

**NAAC**

**Institutional Assessment and Accreditation**

(Effective from July 2017)

**Accreditation - (Cycle: 2)**

**XAVIER INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING, Mumbai,  
Maharashtra**

Track ID : MHCOGN102437

AISHE-ID : C-33830

**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<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>i</sub>M) Weightage scored by the institution in percentage




Fig: The criterion wise distribution of weighted scores (Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>i</sub>M) for the institution




Fig: The comparison of Key Indicators (Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>i</sub>M) based on grade point average(GPA) extracted from the institution




Fig: Comparison of LPKI(0-2.0) and HPKI(3.01-4.0) based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>M</sub>

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




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

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




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

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




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






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<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>M</sub> (Criteria I,II and III)**




**Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths(4) and Weakness(0) of the institution based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>M</sub> (Criteria I,II and III)**

**Graphical representation of Strengths(4) and Weakness(0) of the institution based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>i</sub>M (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)**




**Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the institution based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>i</sub>M (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)**

**Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the institution based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>l</sub>M (Criteria I,II and III)**



**Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths(4) and Weakness(0) of the institution based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>l</sub>M (Criteria I,II and III)**

**Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the institution based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>i</sub>M (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)**



**Fig: Graphical representation of Strengths and Weakness of the Institution based on Q<sub>n</sub>M & Q<sub>i</sub>M (Criteria IV,V,VI and VII)**