration of universities. Records are also used as important sources for strategic planning and successful implementation of policies, as well as for good policy formulation (Nwaomah, 2015). This is not far from the fact that for any meaningful planning and controlling to take place, there must be good access to records.

Records and information management, according to Iwhiwhu (2005), aims at controlling the rapid accumulation of papers within an organization or institution. This is due to the voluminous records created without any organized plan for their storage and maintenance, consequently causing difficulty in tracing and utilizing the information when needed. Having investigated the cases of poor governance and conducted case studies in several different organizations, Isa (2009) found that records management is central to good governance in both public and private organizations.

Despite the important role that records and information play in running an organization such as a university, many universities in Nigeria face challenges in managing their records and information. In his studies on managing e-records in federal universities in Nigeria, Idris

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

(2017) revealed that e-records management activities are not given the attention they deserve in the universities. Most universities have no records department, no records policy, and no ICT facilities to manage e-records effectively. However, Bantin (2002) identified Decision Support Systems (DSS), Electronic Records Management Systems (ERMS), and Online Transaction Processing Systems (OLTPS) as some of the most suitable systems for processing e-records and documents, which are mostly not found in Nigerian universities.

The lack of these facilities will undoubtedly affect the management of electronic records. Supporting this, Idris (2017), citing Asogwa (2012), described the implications of the non-availability of ICT facilities in Nigerian universities as ill-equipped or unprepared for electronic records management, because these technologies are known to be very effective at supporting the needs for information, minimizing the amount of data stored in the system, improving system efficiency, removing obsolete data, and providing effective ways of managing e-records.

Decision-making, which is considered the bedrock of running organizations, also suffers setbacks due to poor management of records and information in the universities. Brenden (2013) pointed out that Nigeria lacks basic records management policies for managing ordinary records; as a result, such records are frequently misplaced or lost due to misfiling. In a similar study, Popoola and Oluwole (2007) posited that Nigerian university administrators are often concerned about the alarming rate of misplacement or loss of vital records and the slow speed at which needed records are retrieved from storage.

Similarly, Atulomah (2011), cited by Momoh and Abdulsalam (2014), observed that universities in Nigeria generate large quantities and quality records in their day-to-day activities, but many files are duplicated in numbers within and across units without control over their creation, causing data redundancy and wasteful spending. Aluede, Idogho, and Imonikhe (2018) added that there is a lot of indiscipline among records officers; such as destroying the confidentiality of the data, students and other users tend to bribe records officers to alter some information, computational aids like computers are unavailable, and poor funding has led to the non-recruitment of sufficient and qualitative staff and low provision of adequate space.

In a study conducted by Ojo, Mairiga, Idakwo, and Mohammed (2019) on policy guidelines for records management in Nigerian university libraries, it was discovered that poor policy guidelines, insufficient funds, inadequate housing, poor electricity supply, low staff morale, lack of training and retraining, and lack of strong support from top management are among the major challenges of staff records management in Nigerian university libraries.

Jika (2022) argued that managing records and information in Nigerian universities is carried out without a standard RIM policy. He added that although some fragments of roughly unwritten policies exist, which are loosely implemented and have an explicit impact on information management and use in the universities—such as records retention and disposition—these rely on the availability of lawful guidance and, to some extent, the

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

judgment of the units or departments or sometimes the decision of the university's top management.

Evidence of Poor Records Management in Nigerian Universities

If requested records are not located due to a poor records system, universities may find themselves in an awkward situation where, as Tailor (2000) observed, lawsuits by aggrieved parties cannot be ruled out. The National Universities Commission (NUC) has previously suspended the operating licenses of seven private universities in Nigeria for various reasons, including noncompliance with NUC regulations, poor management of academic activities, and mismanagement of students' examination records (Nwaomah, 2015).

Recently, a national lawmaker was accused of not graduating from Ahmadu Bello University in Zaria, Nigeria, where he claimed to have earned his first degree. According to Ogbonna (2017), the accused senator, Dino Melaye, allegedly bribed his Head of Department, who, along with other department professors and examinations officials, supported him in falsifying his transcripts, despite the senator's name not appearing on the graduation list. Although the senator was eventually cleared and verified as a graduate of that university by the Vice-Chancellor, who testified before a panel of inquiry in the National Assembly chamber, the institution's delay in providing the pertinent documents raised concerns about the potential misuse of records within the university.

Another case of a certificate scandal involves a renowned politician in Nigeria contesting for a governorship position. According to Akinloye (2017), Ayodele Fayose claimed to have attended Polytechnic Ibadan, Nigeria, and received a Higher National Diploma (HND) certificate. However, he was left in disbelief when the institution issued a disclaimer stating that he had never been a student there and that the certificate he claimed belonged to someone else. As Fayose prepared for the governorship election, many called for his prosecution. However, the Polytechnic later retracted its statement, conceding that Fayose was indeed a graduate of the institution, allowing him to win the election in 2014. This incident highlighted the inconsistency with which Nigerian institutions of higher learning manage and deliver information, stemming from weak record-keeping and information management practices.

Former Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan (2011-2015) was also embroiled in a certificate scandal. Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, a respected leader and former president, accused Jonathan of not completing his PhD (1999-2007). This serious charge jeopardized Jonathan's reputation and integrity, according to Akinloye (2017). Jonathan holds a BSc in Zoology, an MSc in Hydrobiology and Fisheries Biology, and a PhD in Zoology, all from the University of Port Harcourt in Nigeria. His supporters believed that Obasanjo was attempting to defame the then-president ahead of the 2015 presidential election to hinder his chances of winning.

In response to a query from Punch Newspaper, the University's Deputy Registrar, William Wodi, stated, "As an institution with a statutory mandate to expand the frontiers of knowledge, we have absolutely nothing to conceal." However, when a civil society organization, the Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, requested Jonathan's

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

academic records under the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), the University responded, "The management of the University has carefully considered your request and its implications under the FOI Act. It is my duty to advise you that your request does not fall under the relevant requirements of the FOI Act in terms of its feasibility or the University's obligation to supply the sought information. As a result, you will not be able to obtain information about President Jonathan's PhD degree from the University of Port Harcourt." This incident reveals how the freedom to access public information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) is being jeopardized in Nigerian universities.

Why Information Governance?

Information is both a valuable asset and a potential liability for an organization, from the production of records to their eventual disposition. Effective corporate governance is essential for providing documentation necessary for business planning, transactions, and litigation (Smallwood, 2014). Hagmann (2013) noted that, in recent years, primarily US-based professional associations, interest groups, and experts from the Records and Information Management (RIM) and IT communities have raised two key questions while researching the concept of information governance from a RIM perspective: (1) Is the concept of a record and records management as a discipline still fit for purpose? (2) Should we reconsider all the requirements under the traditional view of information lifecycle management in a more holistic manner, in conjunction with all the dependencies from related disciplines within the broader field of Enterprise Information Management (EIM)?

In response to the first question, numerous indicators from the RIM community suggest that addressing the records management lifecycle solely from the perspective of data retention and destruction is no longer sufficient. For example, Smallwood (2019) argued that organizations should shift from a reactive “keep everything” strategy to a proactive strategy of defensible deletion. This proactive approach can enhance disposition and information governance programs by employing a systemized, repeatable, and defensible method. Similarly, Ianarelli (2015) emphasized that with the prevalence of smartphones, tablets, and other devices generating vast amounts of data, traditional RIM systems cannot easily control the information generated and disseminated today.

The idea that relevant information should be classified and designated as a "record" is unlikely to change, particularly given that only 7-9 percent of enterprise content is managed as "official" or scheduled records (Datskovsky, 2012). Hagmann (2013) stressed the importance of involving various stakeholders within the organization, allowing each contributor to benefit from the insights of others. This collaborative approach calls for a more robust method of managing organizational information. Therefore, it is crucial to consider how long we will need all relevant data, why we need it, how and how much we will use it, and what we are permitted to do with it while maintaining or preserving it.

Some experts advocate for adopting the more inclusive terms "Information Lifecycle Management" (ILM) or "Information Lifecycle Governance" (ILG or ILMG) to replace the traditional term "Records Management." The information management field is evolving, and various constructs are emerging, each promising to address the challenges posed by records

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

management (Svard, 2017). Information governance efforts aim to manage and control information assets to reduce risk, ensure compliance with regulations, and enhance information quality and accessibility, while also implementing security measures to protect and preserve information with business value (Smallwood, 2014).

When an organization is information governance (IG)-enabled—that is, when IG is integrated into operations across the enterprise and coordinated on a company-wide basis—the organization will look very different than it does now. It will not only have a clear understanding of the total cost of information but will also shift resources to capitalize on the opportunities presented by Big Data. Furthermore, it will exhibit significant changes in key operational areas, including legal, records and information management (RIM), and IT.

Regarding the second question, discussions among consultancy firms like Gartner and in academia (e.g., Kooper et al., 2011) suggest that the notion of IG is already established, despite the relative immaturity of the corresponding concepts and theories, coupled with limited practical experience. Currently, organizations seem to develop their own interpretations of IG based on internal needs, priorities, ethics, and politics—some even treat IG as synonymous with data governance. However, one common observation noted by Hagmann (2013) is that many organizations do not clearly distinguish between IT governance and information governance. Kooper et al. (2011) commented on the inadequacy of IT governance to effectively manage the information lifecycle. As Gartner (2009) succinctly articulated:

> *"The overall objectives of good governance are to improve the speed and effectiveness of decisions and processes (efficiency), to maximize the value of information in terms of value creation, and to reduce costs and risks to the business or organization. Information governance is a subset of corporate governance. In other words, information governance should not be viewed as part of IT governance. Why? Because such a perspective reinforces the notion that information is the responsibility of IT. It isn't. Information governance is NOT solely the responsibility of IT, or at least not solely the responsibility of IT."*

This perspective from Gartner emphasizes the broad strategic scope of IG rather than its operational IT scope. However, IG can also be seen as the art of fostering trusted interactions among the key stakeholders of an IG program (IT, Business, Legal and Compliance, RIM, Security, and Privacy). These stakeholders aim to collaborate to minimize information risks to the enterprise while maximizing the value of information assets through the development of desirable behaviors and the facilitation of cross-functional decision-making.

How IG Meets the Expectation of RIM?

With changes in the business environment and in regulatory, legal, and IG influences, there comes increased attention to RM as a driver for corporate compliance. For most organizations, a lack of defined policies and the enormous and growing volumes of documents (e.g., email messages) make implementing a formal RM program challenging and

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

costly. Some reasons for this, according to Smallwood (2014), include changing and increasing regulations, managing multiple retention and disposition schedules, changing information delivery platforms, and security concerns. Protecting and preserving corporate records is of paramount importance, yet users must have reasonable access to official records to conduct everyday business. Organizations are struggling to balance the need to provide accessibility to critical corporate information with the need to protect the integrity of corporate records.

Kahn and Blair (2004) introduced the concept of information management compliance (IMC) in 2004 as a collaborative, content-oriented approach to managing information through its entire lifecycle. This concept aligned almost all the business activities that are now under the umbrella of IG concepts and models in their definition of IMC. Indeed, besides the already understood need for better integration of IM disciplines—which often run and work side by side or against each other instead of functioning together—the governance aspect is not new either. "The governance of an enterprise, the compliance with legal obligations and duties, and the appraisal and valuation of risks go hand in hand" (Kampffmeyer, 2007).

So, we can see that the transfer of the Governance, Risk, and Compliance (GRC) concepts into the area of information management now equals IG. In the context of the value chain, it means tying values (including tangible and intangible assets) and legal duties to information assets so that IT can routinely and defensibly manage data, and the business is able to make decisions based on optimized information resources and systems.

With this as a starting point, it is important to follow a holistic enterprise-wide perspective. Why is records management alone not enough? Because organizations have to master all possible information risks in a coordinated way, not just retention and disposition risks. GARP clearly addresses the eight dimensions, which include information security risks (protection) and compliance risks, including data privacy and other risks (ARMA, 2009).

The visibility of the program, including RIM and other associated disciplines, increases significantly when IG is aligned with risk and compliance. It requires someone to be responsible and accountable in a long-term manner in order to be successful. It does not function at no cost. According to Hagmann (2013), risk minimization is only possible with a well-funded, properly choreographed, and multidisciplinary governance program. As a result, this is a critical undertaking; the importance of IG to the business from the start cannot be overstated.

Some IG Implementation Frameworks

Various organizations and initiatives have adopted and implemented different types of IG frameworks, each with distinct perspectives toward IG. Alongside IG maturity, these models continually change their focus on IG while maintaining their fundamental fields of expertise. Mullon and Ngoepe (2019) have identified several frameworks and standards developed for implementation at the organizational level, some of which are applied by institutions in South Africa. They include the following:

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

i. **Concepts IG framework**: Developed by Mullon in 2017, this framework has been implemented in various organizations he consulted for in South Africa. These organizations include the Reserve Bank of South Africa and the eSwatini Revenue Authority. This framework mainly includes three essential pillars, namely, instruments (policy and legislative framework), infrastructure (technology), and interest (people, change management, and accountability).

ii. **ARMA IG body of knowledge**: This framework is based on the Association of Records Managers and Administrators' definition of IG, where IG is defined as a "strategic, cross-disciplinary framework composed of standards, processes, roles, and metrics that hold organizations and individuals accountable for the proper handling of information assets" (ARMA International, 2018). This framework assists organizations in achieving business objectives, minimizes the risk posed by substandard information handling practices, and facilitates compliance with external requirements.

iii. **IBM IG maturity model**: This model is based on the definition of IG by an IBM records manager, where IG is defined as "the disciplines, technologies, and solutions that are used to manage information within an enterprise in support of business and legal requirements. IG incorporates a wide set of subjects that covers information protection, information quality, and information lifecycle management."

iv. **IG Reference Model**: In late 2012, with the support and collaboration of ARMA International and the Compliance, Governance, and Oversight Council (CGOC), the Electronic Discovery Reference Model (EDRM) Project released version 3.0 of its IG Reference Model (IGRM), which added information privacy and security as primary functions and stakeholders in the effective governance of information. The IGRM is aimed at fostering IG adoption by facilitating communication and collaboration between disparate (but overlapping) IG stakeholder functions, including information technology (IT), legal, RM, risk management, and business unit stakeholders. The model serves as a ground for discussion and analysis, rather than a specific prescription for how to approach eDiscovery, which is considered one of its limitations (Mullon and Ngoepe, 2019).

v. **COBIT 5**: Another popular IG framework and quasi-standard from the perspective of IT is COBIT 5 (Control Objectives for Information and Related Technology), based on five key principles. COBIT 5 extends the governance of enterprise information management in alignment with ISO 38500 (2016), the corporate governance of information technology standard. It provides a comprehensive framework that assists enterprises in achieving their objectives for the governance and management of enterprise IT. Simply stated, it helps enterprises create optimal value from IT by maintaining a balance between realizing benefits and optimizing risk levels and resource use.

Universities and Information Governance

Information Governance has many standard concerns that can and should be tackled within all organizations. The situation of IG implementation in universities is similar to that in other industries. Jairak and Paneetpolgrang (2015) argue that they have not found a specific

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

solution that applies to every university, adding that the solution has significantly changed from one university to another. Bhattachariya and Chang (2007), as cited in Jairak and Praneetpolgrang, note that adopting industry best practices may not always be appropriate, especially when institutions are dealing with low staffing levels. Each university can launch its own best practices that connect to its business demands based on available resources.

In 2007, the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) on funding for the University of Strathclyde initiated the compliant roadmap and self-assessment tool to assist institutions of higher education in the UK in tracing areas for enhancing their IT resources. Considering the JISC model and the ISO/IEC 38500:2008 Standard for Corporate Governance of IT, Martínez and Largo (2009) established a university-oriented IT governance framework (ITG4U) for the Spanish Association of University Rectors, which allows individual universities to attain a higher IT governance maturity level.

The whole university system in Thailand is controlled by the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) and the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (ONESQA). The main function of the OHEC, according to Jairak and Paneetpolgrang (2015), is to uphold the internal quality assurance of each university. However, the regulation of external quality assurance among Thai universities falls under the responsibility of ONESQA.

The two organizations share the same vision of creating a suitable quality assurance system for Thai universities. Similarly, based on the OHEC and ONESQA methods, many indicators for measuring university performance were identified.

Oxford University's IG policy considers IG as a broad framework for ensuring that information is controlled legitimately and firmly and that the privacy of personal and confidential information is maintained properly (IG Policy 2020). This comprises access to and disclosure of information, information protection and risk management, freedom of information, IT projects, IT governance, and records management. The policy also states that effective IG requires clear and efficient control, accountability, processes, structures, policies, adequate resources, and trained staff.

The IG policy of the University of Bristol applies to all categories of university staff, ranging from honorary staff and hourly paid teachers to contractors and all students who are carrying out any responsibilities or work on behalf of the university. It adds that the management and use of information are vital to realizing the university's aims as set out in its vision and strategy (Smallwood, 2019). The university has stated that its IG framework ensures compliance with several regulations regarding the usage and handling of information and the common law duty of confidentiality. These include, but are not restricted to:

a. General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679)
b. Data Protection Act 2018
c. Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations 2003
d. Freedom of Information Act 2000

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

e. Computer Misuse Act 1990
f. Intellectual Property Act 2018
g. Official Secrets Act 1989

The IG framework of Manchester University includes people, principles, policies, and organizational and technical controls in order to aid information protection and enhance information openness while being mindful of the individual rights and needs of those who entrust their personal data to the university, as well as the necessities of other interested stakeholders, funding bodies, and regulatory organizations. Through a network of IG guardians, the university offers training, encouragement, and guidance to help staff ensure that information is created and properly disposed of at the end of its life cycle (Manchester IG framework, n.d.).

The IG office has stated that, even though Manchester University deals with a variety of information used for research, teaching and learning, and administrative activities, there are restrictions on using some information that are constrained either by laws, such as current data protection law, or in order to protect and preserve the university's interests, while some information needs to be made available freely. This includes information in response to requests under the Freedom of Information Act.

However, information is considered a vital asset to the university, and the IG office has a controlling function to assist in ensuring that these important assets are safeguarded. This is achieved through leading and supporting the development of related strategic roadmaps, operational processes, and systems to ensure efficient control and protection of the university's information (Manchester IG framework, n.d.).

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the literature reviewed on records and information management in Nigerian universities, this study found that Nigerian universities fell below requirements when it came to maintaining record series that document their functions. This was demonstrated by the incidents discovered regarding the consequences of poor RIM in the universities. The study also indicated that the mechanisms in place for RIM are inadequate to provide an environment in which records management objectives can be achieved.

Additionally, from the available literature studied, no research has been conducted regarding the implementation of an information governance approach to address the problems of information management in Nigerian universities, hence the need for an IG approach. Working on this premise, Kopler (2017) noted that there is an absence of information governance policies or frameworks enabling information governance in most African universities. This means that the high-level management of information is uncoordinated, with limited monitoring and evaluation of strategic and management indicators.

In concept and from a strategic view, IG is capable of initiating a paradigm shift in the world of information management. It is, therefore, recommended that universities in Nigeria carefully examine any information governance initiative or program for its essential elements,

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

specific scope, and intended impact on information lifecycle management and practical RIM for implementation into their records management systems.

This study indicates that the universities face challenges of funding in the area of RIM. They are constrained by insufficient financial backing in their initiatives to provide the most needed facilities and services necessary to sustain the generation, storage, dissemination, and access to information. In view of this, it is recommended that, in the event of a shortage or unavailability of funds, the IG initiative can be implemented at the departmental level on a trial basis. This means that the records management team should demonstrate and try to convince university management of the return on investment and the benefits of IG implementation for the universities.

References

Abdurrahman, A. B. (2015). Management of university records for effective administration of universities in north- central Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 7(30), pp. 47- 54.

ARMA (2009). The Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles *(GARP)*. Retrieved from http://www. arma.org/r2/generally-accepted-br-recordkeeping-principles.

ARMA International (2018). How to Cite GARP, www.arma.org/garp/copyright.cfm

Asogwa, R. & Brenden, F. (2012). "The challenges of managing electronic records in developing countries: implications for records managers in sub- Saharan Africa". *Records Management Journal* 22(3), pp. 198-211.

Atulomah, B. C. (2011). Perceived records management practices and decision making among university administrators in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1(1), Pp.7-13.

Bantin, P. (2012). Electronic Records: A Review of a Decade and a Reflection of Future Directions. In: Kent A. And Hall, C (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, 74. New York: Marcell Dekker. 47-81

Bhattacharjya, J. and Chang, V. (2006), Adoption and implementation of IT governance: cases from Australian higher education, Proceedings of the 17th Australasian Conference on Information Systems, Adelaide, December 6-8.

Brendan, E. A. (2013). The readiness of universities in managing electronic records: A study of three federal universities in Nigeria. *The Electronic Library*, 31(6), pp.792-807.

Dameri, R. (2009). Improving the benefits of IT compliance using enterprise management information systems. *Electronic Journal of Information System Evaluation*, 12 (1), 27-38.

Datkobsky, G. (2012). Step up to get a seat at the table. *Information Management Journal*, 46(6), pp. 20- 24.

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

Gartner, Inc. (2009). *Enterprise information management*. Retrieved from http://www.gartner.co./it-glossary/enterprise-information-management-eim

Hagmaan, J. (2013). Information Governance- beyond the buzz. *Records Management Journal,* 23 (3). Retrieved from http://www.emerald.com

Hobb, R. (2015). Information security policy. Oxford University. Retrieved from http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/card/

Idris, A.A. (2017). Management of electronic records generated /received by federal universities in Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Technologies in Library and Information Science,* 3(2), pp. 45-53.

Information Governance Initiative Policy. (2020). Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford. Retrieved fromhttp://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/card/

Isa, A. M. (2009). Records management and accountability of governance. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Humanities Advanced Technology and Information Institute, *University of Glasgow*.

Iwhiwhu, E. B. (2005). Management of records in Nigerian Universities. *The electronic library*, 3 (30), pp.345-355. Retrieved from http://www.doi.org/101108/0264

Jairak, K., & Praneetpolgrang, P. (2015). Information technology governance practices based on sufficiency economy philosophy in the Thai university sector, *28*(1), 195–223. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-10-2013-0188

Jika, S.M. (2022). Critical Factors for Implementing Information Governance in Nigerian Public Universities. Unpublished PhD Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Information Management, *University Technology Mara,* Malaysia.

Kahn, R. and Blair, B.T. (2004), Information Nation: Seven Keys to Information Management Compliance 2nd ed., AIIM, Silver Spring.

Kampffmeyer, U. (2007), Governance, Risk Management and Compliance, GRC, Hamburg.

Kooper, M., Moes, R.,and Rossline, G. (2011). The governance of information: introducing a new concept of governance to support the management of information. *International Journal of Information Management,* 31, Pp. 195-206. Retrieved from http://www.dl.acm.org/citation.efmd-2297895

Kopler, H.C. (2017). *Report to council by the Deputy Vice- chancellor: strategy and internalization,* university Stellenbosch, South Africa. Retrieved from http://www.sun.ac.za/english/

Ianarelli, J. G. & O'shaughnessy, M. (2015). *Information governance and security: protecting and managing your company's proprietary information.* USA:Butterworth-Heinemann

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

Manchester IG Framework (nd). Retrieved from http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/information-governance-framework/

Momoh, M. & Abdulsalam, D. O. (2014). Information management efficiency in universities in northern Nigeria: an analysis. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 107-116.

Mullon, P. & Ngoepe, M. (2019), An integrated framework to elevate IG to a national level in Sourth Africa, *Reocrds Management Journal,* 29(1/2), pp.103-116.Retrieved from http://doi-org.ezaccess.library.uitm.edu.my/10.1108/RMJ-09-2018-0030.

Nwaomah, A. E. (2015). Political factors' influence on student' records management effectiveness in the Nigerian university system. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences*, 3(2), pp. 29-41. Retrieved from http://www.idpublications.org

Ojo, J.O., Mairiga, H.M., Idakwo, I.S. & Mohammed, U.S. (2019). Policy guidelines for records management in Nigerian University libraries. *Covenant Journal of Library and Information Science,* 2(2), pp. 1-15.

Omekwu, C. O. (2003). National Agricultural information management system in Nigeria: A conceptual framework. *Library review*, 52(9), pp. 444-451. Retrieved from http://www.doi.org/10.1108/00242430310501464

Popoola, S. O. & Oluwole, A. (2007). *A cost model approach to records management system in the civil service of Oyo State, Nigeria*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Library, Archival and Information studies, *University of Ibadan- Nigeria*.

Smallwood, R. F. (2019). Information governance policy development. *Information Governance*, New Jersey: John Wiley and sons.

Smallwood, R. R. (2014). Information governance: Concepts, strategies and best practices. New Jersey: John Wiley and sons.

Smith, M. S. (2015). A phenomenological study of critical success factors in implementing information governance. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Phoenix, USA: ProQuest LLC.

Svard, P. (2017). Enterprise content management, records management and information culture amids e-government development. Cambridge: Elsevier, Chandos Publishing.

The National Policy on Education (1997). Federal Ministry of Education. Revised ed. Pp.231-243.

Ukwoma, S. C. & Mole, A. J. (2017). Utilization of institutional repositories for searching information sources, self- archiving, and preservation of research publications in selected Nigerian universities. *African Journal of Library, Archive, and Information Science,* 27(2), 117-130.

Jewel Journal of Librarianship
ISSN: 2141-3908 (Print); ISSN: 2736-0881 (Online)
Volume 19, Issue 3; Published: September, 2024
https://www.jeweljournals.com

Akinloye, B. (2017, March 26). *Prominent Nigerians with certificate scandals.* http://www.punch.com-prominent-nigerians-with-certificate-scandals/.

Ogbonna, A. (2017, March 27). Dino: How the certificate confirmation drama was unfolded. Retrieved from http;//www.vanguard.com/2017/03/dino-certificate-confirmation-drama-unfolded/