Student Learning Assurance Maturity Model

Bernie Farkas

Raymond Papp

Student Learning Assurance Maturity Model

Bernie Farkas
University of Tampa
BFarkas@ut.edu

Raymond Papp
University of Tampa
RPapp@ut.edu

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

The Cambridge Dictionary defines maturity as "a very advanced or developed form or state" (Maturity, 2024). A maturity model provides a descriptive framework of a domain's processes that provide the desired, expected, or typical procession for continuous improvement (Tarhan et al., 2016). Maturity Models have been developed for many domains, including cybersecurity (Akinsanya et al., 2019; Rea-Guaman et al., 2017), digital transformation (Teichert, 2019), eGovernment (Hujran et al., 2023), healthcare information systems (Carvalho et al., 2016), information systems (Proença & Borbinha, 2016), and manufacturing (De Carolis et al., 2017; Schumacher et al., 2016). A common use for Maturity Models is by continuous improvement quality assurance (QA) programs. Such QA programs are incorporated into academic accreditation requirements, e.g., AACSB and ABET, and are called Assurance of Learning (AoL).   However, a Google Scholar search found no formal AoL maturity model. This research posits an AoL Maturity Model (see below) to assess an institution's progress in academic assurance of learning programs.

	Initial	Developing	Defined	Integrated	Optimized
Student Learning Assurance Maturity Model					
Data	Unstructured, Decentralized	Emergent structure	Seamless collection and Access	Used in Curricula Decisions	
Measurements	Rely on assignments	Rely on direct methods	Standardized, direct methods	Direct and Indirect methods	
Goals & Objectives	Identified	Mapping Courses	Defined for each Program	Included with Curricula Decisions	
Processes	Ad hoc	Faculty-dependent	Defined	Governed	
Faculty	Few, key participants	Emerging dialogue	Full participation	Faculty-driven	
Assessment	Need recognized	Plan Completed	Conducting Assessments	Recognized Priority	Engrained in Culture
Focus	Building Awareness	Implementing Best Practices	Standardization	Integration & Alignment	Continuous Innovation
	Level 1 *Informal, reactive processes*	**Level 2** *Documented, reactive processes*	**Level 3** *Standardized, proactive processes*	**Level 4** *Managed, controlled processes*	**Level 5** *Institutionalized processes*

(Right margin spanning vertical label: Continuous Improvement)

Figure 1: Student Learning Assurance Maturity Model

De Carolis et al. (2017) identify five phases to developing a maturity model: inception, elaboration, construction, deployment, and maintenance. Defining the scope and identifying participants occurs during the inception phase. Next, during the elaboration phase, the architecture and design are determined. Maturity measurements, deployment, and management procedures are created during the construction phase. Finally, the model and tools are validated in the deployment phase. This research covers the inception and elaboration phases. The construction and deployment phases will occur in future research.

The five levels of this AoL model correspond roughly to the Maturity Model found in business, such as the Strategic Alignment Maturity Model proposed by Luftman (Papp, 2001), the Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) by ISACA (Chrissis et al., 2011), and the Project Management Maturity Model by J. Kent Crawford, PMP (Crawford, 2021). Maturity models have a definitive place in business as they allow organizations to continually determine where they are concerning governance and alignment of business and IT strategies. Similarly, the posited AoL Maturity Model can be used by institutions to continually improve their AoL programs needed for the annual assessments of student learning outcomes and the cyclic accreditation visits

and reviews. As institutions progress through the levels, they can be assured that they have well-developed plans, can effectively assess student learning outcomes, and "close the loop" concerning assessment.

Keywords: Maturity Model, Assurance of Learning, Students

REFERENCES

Akinsanya, O. O., Papadaki, M., & Sun, L. (2019). Current Cybersecurity Maturity Models: How Effective in Healthcare Cloud? CEUR Workshop Proceedings,

Carvalho, J. V., Rocha, Á., & Abreu, A. (2016). Maturity Models of Healthcare Information Systems and Technologies: a Literature Review. *Journal of Medical Systems*, *40*(6), 131. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-016-0486-5

Chrissis, M. B., Konrad, M., & Shrum, S. (2011). *CMMI for Development: Guidelines for Process Integration and Product Improvement*. Pearson Education.

Crawford, J. K. (2021). *Project Management Maturity Model*. CRC Press.

De Carolis, A., Macchi, M., Negri, E., & Terzi, S. (2017, 2017//). A Maturity Model for Assessing the Digital Readiness of Manufacturing Companies. Advances in Production Management Systems. The Path to Intelligent, Collaborative and Sustainable Manufacturing, Cham.

Hujran, O., Alarabiat, A., Al-Adwan, A. S., & Al-Debei, M. (2023). Digitally Transforming Electronic Governments into Smart Governments: SMARTGOV, an Extended Maturity Model. *Information Development*, *39*(4), 811-834. https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669211054188

Maturity. (2024). *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/maturity

Papp, R. (2001). *Strategic Information Technology: Opportunities for Competitive Advantage*. Idea Group Pub. https://books.google.com/books?id=o8rNJX6o5CMC

Proença, D., & Borbinha, J. (2016). Maturity Models for Information Systems - A State of the Art. *Procedia Computer Science*, *100*, 1042-1049. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.279

Rea-Guaman, A. M., San Feliu, T., Calvo-Manzano, J. A., & Sanchez-Garcia, I. D. (2017, 2017//). Comparative Study of Cybersecurity Capability Maturity Models. Software Process Improvement and Capability Determination, Cham.

Schumacher, A., Erol, S., & Sihn, W. (2016). A Maturity Model for Assessing Industry 4.0 Readiness and Maturity of Manufacturing Enterprises. *Procedia CIRP*, *52*, 161-166. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.07.040

Tarhan, A., Turetken, O., & Reijers, H. A. (2016). Business Process Maturity Models: A Systematic Literature Review. *Information and Software Technology*, *75*, 122-134. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2016.01.010

Teichert, R. (2019). Digital Transformation Maturity: A Systematic Review of Literature. *Acta universitatis agriculturae et silviculturae mendelianae brunensis*, *67*(6), 1673-1687. https://repozitar.mendelu.cz/xmlui/handle/20.500.12698/1308