| | Strengths | Weaknesses | Other considerations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Local Standards | Local Stakeholders add meaning | Audience may not trust standards | Subjectivity |
| External Standards | Simpler process | not as trusted by local stakeholders | May not exactly fit local program |
| Internal Peer Benchmarks | Allows comparison between programs | Small sample pools may skew results | May not take into account other factors (apples to oranges) |
| External Peer Benchmarks | Allows you to compare your students to larger groups | Difficult to find appropriate peer groups | Data may not always be available for sharing |
| Best Practices Benchmarks | motivating | such comparisons can also be frustrating because change takes time and is success can be difficult to replicate | aspirational |
| Historical Trends Benchmarks | allow us to detect the positive or negative effects of changes at the institution over time | may become less and less relevant | Some change may be outside the control of the institution |
| Productivity Benchmarks | May help control costs | savings doesn't always lead to better outcomes | |
| Value-added benchmarks | Can best measure the change over time | Ignores absolute criteria (students may still leave without knowing the LOs) | motivaton, lack of availability and outliers may affect results |
| Capability benchmarks | May be more focused on individual student needs | Very difficult to measure reliably | May be useful on a case by case basis |
| Strengths and Weaknesses Perspective | Effort can be focused on particular student needs | Does not take into account the variance in natural weakness and resistanvce to improvement | Lacking external benchmarks |