# NAAC

## Institutional Assessment and Accreditation

(Effective from July 2017)

## Accreditation - (Cycle: 2)

## JAYPEE INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, Noida, Uttar pradesh

**Track ID : UPUNGN11440**

**AISHE-ID : U-0522**

# Graphical Representation based on Quantitative & Qualitative Metrics

**NATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION COUNCIL**

An Autonomous Institution of the University Grants Commission

P.O. Box No. 1075, Nagarbhavi, Bengaluru - 560 072, INDIA

# Graphical Representation based on Quantitative & Qualitative Metrics

## Metrics($Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$) Weightage scored by the institution in percentage



Fig: The criterion wise distribution of weighted scores ($Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$) for the institution

# Comparison of $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ in Key Indicators based on performance(GPA)



Fig: The comparison of Key Indicators ($Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$) based on grade point average(GPA) extracted from the institution

# Comparison of LPKI and HPKI based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$



Fig: Comparison of LPKI(0–2.0) and HPKI(3.01–4.0) based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$

## Distribution of High Performance Key Indicators (3.01–4.0)

Internal Quality Assurance System:
5.6%

Faculty Empowerment Strategies:
5.6%

Strategy Development and Deployment:
5.6%

Institutional Vision and Leadership:
5.6%

Maintenance of Campus Infrastructure:
5.6%

Physical Facilities:
5.6%

Curriculum Design and Development:
5.6%

Feedback System:
5.6%

Evaluation Process and Reforms:
5.3%

Student Performance and Learning Outcomes:
5.6%

Innovation Ecosystem:
5.6%

Extension Activities:
4.9%

Fig: High Performance Key Indicators(3.01–4.0) for the institution

## Distribution of Average Performance Key Indicators (2.01–3.0)

Institutional Distinctiveness:
12.3%

Best Practices:
12.3%

Student Progression:
10.3%

Student Support:
8.9%

Library as a Learning Resource:
12.3%

Catering to Student Diversity:
12.3%

Teacher Profile and Quality:
11.5%

Research Publications and Awards:
9.8%

Collaboration:
10.3%

Fig: Average Performance Key Indicators(2.01–3.0) for the institution

# Distribution of Low Performance Key Indicators (0-2.0)



**Student Enrollment and Profile:**
7.1%

**Promotion of Research and Facilities:**
20.0%

**Resource Mobilization for Research:**
21.4%

**Financial Management and Resource Mobilization:**
17.1%

**Alumni Engagement:**
20.0%

**Consultancy:**
14.3%

Fig: Low Performance Key Indicators(0-2.0) for the institution

## Comparison of Criteria based on Criteria Grade Point Average



Fig: Comparison of Criteria based on Criteria Grade Point Average

## Performance of metrics in Curricular Aspects, Teaching-learning and Evaluation



Fig: Performance of metrics in Criteria I & II

Performance of metrics in Research, Innovations and Extension, Infrastructure and Learning Resources

Fig: Performance of metrics in Criteria III & IV



Performance of metrics in Student Support and Progression, Governance, Leadership and Management, Institutional Values and Best Practices

Fig: Performance of metrics in Criteria V, VI, VII

**Graphical representation of Strengths(4) and Weakness(0) of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria I,II and III)**



Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths(4) and Weakness(0) of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria I,II and III)

**Graphical representation of Strengths(4) and Weakness(0) of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)**



Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)

# Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria I,II and III)



Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths(4) and Weakness(0) of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria I,II and III)

# Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)



Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the institution based on $Q_nM$ & $Q_lM$ (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)