FINAL CERTIFICATION REPORT

Master of Science in Business Management

Resolution:	**REVIEW**
Score:	**63.00**
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

An online learning platform equipped with all the necessary features to enable students to access all administrative procedures and course-related information

A management teaching team with the appropriate qualifications and extensive professional experience.

Commitment to several Sustainable Development Goals through actions and policies related to student wellbeing, quality education and sustainability.

Weaknesses

Inconsistencies in the number of credits awarded for the programme.

Work placements are insuEiciently integrated into the academic structure of the programme.

Lack of clarity regarding the roles and responsibilities of tutors and academic coaches.

InsuEicient information on the monitoring and assessment of work placements.

Poor information on the website.

Recommendations for improvement

It is recommended that a list of companies, institutions and other centres with which the ESE has partnerships and agreements for work placements be published on the website.

It is recommended that the transparency portal on the website be expanded.

It is strongly recommended that the processes associated with external placements be systematised.

It is recommended that the teaching staE, CVs and subject(s) taught on each programme be published on the website.

It is recommended that the profile and role of academic tutors be clearly identified.

It is recommended that the profile and role of the academic coach be clearly identified.

It is recommended that the information on the programmes on the website be improved.

Dimension 1: Program Design

Subdimension 1.1: Entry and exit profile

Score: 8.000

The admission profiles are public on the programme website and include both an academic access pathway based on a Bachelor's degree or equivalent qualification and a professional access pathway requiring a minimum of 3 years of accredited professional experience. The entry requirements are consistent with the professional orientation of the programme and with the expected learning outcomes. The inclusion of English language certification requirements is also positively valued considering the international nature of the programme. Those entry requirements were confirmed during the audience with the management team. Since it has been confirmed that students can enroll in the master's program without a prior bachelor's degree, provided they can demonstrate at least three years of professional management experience, it is recommended that the admission requirements remain consistent with the academic level of a master's program.

The defined admission profiles are coherent with the intended learning outcomes and with the graduate profile of the programme. The combination of academic qualifications, professional experience and english language requirements is appropriate for a master's programme focused on international business management and professional specialisation. The admission criteria support the acquisition of the competences and professional outputs described by the programme.

The programme clearly defines the graduate professional profile and publishes it on its website, describing the main professional opportunities associated with the different specialisations in Management, Marketing and Finance. The programme also identifies the knowledge and professional competences expected at the end of the training process, particularly in relation to international business management, leadership, entrepreneurship and global strategic decision making. Thus, the programme meets the requirement that it defines and publishes the professional profile/qualification of graduates, as it clearly presents this information on its website, specifying the knowledge, competencies, and skills to be achieved upon completion. It aligns these elements with the programme's objectives and highlights key career paths such as senior leadership, entrepreneurship, consulting, and business development

The professional profile defined by the programme is appropriate and consistent with the intended learning outcomes. The different professional pathways described, including management, marketing, finance, entrepreneurship and international consultancy, are aligned with the competences and international business perspective developed throughout the programme. The profile is also coherent with the interdisciplinary and professionally oriented structure of the master's degree, complete.

Subdimension 1.2: Program design coherence

Score: 0.000

The programme design is generally coherent with both the admission profiles and the intended graduate profile. The structure of the programme combines core subjects, specialisation modules, internship activities and a final dissertation, which are aligned with the professional orientation of the master's degree and its focus on international business management. The workload distribution and the learning outcomes are consistent with the objectives of the programme and with the expected professional competences. The meeting with the management team, it became very clear that compulsory work placements are not formally integrated, managed or assessed within the programme's academic structure.

Subdimension 1.3: Alliances and cooperation

Score: 0.667

The programme provides evidence of collaboration agreements with companies and institutions that support the development of professional internships aligned with the objectives of the programme. The information available through the Cualificam platform shows the existence of institutional partnerships and international collaborations that may facilitate student's professional exposure and practical experience. However, the meeting with the

management team clearly demonstrated that mandatory internships are not formally integrated, managed and assessed within the academic structure of the programme.

The programme has established a network of relationships and collaborations with companies, partner institutions and other ESE campuses that contribute to the student experience and support key programme activities, particularly internships, employability and international mobility opportunities. The documentation reviewed and the explanations provided during the online audience demonstrate that these collaborations are actively used to facilitate internship placements, professional networking opportunities and engagement with external stakeholders. The panel also noted the role of the alumni network and the cooperation between campuses in supporting student development. While the impact of individual partnerships is not systematically evidenced, the programme demonstrates a substantial level of engagement with external organisations for the benefit of its stakeholders.

Subdimension 1.4: Ethics, Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Score: 1.333

The programme has defined and published a formal process for handling suggestions, complaints and claims. The procedure includes a clear objective, scope, responsibilities, records and a structured workflow covering complaint reception, evaluation, investigation, mediation and response. The process appears to be accessible and appropriately documented through the quality management system. However, no indicators or monitoring results have been provided, making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the process and its continuous improvement. Overall, the process is substantially implemented, although evidence of monitoring and performance measurement is limited.

The programme provides updated information about its main academic results and activities through its quality assurance and monitoring processes. The evidence reviewed includes information on student achievement, retention, internships, employability, student feedback, external examiner reports and annual improvement actions. The programme also identifies areas for enhancement and assigns responsibilities and timelines for future actions. Although the evidence demonstrates a clear commitment to monitoring and reporting programme performance, limited information is available regarding how these results are systematically communicated to external stakeholders and society.

The programme demonstrates awareness of the priorities of the EES Area through its commitments to quality education, internationalisation, student support, sustainability and digital development. The information available reflects alignment with several of the strategic priorities established in the European framework for education and training 2021 2030. However, the evidence reviewed does not fully demonstrate a systematic process for identifying and analysing opportunities and threats arising from changes in the EES, nor how such analyses are formally integrated into the programmes strategic planning and decision making processes. Therefore, there is no clear evidence of a systematic process to analyse emerging challenges or to integrate these insights into strategic decision-making.

The programme demonstrates a clear commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals through a range of policies, activities and institutional commitments. The evidence reviewed shows actions that support student wellbeing, access to education, lifelong learning, inclusion, sustainability and responsible use of resources. These initiatives are aligned with the objectives of the SDGs, particularly SDG 3, SDG 4, and 7. The programme has integrated these commitments into its activities and strategic approach, demonstrating a clear contribution to the values promoted by the SDGs.

Dimension 2: Academic and Administrative Resources and Processes

Subdimension 2.1: Website and Virtual Campus

Score: 6.833

Cualificam website is not easily accessible from the programme's own website https://www.ese.ac.uk/about-ese/accreditations-partnerships and this difficult prospective students and other stakeholders to access the information

required within the Cualificam framework, including transparency information, procedures, indicators and programme documentation.

The information published on the programme's own website is not fully consistent with the information available on the official Cualificam platform. Although the general structure and orientation of the programme are coherent, relevant discrepancies have been identified in relation to the academic content and the visibility of compulsory internship activities.

Following the review of the documentation provided and the demonstration conducted during the online audience, the panel was able to verify that the virtual learning environment is fully operational and constitutes the central platform supporting the delivery of the programme. The platform provides students with access to learning materials, module specifications, academic regulations, library resources, internship documentation, assessment activities, attendance records, feedback reports and institutional communications. In addition, during the online audience, the institution demonstrated the mechanisms used to manage user access, monitor student participation, communicate with students, provide assessment feedback and support the overall learning process. The platform also supports a variety of teaching, learning and assessment methods and enables continuous monitoring of student engagement and academic progress. The evidence reviewed indicates that the virtual campus is effectively embedded within the academic model of the programme and provides students with reliable access to the resources and information required throughout their studies. Overall, the integration of the virtual campus within the academic model is clear and effective, enabling continuous monitoring of student progress and engagement. This confirms a high level of implementation and justifies the conclusion of full compliance.

Subdimension 2.2: Academic and administrative processes

Score: 10.999

The admission criteria are publicly available and aligned with the programme's academic and professional focus. However, there is insufficient evidence of systematic monitoring, as no indicators, data on admitted candidates, or verification mechanisms are provided to confirm consistent compliance with access requirements.

The process of the enrolment is implemented but its effectiveness can not be fully assessed because no indicators, performance data or monitoring evidence were provided in the dashboard regarding processing times, incidences or student follow-up during enrolment,

The programme has defined a credit recognition process that is publicly available before enrolment and includes recognition pathways related to previous academic studies and professional experience. The process is coherent with the professional nature of the programme and with the different admission profiles described by the institution, however, the implementation and monitoring of the recognition process cannot be fully evaluated because no indicators or dashboard evidence were provided regarding the number of applications, recognition decisions or followup of the process.

The programme has established a credit recognition framework generally aligned with the typologies and conditions defined in the Guide, including recognition based on professional experience and previous postgraduate studies. The documentation describes the main criteria, limitations and documentary requirements applicable to the recognition process. However, the effective implementation, consistency and monitoring of these recognitions cannot be verified because the management dashboard does not provide operational indicators, records or measurable evidence related to recognition requests and resolutions. Thus, while the programme has defined a credit recognition framework consistent with the established guidelines, the lack of evidence on process indicators and monitoring data makes it difficult to fully evaluate its effective implementation and consistency.

The programme has defined a student record management process that integrates academic and administrative procedures, including conditions related to temporary suspension and permanent withdrawal from the programme. The documentation reflects an organised structure for the management of student records throughout the academic lifecycle. Also, the evidence provided during the evaluation does not allow a full assessment of the implementation and monitoring of the process, as no operational indicators or dashboard data were provided regarding student record management, incidences or followup actions.

The programme has defined a process for the management of academic records and grading reports, including the formalisation and signing procedures associated with academic assessment. The documentation reflects an organised academic management structure, although the evidence provided during the evaluation does not

include indicators or monitoring data related to deadlines, validation controls or operational performance of the process, which limits the assessment of its effective implementation.

The programme has defined a process for the issuance and management of academic certificates, including the formal validation and signature procedures required for their delivery. The documentation reviewed suggests the existence of an organised administrative framework supporting the certification process. However, the implementation, monitoring and efficiency of this procedure cannot be fully verified because the management dashboard does not provide operational indicators or measurable evidence related to certificate issuance times, compliance monitoring or quality control activities.

The programme has defined a process for the issuance of academic titles, including the procedures needed to manage and deliver the final qualifications. The documentation reviewed suggests that the institution has an organised administrative process for this activity. However, the implementation and monitoring of the process cannot be fully evaluated because the management dashboard does not include indicators or measurable data related to title issuance times, process control or service performance.

The programme has defined an annual review process aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of the management system, the adequacy of the programme design and the achievement of the expected results. The documentation also refers to the establishment of improvement actions with identified objectives, responsibilities and implementation timelines, which reflects a structured approach towards continuous improvement and internal quality review.

Dimension 3: Teaching Staff and Training Program

Subdimension 3.1: Teaching Staff

Score: 6.666

The teaching staff presents profiles and professional experience aligned with the subjects taught in the programme. The documentation reflects a combination of academic qualifications, international professional backgrounds and specialised expertise connected to the different areas of Management, Marketing and Finance. The strong presence of senior profiles and their distribution across subjects support the adequacy and consistency of the faculty with the programme's objectives. Therefore, the programme appears to comply with the requirement regarding the proportion of senior faculty members with more than ten years of professional experience.

The programme management team, including the Director and Coordinators, presents professional and academic profiles aligned with the international and professional orientation of the master's degree. The documentation reflects experience in programme coordination and links with the different international campuses associated with the institution, which is coherent with the qualification and professional profile awarded by the programme.

The teaching staff demonstrates solid accredited teaching experience in business-related fields, with backgrounds aligned with management, marketing, and finance. The evidence suggests a qualified academic team with experience in higher education, clearly meeting and exceeding the required thresholds and supporting the programme's professional orientation. The documentation provided reflects an academic team with previous experience in higher education and postgraduate teaching, consistent with the international and professional orientation of the programme. However, the evidence reviewed does not provide a sufficiently detailed and verifiable analysis of the proportion of faculty members with accredited teaching experience in this or similar programmes. While the information available suggests that a significant proportion of the teaching team has previous teaching experience, the percentage within the criteria cannot be fully verified.

The documentation reviewed reflects positive teaching performance and consistency with the quality standards expected for postgraduate business education programmes, supporting the academic suitability of the teaching staff. The evidence suggests generally positive teaching evaluations and alignment with expected quality standards; however, the absence of specific data on student satisfaction with teaching staff makes it difficult to fully confirm this aspect.

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

Score: 2.666

The programme provides academic tutors and support staff linked to the delivery of the different modules, internships and dissertation activities. The documentation reviewed suggests that the tutoring structure is generally aligned with the academic and professional orientation of the programme and with the international learning environment offered by the institution. At the same time, the evaluation of the tutoring system is affected by the inconsistencies previously identified regarding the visibility and documentary integration of internships and dissertation components within the Cualificam platform, which limits the complete verification of tutor allocation and supervision activities associated with these elements.

The programme appears to have support staff and academic assistance structures that are appropriate for the student support activities linked to the programme. The available documentation suggests the existence of coordination, guidance and student support functions related to academic follow-up, communication and practical activities. The profiles and functions described are generally coherent with the support needs of the programme. However, inconsistencies in the documentation, particularly regarding internships and dissertations, and the lack of verifiable tutor profiles limit a full assessment of tutor allocation and supervision.

Subdimension 3.3: Academic assignment

Score: 2.000

The programme has demonstrated the existence of a structured process for planning, assigning and monitoring academic responsibilities across the different functions involved in programme delivery. During the online audience, the institution explained how faculty members are selected and allocated according to their academic qualifications, professional expertise and alignment with module requirements. ESE also described the role of programme directors, academic coordinators, internship coordinators, advisors and campus management staff in supporting programme delivery and student progression. The evidence reviewed indicates that academic responsibilities are actively managed and reviewed through faculty monitoring processes, student feedback mechanisms and regular academic oversight. The programme demonstrates coordination between academic needs, student support requirements and the profiles of the staff involved in programme delivery. Based on the documentation reviewed and the explanations provided during the online audience, the panel was able to verify that the programme substantially implements mechanisms to plan and manage the academic workload and the allocation of academic and support staff. Thus, the roles of faculty, programme directors, coordinators, and support staff are well defined and aligned with the needs of programme delivery and student progression. In addition, the use of monitoring processes, student feedback, and academic oversight mechanisms shows that responsibilities are not only assigned but also actively managed and reviewed. Overall, the evidence reflects a solid level of coordination between academic planning, staff profiles, and student support requirements. While some aspects could be further detailed, the level of implementation observed justifies the conclusion of substantial compliance.

Subdimension 3.4: Training plan

Score: 6.500

The evidence reviewed demonstrates that the programme is structured in accordance with the expectations associated with a master's level qualification within the European Higher Education Area. The Programme Specification clearly defines the graduate profile, qualification level, intended professional outcomes and overall learning objectives of the programme. The panel was able to verify that module specifications include defined learning outcomes covering knowledge, skills and competencies, together with corresponding teaching, learning and assessment arrangements. The programme combines advanced disciplinary knowledge, professional development, applied learning and independent research through the dissertation component, which is consistent with the expectations associated with MECES 3 qualifications. The programme documentation demonstrates a clear articulation between the graduate profile, the intended learning outcomes and the academic structure of the programme. Based on the documentation reviewed and the explanations provided during the online audience, the criterion is considered fully met.

The programme has demonstrated that module specifications, dissertation guidance and programme documentation are communicated to students through the virtual learning environment and the information

systems supporting programme delivery. During the online audience, I was able to verify the availability of module syllabu, learning outcomes, assessment criteria, weekly learning activities, academic resources and supporting documentation through the virtual campus. The evidence reviewed confirms that students have access to updated academic information throughout their studies and that programme documentation is integrated within the learning environment used to support teaching, learning and assessment activities. The Programme Specification, module documentation and virtual campus resources provide a coherent framework through which students can access the information required for their academic progression. Based on the documentation reviewed and the explanations provided during the online audience, the panel was able to verify that the programme updates and communicates the relevant academic documentation through the channels available to students. Therefore, the evidence shows that academic documentation is clearly available and updated through the virtual campus and students have consistent access to key information, ensuring transparency and supporting their academic progression.

The teaching guides include general information regarding subjects, programme structure and areas of specialisation but the documentation available in the Cualificam platform, does not fully demonstrate the coherence between learning outcomes, evaluation activities and training activities across the complete programme. Important elements such as internships and the TFM are not consistently integrated into the visible guides, and some inconsistencies remain regarding the overall structure and distribution of the declared 90 ECTS, which affects the traceability of competences, learning activities and assessment methods. Also to improve the clarity and transparency of the syllabus, it is necessary to include the estimated student workload for each learning activity (e.g., lectures, seminars, independent study, assignments, group work, and assessment tasks). Providing an estimate of the time students are expected to dedicate to each activity will help them plan their workload effectively and ensure alignment with the overall expected learning effort for the course.

The programme provides evidence of an academic support structure that includes an Tutor, a Coach and programme coordinators with clearly assigned roles and responsibilities. The documentation reviewed demonstrates that academic support functions are formally established and integrated within the programme structure. However, limited evidence is available regarding the publication and communication of staff availability schedules for academic tutorials and the actions taken in cases of non-compliance. Overall, the programme demonstrates a substantial commitment to academic support and tutorial provision, although some operational aspects could be more clearly evidenced.

The programme provides evidence of an Edu Coach role responsible for supporting students throughout their learning journey. The documentation reviewed clearly identifies the coach function and describes responsibilities related to student progress monitoring, academic support and engagement activities. A specific Educational Coach is formally assigned to the programme, demonstrating that this support mechanism is implemented. While limited evidence is available regarding the operation and outcomes of these activities, the programme has established a clear channel through which students can access educational coaching and support when needed.

During the online audience, the panel was able to review examples of modules available within the virtual learning environment and verify the availability of teaching and learning materials provided to students. The platform includes module specifications, handouts, worksheets, supporting documentation, learning resources, assessment guidance and additional academic materials relevant to each module. The evidence reviewed demonstrates that students have direct access to the resources required to support their learning activities and achieve the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The materials are integrated within the virtual campus and are organised in a manner that facilitates access throughout the academic journey. Based on the documentation reviewed and the demonstration provided during the online audience, the panel was able to verify that the programme makes the necessary teaching materials available to students through the virtual learning environment and that these resources are accessible and aligned with the educational objectives of the programme. Therefore, the criterion is considered fully met.

The programme provides evidence of an academic calendar that defines the main teaching periods, assessment deadlines, examination periods, dissertation submissions, internship milestones and other key academic activities throughout the academic year. The calendar appears to be structured and communicated to students in advance, supporting the organisation of learning and assessment activities. Although limited evidence is available regarding the mechanisms used to review the calendar and avoid duplication across modules and assessments, the documentation reviewed demonstrates that academic activities are planned and communicated in a structured manner.

Subdimension 3.5: Practical dimension and professional orientation

Score: 3.333

The programme provides evidence of an academic calendar that defines the main teaching periods, assessment deadlines, examination periods, dissertation submissions, internship milestones and other key academic activities throughout the academic year. The calendar appears to be structured and communicated to students in advance, supporting the organisation of learning and assessment activities. Although limited evidence is available regarding the mechanisms used to review the calendar and avoid duplication across modules and assessments, the documentation reviewed demonstrates that academic activities are planned and communicated in a structured manner.

The programme includes a professional internship component intended to support the acquisition of practical competences aligned with the objectives of the master's degree and its international business orientation. The institution explains that internal tutor follow-up is carried out through individual face2face sessions and continuous monitoring during the internship, adapting the feedback process to the specific situation of each student. The programme has demonstrated the existence of internship activities and has provided additional explanations during the online audience regarding the organisation, supervision and monitoring of professional placements. However, the evidence reviewed does not allow the panel to verify that the compulsory internships are fully integrated within the academic framework of the programme and aligned with the intended learning outcomes through a coherent assessment structure. In particular, the documentation reviewed contains inconsistencies regarding the status of the internship component, which is described as optional in some programme documentation, whereas during the online audience the institution confirmed that internships are mandatory for progression to the dissertation stage. Furthermore, internships do not carry academic credit and are assessed exclusively on a pass/fail basis. These elements make it difficult to verify the academic weight, learning outcomes alignment and assessment coherence expected from a compulsory internship component within a master's level programme. The panel has also not been able to verify sufficient evidence demonstrating a clear alignment between the internship guide, the learning outcomes, the assessment criteria and the evaluation reports completed by internal and external supervisors. While internship opportunities are clearly available and operationally managed, the evidence provided is insufficient to demonstrate compliance with all elements required by the criterion.

During the online audience, the institution explained that internship opportunities are identified and managed through a highly personalised approach, with the Internship Office working individually with students to identify placements aligned with their interests, professional objectives and profiles. The panel was also informed that internship opportunities may be sourced through employer networks, alumni contacts and collaborations across different ESE campuses. However, the evidence reviewed does not allow verification that students are systematically informed of the internship agreements available, the number of places offered by each organisation, the allocation criteria or the formal procedures governing the assignment of compulsory internships. The internship model appears to rely primarily on individual placement arrangements rather than on a documented and transparent internship pool structure. While the programme demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting students in securing internship opportunities, the evidence available is insufficient to verify compliance with the specific information and communication requirements established within the criterion. Therefore, the criterion is considered not met.

The programme provides evidence of an active employment network that offers students access to a wide range of professional opportunities across different sectors and countries. The documentation reviewed includes information on employers, locations, duration, language requirements, working arrangements and other relevant conditions, demonstrating a structured approach to employability support. The evidence suggests that employment opportunities are regularly identified and maintained through collaboration with external organisations. While limited information is available regarding the formal application process and eligibility requirements, the programme demonstrates that a functioning employment board is in place and supports students transition into professional careers.

The programme has established a formal process for managing its Professional Network, which includes students, alumni, professors, collaborating organisations and employers. The procedure defines objectives, responsibilities, communication channels, activities and records, and includes initiatives such as alumni seminars, guest lectures,

networking events, mentoring activities, workshops, job fairs and collaborative projects. The process also incorporates feedback collection and continuous improvement activities. Although limited evidence has been provided regarding performance indicators and the results achieved through the network, the documentation reviewed demonstrates that a structured and comprehensive professional network management process is in place.

The programme has established a formal professional orientation process aimed at supporting students in their career development and transition into the labour market. The procedure includes individual and group guidance sessions, personalised career development plans, workshops, seminars and networking opportunities with alumni and employers. The process also defines records, monitoring activities and indicators related to professional guidance requests. The documentation reviewed demonstrates that professional orientation has been incorporated into the programme through a structured and comprehensive process. However, limited evidence has been provided regarding the implementation results and the outcomes achieved through these activities.

The programme provides evidence of annual employability and career development activities through the organisation of Dreamers' Career Week. The event brings together companies, alumni and industry professionals from different sectors and includes masterclasses, workshops, company presentations, networking opportunities and recruitment interviews. These activities provide students with direct exposure to employers and support their professional development and career planning. The evidence reviewed demonstrates that the programme actively promotes employability and professional orientation through organised annual initiatives.

Dimension 4: Results

Subdimension 4.1: Academic results

Score: 5.333

The programme has demonstrated the existence of a structured process for reviewing academic performance and monitoring programme outcomes. The documentation reviewed includes annual programme monitoring reports, academic review processes and quality assurance mechanisms through which assessment outcomes, module performance and overall programme results are analysed. During the online audience, the institution explained how academic results are reviewed by programme management, programme directors and academic oversight bodies, and how student performance data are used to identify areas for improvement. The panel was also informed that academic outcomes are considered alongside student feedback and other quality indicators as part of the annual review cycle- The evidence reviewed demonstrates that the programme analyses academic performance on a regular basis and that programme management is actively involved in the review of results. However, the panel has not been able to verify with the same level of detail the systematic analysis of all components referred to in the criterion, particularly in relation to compulsory internships.

The programme develops activities and evaluation systems aligned with the professional and academic orientation of the master, and the additional evidence reviewed includes examples of dissertation assessment forms, evaluation criteria and completed MFP documentation that demonstrate the existence of structured assessment practices. The material reviewed shows coherence between research activities, academic supervision and evaluation mechanisms for the dissertation component. Nevertheless, several inconsistencies identified in the Cualificam platform remain unresolved, particularly regarding the visibility and integration of internships and the MFP within the official teaching guides and programme structure, which affects the complete traceability of learning outcomes and assessment activities across the whole programme.

Subdimension 4.2: Student satisfaction

Score: 4.000

The programme has defined mechanisms for collecting student satisfaction regarding teaching staff, tutors and support services linked to the academic experience. The documentation reviewed reflects the existence of evaluation and feedback processes associated with the overall functioning of the programme and student support environment. However, the evidence available during the evaluation does not include detailed satisfaction indicators, response rates or analysed results specifically related to professors, tutors, coaches, counsellors or

support staff, which limits the assessment of the real implementation and systematic use of these satisfaction processes for continuous improvement.

The programme has defined student satisfaction mechanisms covering several elements of the academic experience, including the programme structure, academic services, virtual platform and overall student support environment. The documentation reviewed suggests the existence of feedback and quality review processes associated with the student experience. At the same time, the evaluation is limited by the absence of detailed satisfaction indicators, analysed results, response rates and dashboard evidence related to key areas such as internships, employability services, professional orientation activities and the virtual campus, particularly in those areas where documentary inconsistencies and limited traceability have already been identified during the evaluation process.

Subdimension 4.3: Links with Alumni

Score: 1.667

The programme has demonstrated an intention to monitor graduate outcomes through exit interviews, follow-up activities and the collection of information relating to employment and further progression. During the online audience, the institution explained how graduates are contacted following completion of their studies and how employability-related information is incorporated into programme monitoring activities. The evidence reviewed indicates that programme management considers graduate progression and employment outcomes as part of its quality assurance processes. However, the panel has not been able to verify the full implementation of a systematic and mature process based on standardised surveys covering graduate employability, labour market insertion and satisfaction with the education received, together with annual analysis of sufficiently robust data sets. While relevant mechanisms are in place and appear to be developing, the programme shows a clear intention to monitor graduate outcomes and has started to implement mechanisms such as follow-up contacts and the collection of employability information.

Subdimension 4.4: Reputation

Score: 3.000

The programme has demonstrated that employers and internship supervisors participate in the evaluation of students undertaking professional placements. During the online audience, ESE explained that external supervisors complete evaluation forms assessing student performance and that the Internship Office maintains regular contact with host organisations throughout the placement period. The evidence reviewed indicates that employer feedback is collected and considered as part of the internship process. However, the panel has not been able to verify the existence of a fully systematic and standardised process specifically aimed at evaluating the satisfaction of companies and institutions with the students undertaking internships, together with regular analysis and review of the results by programme management. While relevant feedback mechanisms are clearly in place, only partial compliance with the criterion can be confirmed on the basis of the evidence reviewed and the explanations provided during the online audience. In particular, the absence of standardised tools and regular review of results by programme management limits full verification of compliance.

The programme has established a formal process for evaluating the satisfaction of companies and institutions with employed alumni. The procedure defines objectives, responsibilities, questionnaires, reports and satisfaction indicators, including a specific indicator related to employers' satisfaction with graduates employed by their organisations. The documentation demonstrates that this evaluation activity has been incorporated into the programme's quality assurance framework. However, limited evidence has been provided regarding the implementation of employer surveys for alumni, the results obtained or the analysis of employer feedback. Overall, the process is clearly defined and incorporated into the system, although evidence of its practical application could be more extensive.

00664430Y FEDERICO MORAN (R: G83351346)

Firmado digitalmente por 00664430Y FEDERICO MORAN (R: G83351346)
Fecha: 2026.07.10 13:38:58 +02'00'

Federico Morán Abad

Director of the Madrimasd Knowledge Foundation