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All selected indicators have to comply with so-called **SMART Principle**. It means that they have to be: **Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-based.**

- **Specific** i.e. well defined and clear to anyone that has a basic knowledge of the process. Should include measure assumptions and definitions and be easily interpreted.
- **Measurable** i.e. can be quantified and compared to other data. It should allow for statistical analysis.
- **Achievable** i.e. doable under given conditions at the college
- **Realistic** i.e. within the availability of resources and knowledge. Fits into the college's constraints and is cost-effective.
- **Time-based** i.e. doable within the realistic time frame.

**Example:**

**Strategic outcome/goal:** minimum of 80% of College graduates should communicate in EN at least at B2 level

**Indicator:** "The number of students who completed English courses" is not **SMART**.

**Indicator:** "The number of students who completed B2 courses in English at the College in 2015 and got B2 certificates, versus the total number of students at the College is **SMART**.
Relevance

- All strategic goals should be monitored / assessed by selected indicators.

- It is difficult or impractical to monitor / assess all activities. That is why it is recommended to focus on the key-important ones. This is a sort of compromise to make the assessment system realistic and achievable.

- Selected set of indicators should reflect critical issues of internationalization process.
# Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators (inputs)</th>
<th>Indicators (outputs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Goal 1</td>
<td>Activity 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.1.o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.3.i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Goal 2</td>
<td>Activity 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2.2.i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Goal 3</td>
<td>Activity 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3.1.i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3.1.o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3.3.o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before designing of indicators it is necessary to check if the data needed to calculate indicators’ values are:

- available (ready to use),
- reliable,
- verifiable.

It has to be also checked who is the owner of needed data and how he/she will cooperate with the team.

Having in mind the required workload it is highly recommended to base on the data easily imported from the existing databases / IT systems.
Allocated Resources

- On average, 2-3 people seem to be enough to cope with data mining and processing. However, in most cases it is absolutely necessary to cooperate with other units of the College (IT, Administration, Faculties, Accounts, HR, etc.).

- It is highly recommended that the same team will be engaged with data collection and processing in all three assessment sessions planned in IN2IT project schedule.
Benefit versus Cost

- The „cost” of calculation of values of particular indicators should be realistic.

- The total „cost” of implementation of assessment system based on indicators (data collection + calculations + measurement + processing) should be realistic and not interfering with other basic processes in the College.
Thank you for attention!

Dr. Marek Polak
Email: mpolak@cwm.pw.edu.pl

Dr. Roman Podraza
Email: rpd@ii.pw.edu.pl