FINAL CERTIFICATION REPORT

Máster en Inteligencia Artificial

Resolution:	**REVIEW**
Score:	**57.66**
Report date:	**10/07/2026**

As established by the **CUALIFICAM** procedure, we remind you that:

You can make **ALEGACIONES SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE** if you **DO NOT AGREE** with one or more of the assessments reflected in the Certification Report. You have **10 business days** to do so after receiving it and the subsequent Certification Report will be definitive.

In the event that the Program has received an opinion **IN REVIEW**, the Center must present and communicate an **IMPROVEMENT PLAN** related to the aspects evaluated unfavorably. You will have **20 business days** once the 10 day period for allegations has ended.

The **FINAL CERTIFICATION REPORT** may result in:

- **FAVORABLE**

  The Certificate will have a **VALIDITY OF SIX YEARS** after passing a **MONITORING process AFTER THREE YEARS.** .

- **UNFAVORABLE**

  NO TRACKING IS DONE. The Program may submit a new certification request after resolving the identified weaknesses.

- **UNDER REVIEW (REVISION)**

  The Program must resolve the aspects evaluated unfavorably before undergoing an **EXTRAORDINARY MONITORING PROCESS ONE YEAR**, at most, after receiving the Certification Report or sooner if the improvement plans are correctly implemented. If the result of the **EXTRAORDINARY MONITORING PROCESS** is **FAVORABLE** E, it will lead to the issuance of the certificate with a validity of six years under the same conditions described in the case of a "Favourable" opinion, that is, with monitoring after three years. If the result is **UNFAVORABLE**, it will mean **NO** certification.

However, if you have any questions about your **CERTIFICATION REPORT**, contact the **CUALIFICAM** coordinator.

Strengths, weaknesses and proposals for improvement:

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Proposals for Improvement

Strengths

- Highly qualified faculty.
- Robust virtual learning environment (Canvas).
- High student satisfaction.
- Strong academic and administrative processes.
- Detailed and high-quality course syllabi.

Weaknesses

- Transparency and terminology issues that may create difficulties in the Spanish market.
- Inappropriate use of the protected term "engineer," potentially causing legal and regulatory confusion.
- Faculty profile does not fully meet Cualificam requirements regarding industry experience.
- Mandatory internships advertised for the program were not implemented.
- Students perceive the curriculum as overly theoretical and insufficiently market-oriented.
- Limited visibility of admission criteria and leveling mechanisms in official documentation.

Proposals for Improvement

- Strengthen integration and coordination among courses, including leveling and elective modules.
- Formalize academic tutoring and career guidance processes.
- Increase links with industry to better align the curriculum with labor market needs.
- Reduce the theoretical emphasis and incorporate more practical, employability-focused components.
- Improve transparency by documenting admission procedures and academic support mechanisms more clearly.

Dimension 1: Program Design

Subdimension 1.1: Entry and exit profile

Score: 5.333

FC. The 1.1.1.a) stipulates that entry requirements must be published on the Programme's website and consist of a bachelor's degree or equivalent, or accredited professional experience (a minimum of three years in a role requiring skills equivalent to a bachelor's degree or equivalent). The Programme publishes the entry requirements, which cover both pathways — a recognised bachelor's degree or, failing that, at least three years' professional experience — with a minimum age of 21, proof of English language proficiency (IELTS 6.0 or equivalent) and the relevant documentation (degree certificate and academic transcript, CV, personal statement and references). The profile complies with the requirements and is publicly available. There is a minor discrepancy in the wording regarding the work experience route (described as 'professional' in the information sheet and as 'executive/ managerial' on the website), which should be standardised.

SC. The 1.1.1.b calls for a coherent thread linking the entry profile, learning outcomes and graduate profile. The graduate profile is highly technical (machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing, computer vision and tools such as TensorFlow and PyTorch), whilst the entry profile accepts qualifications from any field and an entry route via experience that does not require prior technical knowledge. There is, therefore, a risk that certain non-technical entry profiles may not achieve the learning outcomes or meet the graduate profile without remedial training. The assessment is 'substantial compliance', given that it is difficult to fully guarantee a consistent thread for all admitted profiles.

NC. The 1.1.2 a) stipulates that the programme must define the graduate profile and publish it on its website, specifying the knowledge, competencies and skills to be acquired upon completion of the course. The programme defines and publishes the graduate profile, including the graduate's main role, career prospects and a set of competencies, knowledge and skills. However, the title of the profile uses the term 'Engineer' ('AI/ML Engineer', 'Robotics Engineer'), which in Spain is reserved for the official university system and is inappropriate for a professional master's degree; this constitutes an inaccuracy in the definition of the profile and risks causing confusion. Recommendation: replace 'Engineer' with a professional profile designation that is not reserved (e.g. 'Artificial Intelligence Specialist/Professional', 'Robotics Professional', 'Data Scientist', 'AI Consultant').

SC. The 1.1.2.b requires that the graduate's professional profile/qualification be appropriate and consistent with the learning outcomes. The intended career paths (specialist in artificial intelligence and machine learning, data science, AI and robotics consultancy) are consistent with the programme's technical learning outcomes. The assessment does not achieve the full level due to the inappropriateness of the title 'Engineer', as previously noted.

Subdimension 1.2: Program design coherence

Score: 2.666

SC. The 1.2.1 stipulates that the programme's design must be consistent with the entry profiles and the professional profile/qualification upon graduation, in terms of structure, learning outcomes and the workload of the modules. The structure —90 ECTS organised into a common core block, four specialisation pathways, work placements (12 ECTS) and the Master's Thesis (18 ECTS)— is consistent, in terms of modules and credits, with the technical graduate profile; the allocation of 18 ECTS to the Master's Thesis is reasonable for a 90 ECTS programme. The breakdown of student time commitment (scheduled activities versus independent study) is set out in the campus course guides, which allows for verification of its alignment with the credits. However, the mode of study is not clearly defined: the programme description states 'Face-to-face', whilst the guides and the campus itself describe online teaching (online classes, seminars and tutorials, using Zoom), a discrepancy that needs to be resolved.

Subdimension 1.3: Alliances and cooperation

Score: 4.500

FC. The 1.3.1 assesses whether the Department manages the signing of framework agreements and annexes to ensure that students—particularly those entering the programme via a degree qualification—are able to undertake compulsory work placements that are appropriate to the programme's learning objectives, in terms of both duration and the level of skills required. The Programme has accredited work placement agreements with companies and institutions and, as a member of the GUS Germany (GGG) network, has access to a wide range of companies offering work placements, sufficient to accommodate all students. The agreements exist and are sufficient. (This criterion assesses the agreements themselves—their existence, correctness and sufficiency—regardless of their implementation, which is evaluated in 3.5.1.)

FC. The 1.3.2 assesses whether the Programme establishes relationships or partnerships with other institutions (business schools, postgraduate centres, companies, social institutions, NGOs, etc.) to create value for its stakeholders. The Programme has established partnerships of various kinds: academic (partner universities and higher education institutions), membership of networks (the GUS Germany network and the Business Graduates Association), and partnerships with institutions that provide advantageous conditions for student services (accommodation, legal advice and others) or that establish academic exchanges of interest to students. This range of partnerships generates value for stakeholders.

Subdimension 1.4: Ethics, Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Score: 2.166

SC. The 1.4.1 stipulates a defined and implemented process for handling suggestions, complaints and claims, with the portal accessible via the official CUALIFICAM website. The official programme page on CUALIFICAM includes a dedicated Complaints, Suggestions and Claims Form; the centre also has internal procedures for system review and appeals, and the indicators show that there were no claims during the period. The requirement is substantially met. However, the centre's master's degree webpage displays the CUALIFICAM logo but does not link to the official page, meaning that a student starting from the centre's website cannot easily access the box. It should also be noted that the institution must provide students with clear and accurate information about the nature of the institution and the qualification (a business school and a professional master's degree, not a university or an official qualification), ensuring that the terminology and imagery used do not cause confusion. Recommendation: link the CUALIFICAM seal on the master's programme website to its official profile, so that the contact form is directly accessible from the programme's website.

SC. The 1.4.2 stipulates that there must be a Transparency Portal containing comprehensive and up-to-date information (on employability, social responsibility, supply and demand, student numbers and indicators, all duly referenced), accessible via the programme's website. The official programme profile on CUALIFICAM features a Transparency Portal with comprehensive and up-to-date information: student data (numbers and diversity), corporate social responsibility (scholarships, community initiatives, health and wellbeing), commitment to sustainability and the SDGs, and the course offering. The portal exists and is substantial. The assessment does not reach the 'complete' level for three reasons: it should be confirmed that it explicitly incorporates and references data on employability, supply and demand, and programme indicators; as in 1.4.1, the CUALIFICAM logo on the master's programme website does not link to the profile, meaning the portal is not directly accessible from the institution's website; and the Portal should clearly state the legal status of the institution (business school) and the qualification (professional master's degree, non-accredited), so that institutional transparency counteracts the university-like appearance (use of 'Faculty', 'Rector', doctorates) which leads to confusion for students. Recommendation: to complete the Portal with properly referenced employability data and indicators and to link to it, in an accessible manner, from the institution's website.

PC. The 1.4.3.a) requires the Management to identify and analyse the opportunities and threats arising from changes in the EHEA and to reflect these in its strategy (reference: the five priorities of Council Resolution 2021/C 66/01). The website and the Transparency Portal state a commitment to the EHEA (quality, equity, inclusion, lifelong learning, mobility —participation in Erasmus+— and sustainable development), but in a generic manner, without an explicit analysis of opportunities and threats reflected in the strategy.

SC. The 1.4.3.b) requires actions demonstrating a commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals (at a minimum SDG 3 – good health and well-being, SDG 4 – quality education, and SDG 7 – affordable and clean energy). The Transparency Portal highlights specific initiatives: health and wellbeing programmes and support groups (Mental Health Awareness Week, 'Tea and Chat' and 'What's Your Story?' groups) —SDG 3—; scholarships

and initiatives for educational equity and inclusion (Women in Tech, BSBI for the Community, Back-to-School Africa) —SDG 4—; and sustainability measures (renovation of facilities to optimise water consumption, sustainable mobility, energy management seminars) and the SUDEMAR project —linked to SDG 7 and others—. The assessment does not achieve the full level because, although the actions are specific, they are not systematically presented as linked to and referenced against each SDG.

Dimension 2: Academic and Administrative Resources and Processes

Subdimension 2.1: Website and Virtual Campus

Score: 5.666

NC. The 2.1.1.a) stipulates that the official CUALIFICAM website must be clearly accessible from the programme's own website. The Master's programme website features the CUALIFICAM logo, but it does not link to the official programme page or the CUALIFICAM website; on the programme's alternative website, the logo does not even appear. Consequently, students cannot access the official programme page, the Transparency Portal or the complaints and suggestions inbox from the programme's website. In the website of the master https://www.berlinsbi.com/programmes/postgraduate/master-in-artificial-intelligence it is not clear enough if this master of AI has CUALIFICAM certification.

PC. The 2.1.1.b) stipulates that the information on the institution's own website must be consistent with that on the official CUALIFICAM website. Significant inconsistencies have been observed: there are two websites for the same master's degree, and the one submitted for accreditation displays a curriculum that does not correspond to this programme (modules in business administration and a reference to another master's degree), whereas the official programme description contains the correct curriculum. Added to this are discrepancies regarding the partner university (UCA versus the University of Chichester), the location (Berlin versus Madrid/Barcelona) and the nature of the qualification (official MSc versus professional master's degree/diploma).

SC. Feature 2.1.2 requires the virtual campus to offer reliability, security and availability, including an information security plan, guaranteed access to resources, support and robust software. The LMS is Canvas (by Instructure), a widely tested and recognised platform, backed by a provider that guarantees its capacity (cloud architecture on AWS, 99.9% availability target, ISO/IEC 27001, SOC 2 and PCI DSS certifications, GDPR compliance and WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility); therefore, reliability, security and availability are sufficiently guaranteed by the platform itself, without it being necessary to require a specific technical specifications document for the instance. Upon reviewing the campus, it is confirmed that it is functional, with virtualised modules and materials available to students, and that video conferencing is conducted via Zoom. The assessment does not reach the 'full compliance' level because there are no coordination spaces on the campus providing additional services to students — each subject is structured as an independent virtualised course —; their inclusion would raise the assessment to 'full compliance'.

Subdimension 2.2: Academic and administrative processes

Score: 7.999

PC. Criterion 2.2.1 requires a comprehensive admissions process (request for information; entry routes and requirements; submission of documentation and deadlines; student activities and deadlines; notification of results; place reservation; and steps for enrolment). The institution has a documented and implemented admissions policy and procedure — entry routes (Bachelor's degree or equivalent and professional experience route), required documentation, types of places offered and deadlines (the indicator reflects confirmation of admission within approximately two days). However, the process is formulated in terms of the partner university and makes admission conditional upon confirmation from that university (the 'provisional or conditional offer' is subject to approval by the partner university), which is characteristic of an official university degree rather than a professional master's degree. In these terms, it is not possible to assess the process as the admission to a professional master's degree: the school must clarify, once again, whether the qualification being awarded is a professional master's degree or an official master's degree.

SC. The 2.2.2 calls for a comprehensive, clearly defined and fully implemented enrolment process. The institution has a documented and implemented procedure that covers eligibility criteria (letter of acceptance, signed study

agreement, deposit and instalment plan or full payment), the enrolment appointment (managed via Microsoft Bookings, with eligibility verification), online and in-person enrolment with document and identity verification, the emergency contact form and the welcome communication (an email titled 'Welcome to BSBI!' containing academic regulations, guides on using tools, video tutorials and contact details for support services, as well as a campus-specific Welcome Guide and an Accommodation Guide). The indicator shows that enrolment confirmation takes around five days. The financial and withdrawal conditions are set out in the study agreement signed by the student and in the Withdrawal Policy (reasons, refunds and appeals). However, the Refund Policy to which it refers has not been provided, and no document setting out the enrolment conditions that the student must expressly accept upon enrolment has been found (the welcome email does not include them), so it cannot be fully verified that the student is aware of and accepts these conditions.

SC. The 2.2.3.a stipulates that the credit recognition process must be published on the website prior to enrolment. The institution has an officially documented procedure for the recognition of prior learning, which includes the determination of equivalencies and the registration of applicants, and, as recorded in the system review report, is published on the programme's website and disseminated through various channels. The assessment does not achieve the full level due to the need to confirm its accessibility prior to enrolment.

SC. The 2.2.3.b stipulates that recognition must comply with the categories set out in section '1.2 Scope' of the CUALIFICAM Guide: professional placements based on work experience (full recognition), credits from other CUALIFICAM Professional Master's degrees, and credits from university Master's degrees or from AMBA/EQUIS/AACSB-accredited institutions (up to a maximum of 30% of ECTS credits and never the Master's Thesis), with the application for recognition of professional experience registered in EVALUE. The centre's policy expressly covers this category: it recognises credits obtained in other CUALIFICAM-certified Professional Master's programmes (either its own or those of AEEN-associated centres), in BSBI Master's programmes and at accredited business schools (AMBA, EQUIS, AACSB), with a maximum limit of 30% of the programme's ECTS and the express exclusion of the Master's Final Project, whilst also distinguishing between the recognition of prior academic learning and experiential learning (work experience, assessed through evidence and an interview). The assessment does not reach the full level pending confirmation of the full recognition of compulsory professional placements based on experience and the registration of applications based on experience in EVALUE.

SC. The 2.2.4 calls for a process that integrates academic and financial management, including provisions for temporary suspension and permanent withdrawal. The institution has a documented and implemented procedure that defines the student record statuses (enrolled, deferral of studies, interruption, etc.), managed within the internal student management system and on the virtual campus, including the processing of these statuses (application, review by the Programme Coordinator, decision and notification). Withdrawal is governed by a comprehensive Student Withdrawal Policy (v2.0), which covers: governance (Withdrawal Committee), the grounds for voluntary and involuntary withdrawal (attendance, academic progress, discipline, non-payment of fees, lack of required documentation, visa non-compliance and fraudulent documentation), the process flow, appeals, financial implications and refunds (withdrawal does not automatically entitle the student to a refund; requests are processed via the Refund Portal in accordance with the Refund Policy; the deposit is non-refundable except in exceptional circumstances) and voluntary withdrawal (withdrawal/refund form for the Finance Department, subject to approval by the Refunds Committee). A template for the Informal Notice of Withdrawal (bilingual) is also provided, which demonstrates the implementation of the process and applies to Spain. The indicators reflect the rates of temporary suspensions and withdrawals. The process thus brings together academic and financial management. The assessment does not achieve the full level because the Refund Policy to which it refers has not been provided.

PC. The 2.2.5 stipulates a process for managing academic transcripts that includes a signature in due form and time, thereby guaranteeing their integrity. The institution has a documented assessment and grading procedure, with assessment criteria and a system of internal and external moderation, and the indicator shows that transcripts are issued and signed within approximately five days. However, the documents provided as examples are not academic transcripts from the Programme, but rather progress reports relating to other master's programmes; consequently, it is not possible to verify the actual format of the academic transcript or whether it incorporates a signature system that guarantees its integrity (electronic signature or time stamp).

PC. The 2.2.6 stipulates a process for managing academic certificates that are duly signed, with preference given to electronic issuance (with an electronic signature) and a system for verifying authenticity that is accessible to third parties. The documented procedure provides for the issuance of documents in digital format with digital

signatures and seals, physical copies bearing an original signature and a verification QR code, within five days. However, the template provided (Record of Academic Achievement) does not incorporate any tracking or verification elements: it lacks document numbering or an identifier and an electronic verification system (QR code or online validation), and includes only the 'signature of the signatory and the school's seal' (handwritten signature). Therefore, it cannot be verified that the certificates actually incorporate the electronic signature and the authenticity verification system provided for in the procedure.

PC. The 2.2.7 stipulates a degree awarding process that involves the timely and proper submission of the list of degrees to be awarded. The institution has a documented and implemented procedure: an Examinations Board reviews and approves the student's graduation profile (grades and final average), the list of graduates is exported and confirmed, and the degree certificate, academic transcript and degree supplement are then generated (approximately six weeks after the Board meeting); the indicator shows that the degree is issued within the reference timeframe. However, the degree template provided lacks numbering, an electronic signature and secure authenticity verification codes, meaning that the authenticity or verification of the issued degree cannot be guaranteed. It must also be clarified which degree is awarded (BSBI professional diploma or degree from the partner university), in line with the nature of the programme being accredited.

SC. The 2.2.8 stipulates an annual review process to assess the effectiveness of the management system, the suitability of the training programme and its outcomes, including improvement actions (objectives, commitments, responsible parties and deadlines). The centre has a documented procedure for reviewing the system (an annual review by management, involving Operations, the Academic Management and the GUS Legal Department) and provides evidence of this through the signed minutes of the review for the 2025/2026 academic year, one for each of the four dimensions, which include the agenda, the conclusions of the analysis, the agreements (improvement actions) with the person responsible for monitoring, the person responsible for implementation and the deadline, the attendees and the signatory's signature. The indicators show that 72% of proposed improvement actions have been implemented and 41 new actions have been proposed, as well as the absence of complaints, which demonstrates a cycle of continuous improvement in operation. The rating does not reach the full level because the implementation of the improvement actions is not complete (72%) and some of them are still within the deadline.

Dimension 3: Teaching Staff and Training Program

Subdimension 3.1: Teaching Staff

Score: 4.166

NC. Characteristic 3.1.1.a requires that at least 60% of the teaching staff hold a senior profile, defined as having ten or more years of professional experience relevant to the subjects taught (junior: fewer than ten years). Based on the curricula vitae submitted and reviewed, the faculty body presents a predominantly academic and research-oriented profile, characterised by doctoral qualifications, postdoctoral experience, and university teaching careers, supported by strong academic credentials. The years of experience evidenced relate predominantly to teaching and research activities rather than to professional experience in the labour market, which is the criterion used to determine senior status in a professional master's programme. Only a limited number of lecturers demonstrate substantial market-oriented experience through activities such as innovation, knowledge transfer, consultancy, or industrial collaboration. Consequently, the programme does not meet the threshold requiring 60% of the faculty to hold senior status when measured in terms of relevant professional market experience. The assessment requires a clear distinction between three concepts that should not be conflated: academic qualifications and training, teaching experience, and professional market experience. It is the latter that determines senior status in a professional master's programme. Academic or research experience cannot be considered equivalent to professional market experience. Research activities, including applied research, may only be counted as professional experience where there is evidence that they have been carried out within, or for, the market environment—for example through employment in companies, commercial or technology-transfer contracts with external clients, spin-off ventures, consultancy activities, or the commercial exploitation of patents. To treat academic research as equivalent to professional market experience without such evidence would not be consistent with the standard, as it would undermine the distinction between a professional master's programme and a traditional university-based academic programme. Furthermore, the curricula vitae of two module coordinators

have not been provided—one responsible for an elective module within the Blockchain and Fintech specialisation and the other for the Master's Final Project. As a result, their professional experience cannot be assessed.

PC. The 3.1.1.b stipulates that the Program Director must demonstrate professional and teaching experience appropriate to the qualification awarded by the programme. The curriculum vitae of the Director, Dr. Farshad Badie, is not among the documents provided; Therefore, the professional industry experience relevant to the professionally oriented nature of the program.

SC. Criterion 3.1.2.a assesses the percentage of course leaders with verifiable teaching experience (NC < 50% · CP 50–60% · CS 60–80% · CC > 80%). The CVs submitted demonstrate extensive teaching and academic experience among the majority of the teaching staff, consistent with their academic careers. The assessment does not reach the full level because the CVs of two course leaders have yet to be provided, which prevents the calculation from being completed.

SC. Criterion 3.1.2.b requires favourable and recent teaching evaluations (from the last five years, with a score of over 7 out of 10). The module-specific evaluation surveys yield very favourable results—ranging from 8 to 9.6 out of 10, with satisfaction rates exceeding 90%—easily exceeding the required threshold. However, the evidence relates to a single intake, rather than the entire five-year period, and the teaching staff assessed only partially overlaps with those on the teaching roster, meaning that the favourable ratings do not cover a significant proportion of the teaching staff responsible for the intake being accredited.

Subdimension 3.2: Academic tutors, coaches, counselors and other support staff

Score: 2.000

SC Feature 3.2.1 requires that there be a sufficient number of academic tutors with adequate training for academic supervision, particularly for the Master's Thesis and External Internships, using as a reference the ratio of one tutor for every eighty participants in online learning (Royal Decree 694/2017, art. 4). The Program designates one academic tutor with a profile appropriate to the subjects, and the ratio is comfortably met for the number of students in the intake. The assessment does not reach the full level for two reasons. The tutoring function falls to a single person, who also teaches several subjects, which raises doubts about their capacity for effective cross-curricular supervision of the entire Program. Furthermore, the supervision of the Master's Thesis is not specifically accredited, and the person responsible does not provide a profile that would allow for an assessment of their suitability for this role. Recommendation: strengthen the academic supervision team to avoid concentrating it on a single person and accredit the suitability of the tutor for supervising the Master's Thesis and External Internships.

PC. The 3.2.2 requires that coaches, counsellors, and other support staff possess the necessary qualifications and training to provide student support and facilitate the learning process, and that their profiles may differ from those required for teaching positions. The Programme appoints an Educational Coach; however, the profile provided does not demonstrate specific training or qualifications for carrying out this role. Furthermore, no documentation has been provided regarding the mechanism through which students may access the coaching service.

Subdimension 3.3: Academic assignment

Score: 2.000

SC Criterion 3.3.1 requires the Management team to plan and oversee the academic workload, aligning the needs of the training programme and the student body with the profiles, availability, and contractual links of the academic staff. The teaching assignment for the intake has been formally documented and allocates faculty members to all courses, covering the four specialisations, which demonstrates comprehensive and documented planning. The assessment does not reach the highest rating due to a consistency concern: the faculty listed in the teaching assignment does not fully match the staff identified as responsible for the teaching actually delivered. In addition, it has been verified that the Blockchain and Fintech pathway was not ultimately delivered (its modules are marked as "inactive" on the virtual campus).

Subdimension 3.4: Training plan

Score: 4.666

SC. The criterion, 3.4.1, requires alignment with Master's level (EQF Level 7), including an appropriate graduate profile and course-specific learning outcomes. The graduate profile is clearly defined in terms of its main professional function and career pathways, and the course guides specify learning outcomes in terms of competencies, knowledge, and skills that are consistent with the expected level.However, the criterion does not achieve the highest rating because the graduate profile is designated as "Engineer", a title that is reserved for the official university system and is not appropriate for a professional master's qualification of this nature. Recommendation: replace the term "Engineer" with a non-reserved professional profile designation that accurately reflects the intended graduate outcomes.

SC. The 3.4.2.a stipulates that up-to-date course guides (for modules, Master's theses and work placements) must be published on the CUALIFICAM website and the virtual campus, and that these must be consistent with the Programme's website. Following a review of the virtual campus, the twenty-one teaching guides are available to students and are up to date (approved version with date). The assessment does not reach the full level because consistency with the Programme's website remains an issue: the official website presents a curriculum that does not correspond to this master's degree, and two websites for the same programme coexist.

SC. The 3.4.2.b stipulates that course guides must be consistent with the learning outcomes, and that these must be consistent with the assessment and learning activities; they must also include the syllabus, assessment activities, learning activities and the teaching staff profile. The course guides available on the campus are detailed and include: content (what/why/how), learning outcomes linked to grading descriptors, teaching and learning methods with a breakdown of hours (scheduled activity versus independent study), assessment components and weighting with their types, and reading lists (essential and recommended). The assessment does not reach the full level for two reasons: the guides do not include the teaching staff profile; and there are two versions of the teaching guide in use — that of the CUALIFICAM programme (in ECTS) and that of the campus, in the partner university's format and credit system — the equivalence and consistency of which must be ensured.

NC. Criterion 3.4.3.a requires that faculty availability schedules be kept up to date, communicated to students, and accompanied by procedures to be followed in the event of non-compliance. Links to the virtual campus courses have been provided; However, appropriate access credentials—requested and still pending—have not been supplied. Consequently, it is not possible to verify office hours or the appointment-booking system with faculty members. Furthermore, no supporting documentation has been provided to substantiate these arrangements. Therefore, this criterion cannot be assessed positively at this time.

NC. The 3.4.3.b stipulates that there must be a clearly defined and communicated channel for accessing educational coaching. Upon reviewing the virtual campus, no such channel for accessing coaching or any means of requesting the service can be found (nor are there any student guides describing it). This cannot be assessed positively. Recommendation: define, implement and communicate a channel on the campus through which students can access educational coaching.

FC. The 3.4.4 stipulates that teaching materials must be available and accessible on the virtual campus. Upon reviewing the virtual campus, it is confirmed that the materials are appropriate and available to students: presentations, books, articles and lecture notes, online resources, bibliographic resources, multimedia elements and documentation regarding the assignments to be submitted. Each subject has its materials available on its virtual course. This is considered full compliance. (The observation noted in 3.3.1 remains, namely that the Blockchain and Fintech pathway is listed as 'not in active use', meaning that its materials relate to a specialisation that was not taught.)

PC. The 3.4.5 calls for a timetable of subjects, activities and assessments that is planned, reviewed, updated and communicated, whilst avoiding duplication. It is noted that the material for each subject is uploaded to the campus before the start of the term, which demonstrates prior planning, and the programme structure diagram organises the subjects by term and week. However, upon reviewing the campus, each subject is organised as an independent online course, and there is no evidence of a timetable with timetables and assessments, nor a common coordination structure between subjects a course space that avoids duplication and gives the programme its identity. The academic calendar provided as evidence (October 2024 edition) is also insufficient, as it merely indicates the weeks of classes.

Subdimension 3.5: Practical dimension and professional orientation

Score: 3.500

NC. The 3.5.1.a stipulates a management process for compulsory work placements (application and allocation, list of agreements, places per company, allocation criteria, application to the placement pool, and reports from the internal and external supervisors). The programme indicators state that no one undertook placements and that these 'were not part of the academic programme', despite appearing in the curriculum as a compulsory module worth 12 ECTS credits with an assigned tutor. The institution itself confirms that in previous intakes, placements were not incorporated into the curriculum and that the compulsory placement process has been defined from 2025 onwards for certification programmes, with no record of its implementation. The school has an internship and employment management platform (JobTeaser), access to which has been verified; it is correctly structured and has a wide pool of partner companies, constituting an adequate management infrastructure. However, this infrastructure does not address the fundamental shortcoming: the Programme's compulsory work placements were neither integrated nor implemented in the cohorts taught (the compulsory process is prospective, defined from 2025 onwards), meaning there is no implementation to assess (no placements awarded, criteria applied or tutor reports in actual cases). As this is an essential element, its non-compliance precludes a favourable assessment.

NC. The 3.5.1 b, There is a teaching guide for practical sessions, but without any practical sessions having taken place, there is no activity or report rubric to refer to.

NC. The 3.5.1.c stipulates that students must be informed of the agreements, administrative procedures, placement opportunities and allocation criteria. There is no record of such communication; the institution itself states that, in the courses delivered, work placements were not compulsory and were managed via email. Furthermore, there is a contradiction with the programme's website, which advertises integrated and paid work placements, whereas in reality no such placements were offered.

FC. The 3.5.2 stipulates a process for managing the job board (posting vacancies, listing vacancies and eligibility criteria). Having verified access to the JobTeaser platform, the institution has a well-structured institutional-level work placement and job vacancy system—which serves all the institution's degree programmes—and which currently lists over 2,600 work placement and job vacancies, with vacancies published in a highly effective manner that includes all the necessary information for students. It also features highly effective management of partner companies and a two-way communication system between companies, the institution, candidates and tutors, complemented by career guidance events and soft skills workshops. This constitutes a strength of the institution and is considered to be fully compliant.

FC. The 3.5.3 calls for a professional network management process that includes students, alumni, staff, partner organisations and employers. A documented Professional Network procedure, managed by the Careers Service, is provided; this coordinates the network through online platforms—the alumni page, the LinkedIn alumni group (with around 600 members), the JobTeaser platform and membership of the Business Graduates Association—and in-person events, and identifies all the relevant groups (students, graduates, lecturers, partner companies and institutions, and employers). Its implementation is evidenced by a calendar of 45 events in 2025 (workshops, company visits, presentations and job fairs), a growing alumni group and an action plan for improvement with annual monitoring. The process is institutional and general in scope, which is appropriate for this feature, without requiring specificity by master's programme. It is considered to be fully compliant.

FC. The 3.5.4.a calls for a defined and implemented career guidance process. The Careers Service has a documented process (career guidance, interview training, workshops, CV review and links with employers) that has been implemented, as evidenced by a programme of 45 events in 2025, an action plan for improvement, and the JobTeaser platform, access to which has been verified: it is correctly structured and includes career guidance events, soft skills workshops and a two-way communication system between companies, the school, candidates and tutors. This is considered full compliance.

FC. The 3.5.4.b stipulates annual career guidance and employability-enhancing activities. A comprehensive annual programme is in place—45 events in 2025 (CV workshops, interview practice, LinkedIn, job search strategies and salary negotiation) and four careers fairs—along with an improvement action plan with objectives, responsible parties and deadlines, based on the annual survey (90.1% satisfaction with the Careers Service). The institutional and general nature of the activities is appropriate for this criterion, with no need for specific measures per master's programme. Full compliance is considered to have been achieved.

Dimension 4: Results

Subdimension 4.1: Academic results

Score: 5.333

SC. The 4.1.1.a stipulates a process for analysing results, including a review by the management at least once a year, covering all modules, compulsory placements, the Master's thesis and overall results. The institution has a systematic and documented process (Academic Results Procedure): periodic review at academic meetings, an annual review meeting by the Academic Management and senior teaching staff (combined with student surveys and feedback from partner universities), programme meetings, the Academic Council and Senate, and Examination Boards, incorporating internal moderation and external examination. This review is documented in signed minutes for each area of the 2025/2026 academic year, in which academic results, satisfaction and employability are analysed, and improvement actions are agreed upon with those responsible and deadlines set. The programme's grade distribution is also provided. The assessment does not achieve the full level because the compulsory work placements have not been delivered (there are no work placement results to analyse) and because the integrity of the grade transcripts could not be verified (see 2.2.5)

SC. The 4.1.1.b stipulates that the planned teaching activities and assessment systems must be properly implemented and enable the learning outcomes to be achieved. The indicators show 100% submission and pass rates; there are actual Master's theses accompanied by their assessment sheets and reports; and a system of internal and external moderation of assessments is in place. The master's theses reviewed demonstrate a genuine and consistent methodological structure (introduction, literature review, methodology chapter covering research design, ethics and reliability/validity, findings/discussion, bibliography and appendices), which is positive. However, their methodology is predominantly qualitative and empirical (surveys and interviews) on topics of AI adoption or management, with little technical-experimental development (models, datasets, experiments or metrics), meaning that their focus is not entirely consistent with the programme's technical graduate profile. Furthermore, the distribution of marks is concentrated in the middle bands (5–6: 24%; 6–7: 50%; 7–8: 26%), with no marks in the 8–10 bands, and the teaching guides do not detail the criteria or weighting of the assessment, meaning that the consistency of the assessment system with the learning outcomes cannot be fully verified; a 100% pass rate.

Subdimension 4.2: Student satisfaction

Score: 4.000

SC. Indicator 4.2.1 assesses student satisfaction with teaching staff, tutors, coaches and support staff. Satisfaction with teaching staff is high and is confirmed by three consistent sources: (i) the annual survey (18 questions on academic matters and teaching quality), with ratings ranging from 81% to 96%; (ii) module-specific surveys, which specifically assess teaching performance — assistance with difficulties, sensitivity towards students, freedom to ask questions, fair treatment, clarity of oral communication and organisation of the subject—with results, in their quantifiable part, ranging from 7.8 to 9.6 out of 10 and satisfaction levels of 92–100%; and (iii) the teaching satisfaction indicator, which is favourable. The assessment does not achieve the full rating because the evidence is drawn mainly from the institution's general cohort and a single academic year, and the teaching staff evaluated in the module-specific surveys only partially matches that of the teaching assignment, meaning their correspondence with the accredited academic year.

SC. The 4.2.2 assesses student satisfaction with the programme, the website, the virtual campus, academic and administrative processes, work placements, the careers service, student guidance, the professional network, and overall satisfaction. Satisfaction with the programme is high: over 82% in the programme satisfaction survey, and the indicators (NPS, on a baseline of 25) are high for the website (92), virtual campus (100), academic and administrative processes (83), job bank (83), career guidance (91) and professional network (91), with overall satisfaction (67) above the benchmark; module-specific surveys add favourable ratings regarding the clarity of objectives, the module structure, the usefulness of materials hosted on the campus and the appropriateness of the workload. The indicator for satisfaction with work placements is not applicable (none were offered). The rating does not reach the full level for the same reason regarding the population/cohort mentioned.

Subdimension 4.3: Links with Alumni

Score: 1.667

PC. The 4.3.1 calls for a systematic process involving standardised surveys and an annual review by management. The institution has such a process in place at institutional level: in 2025, it conducted three employability surveys among a cohort of 997 graduates (who graduated between January 2024 and February 2025; 191 responses, 19% response rate), a Graduate Destinations Survey and an action plan for improving the Careers Service, with an annual review by the Management. However, this survey does not include the Master's in Artificial Intelligence, whose students have not yet graduated (a recently introduced programme), but rather other degree programmes at the institution (MBA, Data Analytics, Engineering Management, Tourism, Health, etc.). Consequently, there are as yet no results regarding the labour market integration or employability of graduates from this programme that can be assessed; the available institutional data (around 55–59% in employment or continuing their studies, high levels of temporary employment and underemployment, and sectors such as hospitality, food and logistics) relate to other programmes. The existence and systematic nature of the process are viewed positively, but there is no evidence of its application to this programme.

Subdimension 4.4: Reputation

Score: 2.000

PC. Criterion 4.4.1 assesses the satisfaction of companies and institutions with work placement students. The institution provides a documented 'Reputation' procedure (version 2, finalised on 29/04/2026; drawn up by the Head of Careers and approved by the Management; owners: Operations, Student Life and Careers Departments) which describes in a structured manner the process for assessing companies' satisfaction with students on work placements. For compulsory placements, the procedure defines an interim review — halfway through the module, via video call or telephone call between the school, the host organisation and the intern—and a final evaluation—one week before the end of the module, completed online—both completed by the host company and the intern, plus a separate evaluation by the supervisor to determine whether the learning objectives have been met and whether credits should be awarded. The relevant questionnaires (employer and intern, for the mid-term review and final assessment) are provided as evidence. Alongside the procedure, real feedback is provided by companies (Kantox, DHL Supply Chain, Uriach, Occident, SAP, amongst others) that assess the student on placement: skills are mostly rated as 'Good' and the achievement of objectives as 'Above Expectations' or 'Professional Standard', with an overall 'Good/Excellent' rating and a willingness to provide a reference or offer employment in most cases (with the odd unfavourable assessment). It is necessary, however, to qualify the scope: the procedure is of a general nature (not assigned to a specific programme) and has no defined monitoring or measurement indicators; the responses provided relate to extracurricular and institutional placements —not to the Programme's compulsory placements, which have not been delivered— with a small sample (seven responses) and no evidence that they relate to students on the Master's in Artificial Intelligence. The procedure and questionnaires confirm that the system is defined and available; results relating to the Programme's compulsory placements and the indicators enabling their measurement and monitoring are missing.

PC. Feature 4.4.2 assesses the satisfaction of employers and institutions with employed graduates. The same 'Reputation' procedure defines and provides a standardised system for measuring this aspect: surveys of the companies where graduates work and follow-up surveys of the graduates themselves, both conducted within a maximum period of 6 to 12 months after graduation, with a regulated implementation process (reminders sent three weeks, one week and one day before the deadline; a call list compiled from a file containing employment status; grouped data analysis by programme indicators) and an annual review. As evidence of the institutional dimension of the process, the Graduate Survey Report 2025 is provided, based on 191 responses from a cohort of 997 graduates who completed their studies between January 2024 and February 2025. However, there are no results for this programme, which has not yet produced any graduates (recently established) and is not included in that institutional survey; furthermore, the procedure has not defined any indicators. It is viewed positively that the system is defined, documented and available, but there is no record of its application or results in this programme.

00664430Y FEDERICO MORAN (R: G83351346)

Firmado digitalmente por 00664430Y FEDERICO MORAN (R: G83351346)
Fecha: 2026.07.10 13:27:43 +02'00'

Federico Morán Abad

Director of the Madrimasd Knowledge Foundation