FINAL CERTIFICATION REPORT

Máster en Gestión de Ingeniería

Resolution:	**REVIEW**
Score:	**61.66**
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: 6.000

FC The 1.1.1.a stipulates that entry requirements must be published and consist of a bachelor's degree or equivalent, or recognised professional experience (a minimum of three years in a role requiring at least bachelor's-level competencies or equivalent). The Programme publishes the entry requirements, which cover both pathways—a recognised bachelor's degree or, failing that, a minimum of three years' relevant professional experience (or a combination of both)—, with proof of English language proficiency (IELTS 6.0, with at least 5.5 in each component, or equivalent) and the relevant documentation (degree certificate and academic transcript, CV, personal statement and letters of recommendation). Candidates entering via the experience route are subject to an individual academic assessment and approval. The profile meets the requirements and is publicly available.

SC. Feature 1.1.1.b requires a coherent link between the entry profile, the learning outcomes and the graduate profile. The graduate profile combines technical and engineering management skills (management and leadership of engineering projects, operations, process optimisation), whilst the entry profile accepts qualifications from any field and allows entry via experience that does not require a prior technical or engineering background. There is, therefore, a risk that certain non-technical entry profiles may not achieve the learning outcomes specific to engineering management without remedial training. During the visit, it was noted that the programmes does have supplementary bridging course content, but that this is not offered systematically nor communicated to students, the students themselves were unaware of its existence, and therefore does not provide a consistent framework for all admitted profiles. Recommendation: systematise and communicate to students the supplementary training (bridging) for non-technical entry profiles, ensuring the necessary foundation to achieve the graduate profile.

SC. The 1.1.2.a stipulates that the programme must define and publish the graduate profile and qualifications, specifying the knowledge, competencies and skills to be acquired. The programme defines and publishes the graduate profile, including its main role (planning, managing and coordinating engineering projects and technological processes), career prospects and a set of competencies, knowledge and skills. However, the title of the profile ('Engineering Project Manager', 'Technical Project Director', 'Engineering and Operations Coordinator', 'Engineering Management Consultant') implies functions specific to the field of engineering, even though the entry profile does not require an engineering degree, which may lead to misunderstandings regarding the qualification conferred by the degree. Unlike the use of the reserved term 'Engineer' (clearly inadmissible), these titles are borderline and are penalised: they would only be consistent if the title were aligned with management functions not exclusively attributable to engineering, or if the entry requirements expressly stipulated an engineering degree (Bachelor's) consistent with the qualification awarded. Recommendation: amend the title of the graduate profile so that it does not attribute functions reserved for engineering, or require an engineering degree in the entry profile to ensure consistency with the graduate profile.

SC. The 1.1.2.b stipulates that the graduate's professional profile and qualifications must be appropriate and consistent with the learning outcomes. The intended career pathways (management and leadership of engineering projects, coordination of operations, consultancy in engineering management, innovation and process improvement) are consistent with the programme's learning outcomes, which combine technical foundations and management skills. The assessment does not reach the full level due to the need to ensure consistency between these engineering-related roles and an entry profile that does not require an engineering degree.

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 block of seven compulsory core modules (7.5 ECTS each), three optional modules, of which the student takes one (7.5 ECTS), the work placement (12 ECTS) and the Master's Thesis (18 ECTS)—is consistent, in terms of modules and credits, with the engineering management graduate profile; the allocation of 18 ECTS to the Master's Thesis is reasonable for a 90-ECTS programme. The

breakdown of student time allocation (scheduled activities versus independent study) is set out in the campus teaching guides, which allows verification of its alignment with the credits. However, the mode of study is not clearly defined: the course 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. Criterion 1.3.1 assesses whether the management team oversees 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 register of partnerships includes work placement agreements with companies and institutions (classified as 'Compulsory Work Placements') and, as a member of the GUS Germany (GGG) network, the centre has access to a wide pool of affiliated companies for work placements, sufficient to cover all students. The agreements exist and are sufficient. (This criterion assesses the agreements themselves — their existence, correctness and sufficiency — independently of their implementation, which is evaluated in 3.5.1.)

FC. Criterion 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 (Roehampton University, CETT Estudis d'Hostaleria i Turisme, partner universities), membership of networks (the GUS Germany network and the Business Graduates Association) and commercial partnerships for student services (Uniplaces, Student Concierge Club and Spotahome —accommodation and various student services—). This set 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 a documented procedure (resolution of formal complaints within ten working days, including appeal channels) and a system review, and the indicators show a 100% response rate to claims. The requirement is substantially met. However, the Master's programme website 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 degree), 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 a Transparency Portal containing comprehensive and up-to-date information (on employability, corporate social responsibility, supply and demand, student numbers and indicators, all duly referenced), accessible via the programme's website. The programme's official profile on CUALIFICAM features a Transparency Portal containing information on student numbers, corporate social responsibility, 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 the programme's 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 stipulates that the Management must identify and analyse the opportunities and threats arising from changes in the EHEA and 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 European Higher Education Area (quality, equity, inclusion, lifelong learning, mobility and sustainable development), but in a generic manner, without an explicit analysis of opportunities and threats reflected in the strategy.

SC. Feature 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 documents specific actions: health and well-being programmes and support groups (SDG 3); scholarships and initiatives promoting educational equity and inclusion (SDG 4); and sustainability and energy management measures (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 displays the CUALIFICAM logo where applicable, but does not link to the official profile or the CUALIFICAM site; on the alternative website for the same programme, the logo does not appear. Consequently, students cannot access the official profile, the Transparency Portal or the complaints and suggestions inbox from the programme's website. In the website of the master https://www.berlinsbi.com/programme/postgraduate/master-in-engineering-management it is not clear enough if this master in Engineering management has CUALIFICAM certification.

PC. The 2.1.1.b stipulates that the information on the programme's own website must be consistent with that on the official CUALIFICAM website. The Programme's official website correctly reflects the curriculum (it matches the programme description and the EC_Datos), but coexists with an alternative website (.../msc-in-engineering-management) which presents the same master's degree as an official MSc from the University of Chichester (Berlin, UK credits), with a different curriculum and without the CUALIFICAM seal. Furthermore, the programme actually delivered and assessed corresponds to the UNINETTUNO (UTIU) MSc in Berlin, meaning that up to three references coexist (CUALIFICAM/BSBI professional master's degree, Chichester MSc and UNINETTUNO MSc), the consistency of which needs to be resolved. Furthermore, the Programme's communications use institutional terminology reserved for the university sector — 'Faculty', 'Rector', 'Dean', doctorates, scientific journal — which leads to confusion regarding the nature of the institution: during the visit, students stated that, when formalising their admission, they believed they were dealing with a university. 'Faculty' and 'University Institute' are reserved designations in accordance with Article 2.3 of Royal Decree 640/2021 (including in other languages) and the anti-confusion clause of the LOSU (Additional Provision 8.2 and Article 7.4). These inconsistencies are noted as observations to be rectified. Recommendation: clarify the purpose and scope of the Programme's two websites and those of the various partner universities, standardise the information, and specify the objective of the programme.

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 (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. The 2.2.1 stipulates a comprehensive admissions process (request for information; entry routes and requirements; documentation and deadlines; notification of results; place reservation; and steps for enrolment). The institution has a documented and implemented admissions policy and procedure — entry routes, required documentation, types of programmes and deadlines (the indicator reflects an admission confirmation within approximately two days). However, the process is formulated in terms of the partner university and makes admission conditional upon confirmation from that university, which is typical 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 whether the qualification being awarded is a professional master's degree or an official master's degree.

SC. The 2.2.2 stipulates that a comprehensive, clearly defined and implemented enrolment process must be in place. The institution has a documented and implemented procedure that covers eligibility requirements (letter of acceptance, signed Study Agreement, deposit and payment plan), the enrolment appointment with eligibility verification, online and in-person enrolment with document and identity verification, emergency contact details and a welcome message. The indicator shows that enrolment confirmation takes around five days. 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; therefore, 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 stated in the system review report, is published and disseminated through various channels. .

SC. The 2.2.3.b stipulates that recognition must comply with the CUALIFICAM framework (work placements based on professional experience; credits from other CUALIFICAM Professional Master's programmes; and credits from university Master's programmes or schools accredited by AMBA/EQUIS/AACSB, up to a maximum of 30% of ECTS credits and never including the Master's Thesis). The institution's policy expressly sets out this classification, with a limit of 30% of ECTS credits and the exclusion of the Master's Thesis, distinguishing between academic and experiential recognition. The assessment does not reach the full level pending confirmation of full recognition of compulsory work placements based on experience and the registration of applications based on experience in the EVALUE system.

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 status of student records, managed within the internal system and on campus, along with the relevant processing steps. Withdrawal is governed by a comprehensive Student Withdrawal Policy (covering governance, grounds for voluntary and involuntary withdrawal —including non-payment—, procedures, appeals and financial implications). The indicators reflect the rates of temporary suspensions (4%) and withdrawals (6%). The process integrates academic and financial management. The assessment does not reach 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 timely and proper signing to ensure they cannot be altered. The institution has a documented assessment and grading procedure, with a system of internal and external moderation, and the indicator shows a timeframe of around five days for the issuance and signing of transcripts. However, no actual examples of academic transcripts from the Programme are provided to verify the format of the transcript or to demonstrate that it incorporates a signing 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 and a system for verifying authenticity that is accessible to third parties. The documented procedure provides for the issuance in digital format with digital signatures and seals, physical copies with original signatures and a verification QR code, within five days. However, there is no evidence from actual copies that the

certificates actually incorporate the document number or identifier, the electronic signature and the authenticity verification system as required.

PC. The 2.2.7 stipulates a degree issuance process that involves the timely and proper submission of the list of degrees to be awarded. The institution has a documented and implemented procedure (Examinations Board, export and confirmation of the list of graduates, generation of the degree certificate, academic record and supplement); the indicator shows that the degree is issued within the specified timeframe (seven days). However, it must be demonstrated that the qualification includes a serial number, electronic signature and secure authenticity verification codes, and it must be clarified which qualification is being issued (the institution's professional diploma or the partner university's qualification), 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, accompanied by improvement actions (objectives, commitments, responsible parties and deadlines). The centre has a documented procedure for annual review by management and provides evidence of this in the form of signed minutes of the review for the 2025/2026 academic year, one for each of the four dimensions, which include the agenda, conclusions, agreements (improvement actions) with the person responsible and deadline, attendees and signatures. The indicators show that 72% of proposed improvement actions have been implemented, 41 new actions have been proposed, and 100% of complaints have been addressed, demonstrating that a cycle of continuous improvement is in operation. The rating does not reach the full level because the implementation of improvement actions is not complete (72%) and some are still within the deadline.

Dimension 3: Teaching Staff and Training Program

Subdimension 3.1: Teaching Staff

Score: 5.000

NC Criterion 3.1.1.a requires that at least 60% of the teaching staff have a senior profile, defined as ten or more years of professional experience relevant to the subjects taught. Having assessed the teaching staff's CVs (visit dossier) and verified their public profiles, the teaching staff presents a predominantly academic and research-oriented profile (PhDs and university teaching careers), with solid training credentials. Of the eleven teaching staff, only two have relevant and extensive professional experience in the industry—one with over ten years in transport and logistics project management, and another due to their long career—meaning that the percentage of senior teaching staff measured by industry experience stands at around 18%, well below the 60% threshold. The years of experience of the remaining staff correspond mainly to teaching and research activity, not to professional experience in the market, which is what determines the 'senior' status in a professional master's degree. It should be noted that academic or research experience is not equivalent to professional market experience: only activity carried out in or for the market (company, commercial or technology transfer contract with a client, spin-off, consultancy or commercial exploitation of results) counts as such. The visit confirmed this profile, the panel itself noted that, based on the information in the CVs, the 60% senior threshold is not met a finding reinforced by the and the students, who called for more practical content or content relevant to the business world. Recommendation: strengthen the teaching staff with candidates who can demonstrate relevant professional experience in the industry for each subject, until at least 60% of the teaching staff are senior lecturers.

PC The 3.1.1.b stipulates that the Programme Director must demonstrate professional and teaching experience appropriate to the qualification awarded by the programme. The Programme Director has published their CV on their LinkedIn profile, which demonstrates an academic background (education and teaching and research experience) but does not provide evidence of professional experience in the relevant sector. Therefore, they meet the teaching requirements but not the requirement for professional experience relevant to a professional master's degree.

FC. Criterion 3.1.2.a assesses the percentage of subject-leading staff with verifiable teaching experience (NC < 50% · CP 50–60% · CS 60–80% · CC > 80%). The verified curricula and profiles confirm that all teaching staff have verifiable teaching experience, well exceeding the 80% threshold. .

SC. Criterion 3.1.2.b requires favourable and recent teaching evaluations (over the last five years, with a score of over 7 out of 10). The module evaluation surveys yield very favourable results, and the teaching satisfaction indicator is high (NPS 92). The rating does not reach the full level because the evidence relates to a single intake — not the entire five-year period — and the teaching staff assessed only partially matches that of the teaching assignment, meaning that the favourable ratings do not cover the entire teaching staff responsible for the intake being accredited.

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

Score: 3.333

SC. The 3.2.1 stipulates that there must be a sufficient number of academic tutors who are adequately trained to provide academic supervision, particularly for the Master's Thesis and External Placements, based on a ratio of one tutor for every eighty distance-learning participants. The Programme appoints an academic tutor 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 academic tutor's profile is academically oriented (physics), and it is necessary to clarify how well this fits with the supervision of a Master's in Engineering Management; and there is no specific evidence of supervision of the Master's Thesis or the Work Placements.

FC. The 3.2.2 stipulates that coaches, counsellors and other support staff must have the necessary training to support and guide students, and may have a different profile to that required for subject teachers. The Programme appoints an Educational Coach whose profile is suitable for this role: they hold specific coaching qualifications (coaching certification), appropriate for the tasks of supporting and facilitating students. This is considered full compliance.

Subdimension 3.3: Academic assignment

Score: 2.000

SC. Criterion 3.3.1 requires the Management to plan and manage the academic programme, aligning the requirements of the curriculum and the student body with the profiles, availability and affiliations of academic staff. The programme's teaching allocation has been formalised and assigns teaching staff to all modules, demonstrating comprehensive and well-documented planning. The assessment does not achieve the full level due to a consistency issue: the teaching staff listed in the teaching allocation does not fully correspond to those listed as responsible for the teaching actually delivered (module surveys indicate lecturers not included in the allocation), a matter that requires clarification. To confirm that the teaching allocation matches actual demand, it is necessary to know the distribution of students by subject and optional module, which should be requested during the visit. Recommendation: ensure that the teaching staff listed in the programme matches those actually delivering the teaching, and provide the distribution of students by subject and elective. (The existence of a large teaching staff for a small number of students is a matter of organisational efficiency — underutilisation — rather than the quality of the programme, and therefore does not lower the rating.)

Subdimension 3.4: Training plan

Score: 4.666

SC. The 3.4.1 stipulates that the programme must be tailored to Master's level (MECES 3 – EQF 7) and include the graduate profile and the learning outcomes for each module (knowledge, competences and skills). The graduate profile is defined – including its main role and career prospects – and the teaching guides set out the learning outcomes structured into competences, knowledge and skills, consistent with the Master's level. The assessment does not achieve the full level because the title of the graduate profile ('Engineering Project Manager', 'Technical Project Manager', 'Engineering Management Consultant') attributes functions specific to engineering without the entry profile requiring an engineering degree, which must be clarified so as not to cause confusion regarding the qualification conferred by the degree.

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. Having reviewed the virtual campus, the course guides are available to students and are up

to date (approved version with date). The assessment does not reach the full level because their consistency with the Programme's website remains compromised: two websites for the same master's degree coexist, with discrepancies in the curriculum.

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 formative activities; they must also include the syllabus, assessment activities, formative activities and the teaching staff profile. The course guides available on 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); it is assumed that the remaining courses follow the same model. 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 course 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. The 3.4.3.a stipulates that staff availability timetables must be kept up to date and communicated to students, with measures in place in the event of non-compliance. Upon reviewing the virtual campus, there is no timetable showing staff availability nor a mechanism for requesting or arranging tutorials; nor is there any documentation to substantiate these. This cannot be assessed positively. Recommendation: establish and communicate to students, via the virtual campus, tutorial timetables and a system for arranging appointments, with measures in place in the event of non-compliance.

NC. The 3.4.3.b stipulates that there must be a clearly defined and communicated channel for students to access educational coaches. 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 on the campus a channel for students to 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 was found 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 module has its own materials available on its virtual course platform.

PC. The 3.4.5 stipulates that a timetable of subjects, activities and assessments must be planned, reviewed, updated and communicated, whilst avoiding duplication. It is noted that the material for each subject is uploaded to the campus prior to the start of the term, which demonstrates prior planning. However, upon reviewing the campus, each subject is organised as an independent online course, and there is no evidence of a calendar setting out 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 is also insufficient, as it merely indicates the weeks of teaching. There is therefore a lack of an integrated calendar of activities and assessments and a mechanism for coordination between subjects. Recommendation: incorporate into the campus a comprehensive calendar detailing planned activities and assessments, along with a shared coordination space between subjects that prevents duplication and gives the programme its identity.

Subdimension 3.5: Practical dimension and professional orientation

Score: 3.333

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, registration on the placement pool, and reports from the internal and external supervisors). The programme indicators state that no one undertook work 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, given the senior profile of the students in Berlin, it was not considered necessary to introduce compulsory placements, and that the compulsory process has been defined from 2025 onwards for certification programmes, with no record of its implementation. During the visit, it was also noted that the existing work placements correspond to the German dual system (agreements with companies in Germany), which cannot be directly transferred to the Spanish version that is intended to be implemented; the claim that 'senior' students did not require work placements stands in

contrast to the opinion of the students themselves — who are not necessarily of a senior profile — who valued having work placements and guidance more tailored to the business world. The school has access, via the GUS Germany network, to a pool of companies for work placements, which constitutes an adequate management infrastructure; however, this infrastructure does not remedy the fundamental shortcoming: the Programme's compulsory work placements are not were not incorporated or implemented in the courses delivered, so there is no implementation to assess. Recommendation: implement and deliver the compulsory work placements, including the full management process; provide user access to the platform supporting this; and maintain documentary evidence of each phase in actual courses.

NC. The 3.5.1.b stipulates that the work placement must be appropriate to the learning objectives, with a teaching guide for the placement that is consistent with the rubric for tutors' reports. A teaching guide exists for the work placement module (12 ECTS), but as no placements have taken place, there is no activity to assess nor any rubric for tutors' reports to compare.

NC. Point 3.5.1.c requires that students 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.

FC. The 3.5.2 stipulates a process for managing the job board (posting vacancies, listing vacancies and eligibility criteria). The institution has a well-structured, institution-wide work placement and job vacancy system—which serves all the institution's degree programmes—and which brings together a wide range of work placement and job vacancies, with highly effective publication of vacancies that incorporates all the necessary elements to inform students, appropriate management of partner companies, and a two-way communication system between companies, the institution, candidates and tutors. 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 is provided, managed by the Careers Service, which organises the network around online platforms — an alumni page, an alumni group on a professional network, an employment platform and membership of the Business Graduates Association — and in-person events, and identifies all the required groups. Its implementation is demonstrated by a programme of events in 2025, an alumni group and an action plan for improvement with annual monitoring. The process is institutional and general in scope, which is appropriate for this requirement. It is considered to be fully compliant.

SC. The 3.5.4.a calls for a clearly defined and implemented career guidance process. The Careers Service has a documented process (career guidance, interview training, workshops, CV review and links with employers) and an employment platform; the indicator shows that 100% of requests for guidance have been met. The assessment does not reach the full level because the visit revealed that career guidance is not offered systematically to students on the Programme — students stated that they had not been offered the services of a career advisor — and that there is no systematic system in place for consulting companies on market demand. Recommendation: systematise and communicate the career guidance service to students on the Programme, and introduce regular consultation with companies regarding market demand.

FC. The 3.5.4.a calls for a clearly defined and implemented career guidance process. The Careers Service has a documented process (career guidance, interview training, workshops, CV review and links with employers) and an employment platform; the indicator shows that 100% of requests for guidance have been met. The assessment does not reach the full level because the visit revealed that career guidance is not offered systematically to students on the Programme students stated that they had not been offered the services of a career advisor and that there is no systematic system in place for consulting companies on market demand. Recommendation: systematise and communicate the career guidance service to students on the Programme, and introduce regular consultation with companies regarding market demand.

Dimension 4: Results

Subdimension 4.1: Academic results

Score: 6.666

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 by course component for the 2025/2026 academic year, and the programme's grade distribution is provided. The assessment does not achieve the full level because the compulsory placements have not been delivered (there are no placement results to analyse) and because the immutability of the grade records could not be verified (see 2.2.5).

FC. 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, and a system of internal and external marking moderation is in place; the campus teaching guides detail the assessment criteria and weighting (verified), and assessment is structured around the submission of assignments. Upon review, the Master's Theses submitted demonstrate a genuine and comprehensive methodological structure (abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, findings/discussion, conclusions and recommendations) and address topics consistent with the engineering management graduate profile: sustainability and digital technology in industrial project management; the application of Lean management and digital technologies in operations; a quantitative model for assessing software risks in the supply chain using multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) methods; and the governance of on-demand transport in urban-rural settings. The methodologies employed are appropriate (qualitative, quantitative and mixed: surveys, interviews, thematic analysis and multi-criteria modelling) and the theses meet the objectives of the Master's thesis teaching guide and demonstrate the expected knowledge and skills. Full compliance is considered to have been achieved.

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 is high: the teaching satisfaction indicator (NPS) stands at 92; the annual student survey (166 responses out of 388, a 43% response rate) is positive, and the module-specific surveys —which have been reviewed— specifically assess teaching performance (module objectives, usefulness of campus materials, and a set of around sixteen items regarding the lecturer: assistance with difficulties, fair treatment, clarity of communication, organisation and encouragement of critical thinking), with favourable open-ended responses. The assessment does not achieve a full rating for three reasons: the evidence comes from the 'UTIU MSc in Engineering Management' cohort (388 students), which is larger than the enrolment for the intake undergoing certification; the teaching staff assessed in the module-specific surveys only partially matches that of the teaching assignment (teachers not part of the assignment appear); and the module-specific surveys are based on small samples per group (around ten responses), with the breakdown by item presented graphically.

SC. Section 4.2.2 assesses student satisfaction with the programme, the website, the virtual campus, academic and administrative processes, work placements, the job bank, career guidance, the professional network, and overall satisfaction. Satisfaction with the programme is high: the satisfaction indicator for the training programme (NPS) stands at 94, with high scores for the website (98) and the virtual campus (98). The satisfaction indicator for work placements is not applicable (none were offered). The assessment does not reach the full level for the same reasons regarding the cohort and intake as previously noted.

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: the 2025 graduate survey (997 graduates who graduated between January 2024 and February 2025; 191 responses, 19% response rate), a survey on graduates' career paths, and an action plan for improvement by the Careers Service, reviewed annually. This survey does include the 'MSc in Engineering Management', with 22 responses (out of a total of 191, the second degree

programme with the highest response rate). However, the assessment does not reach the full level for two reasons: the results are presented in aggregate form for all degree programmes (around 55–59% in employment, self-employment or further study; high levels of temporary employment and underemployment; sectors such as hospitality, food and logistics), without a specific breakdown for the Programme; and the graduates surveyed are from previous cohorts (the MSc cohort taught with the partner university), not the cohort undergoing certification (OCT24ENG), which has not yet produced any graduates. The process therefore exists and the discipline is represented, but there are no specific results regarding labour market integration and employability for the Programme and the cohort being accredited.

Subdimension 4.4: Reputation

Score: 2.000

PC Criterion 4.4.1 assesses the satisfaction of companies and institutions with work placement students. The centre provides a documented 'Reputation' procedure describing the process for assessing companies' satisfaction with work placement students (interim monitoring and final assessment, completed by the host company and the student, plus an assessment by the supervisor to award credits). Real responses from companies (Kantox, DHL Supply Chain, Uriach, Occident, SAP, amongst others) are also provided, rating the intern mostly as 'Good'. However, the procedure is of a general nature and does not define any indicators; the responses relate to extracurricular and institutional placements —not to the Programme's compulsory placements, which have not been delivered— with a small sample size (seven responses) and no evidence that they relate to Master's students. The system is defined and available; results relating to the Programme's compulsory placements and the indicators required to measure them are missing.

PC. Feature 4.4.2 assesses the satisfaction of companies and institutions with their employed alumni. The 'Reputation' procedure itself defines and provides a standardised system for measuring this aspect (surveys of the companies where graduates work and of the graduates themselves, within a period of 6 to 12 months after graduation, with a regulated process of implementation and annual review). However, there are no results for this programme, which does not yet have any graduates; furthermore, the procedure does not define 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. Recommendation: assign indicators with benchmark values to the procedure and implement the system by providing results on employer satisfaction with alumni employed through the programme once graduates have emerged.

00664430Y
FEDERICO MORAN
(R: G83351346)

Firmado digitalmente por 00664430Y FEDERICO MORAN (R: G83351346)
Fecha: 2026.07.10 13:28:10 +02'00'

Federico Morán Abad

Director of the Madrimasd Knowledge Foundation