FINAL CERTIFICATION REPORT

Master in Business Administration

Resolution:	**FAVORABLE**
Score:	**77.16**
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

- Strong organizational culture and professional values, widely embedded in processes, training, and daily operations, with high stakeholder satisfaction.
- Coherent academic program design aligned with intended learning outcomes.
- Effective management of professional internships, including agreements, placements, allocation criteria, and monitoring.
- Well-planned teaching activities supported by course guides, learning materials, and competency-based assessment systems.
- Strong career services, employment support, and connections with the business sector.
- Positive academic results and overall satisfaction indicators.
- Extensive network of partner organizations supporting internships and employment opportunities.

Weaknesses

- Some academic and administrative processes are only partially defined and documented.
- Student support structure could be better integrated and coordinated.
- Faculty and academic leadership information is not always complete or consistent.
- Limited use of individualized teaching performance evaluations.
- Insufficient technical evidence supporting certain aspects of the virtual campus.
- Satisfaction, employability, and employer feedback data require greater analysis and traceability.
- Some processes need stronger evidence of implementation and monitoring.
- Lack of a formal AI policy and governance framework for faculty and students.

Improvement Proposals

- Fully document and standardize academic and administrative processes.
- Strengthen coordination among student support services and academic staff.
- Improve transparency and consistency of faculty information.
- Implement more detailed and individualized teaching evaluations.
- Provide stronger technical evidence of virtual campus performance and effectiveness.
- Enhance the collection and analysis of satisfaction, employability, and employer feedback data.
- Increase documentary evidence of process implementation and continuous improvement.
- Develop an institutional AI policy, governance framework, and training program for responsible AI use.

Dimension 1: Program Design

Subdimension 1.1: Entry and exit profile

Score: 7.333

FC. 1.1.1. a). The admission profile is clearly defined and publicly available on the programme website. The entry requirements include access through a university degree or equivalent qualification, as well as through accredited professional experience of at least three years in positions demonstrating competencies equivalent to graduate level. These admission routes are coherent with the academic level and professional orientation of the MBA programme. The information available is consistent across the CUALIFICAM platform and the programme description. Following the visit, it is suggested that a brief profile of the teachers be included on the website, in addition to the link to LinkedIn.

FC 1.1.1 b) .The admission profiles are consistent with the intended learning outcomes and with the graduate profile of the programme. The combination of prior academic qualifications and relevant professional experience is appropriate for an MBA focused on strategic management, leadership and business development competencies. The admission criteria support the achievement of the expected professional and academic outcomes of the programme.

FC 1.2.1 a) 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

FC. 1.2.1 b). The graduate profile is appropriate and coherent with the learning outcomes defined for the programme. The MBA is focused on developing strategic and also entrepreneurial competencies that are consistent with the professional positions described in the graduate profile, including senior management, consulting and business development roles. The information published in the Cualificam platform provides clear connection between the programme objectives, the intended competencies and the expected professional outcomes

Subdimension 1.2: Program design coherence

Score: 4.000

FC. 1.2.1.The inconsistencies identified in the documentation published on the Cualificam platform – particularly regarding the total allocation of ECTS credits, the integration of work placements and the completeness of certain academic information – were resolved at the face-to-face meeting; consequently, there is now full consistency between the programme structure, the distribution of the teaching load and the published learning outcomes.

Subdimension 1.3: Alliances and cooperation

Score: 3.500

FC.. 1.3.1.Following the on-site visit, the extensive list of work placement agreements and the rest of the requested documentation were verified and it was confirmed that they have signed multiple framework agreements for work placements – around 1,000 –

PC 1.3.2. The programme does not provide information on its relationships or alliances with other institutions, citing confidentiality reasons. As a result, the existence, scope, and added value of these partnerships for stakeholders cannot be verified. Some deficiencies have also been identified in existing cooperation agreements. Evidence of implementation must be provided during the monitoring process.

Subdimension 1.4: Ethics, Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Score: 1.500

FC. 1.4.1. The programme has defined and implemented a formal process for the management of suggestions, complaints and claims, which is accessible through the official Cualificam portal. The procedure includes a clearly defined workflow, responsibilities, records, communication channels and resolution stages, providing an appropriate mechanism for collecting and managing stakeholder feedback. Nevertheless, no indicators or monitoring data were provided regarding the operation of the process, which limits the assessment of its effectiveness and the systematic use of the information obtained for continuous improvement.

SC. 1.4.2. The programme provides a transparency portal through the Cualificam platform, offering access to information on its structure, procedures, and quality management system, which supports openness for stakeholders. However, although this mechanism is in place, the available evidence does not include specific data—such as performance indicators or analysed results—making it difficult to fully verify how the programme reports its outcomes and overall achievement

PC. 1.4.3. a). The programme demonstrates alignment with the principles and priorities of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), including quality assurance, internationalisation, inclusiveness, employability, and sustainability, as reflected in its institutional commitments to the EHEA and the SDGs. This alignment is consistent with the strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training 2021–2030.

PC. 1.4.3 b). The programe demonstrates a clear commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly SDG 4 (Quality Education) and SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), as well as, to a lesser extent, SDG 1, SDG 3, SDG 5, and SDG 7. This is reflected in initiatives related to applied learning methodologies, employability and entrepreneurship, student wellbeing, inclusive access to education, gender equality, and environmental awareness, aligning with the principles of the 2030 Agenda.

Dimension 2: Academic and Administrative Resources and Processes

Subdimension 2.1: Website and Virtual Campus

Score: 9.000

FC. 2.1.1 a). The official CUALIFICAM website is accessible from the programe website

FC. 2.1.1 b). The information published on the programme's website is consistent with that available on the CUALIFICAM platform. In both sources, the programme, its face-to-face delivery mode, curriculum structure, modules, credit allocation, admission profile, and graduate profile are clearly identified, with no significant discrepancies observed in the core information relating to the MBA.

SC. 2.1.2. The Virtual Campus is described as a Moodle-based platform accessible through personal credentials, available 24/7, and supported by a cloud-based infrastructure. It includes role-based access control, communication tools, continuous assessment functionalities, activity tracking, backup systems, HTTPS security protocols, and technical support services. The documentation provided offers a substantial level of information regarding the virtual campus, including a user handbook describing the operation of the student portal and access procedures.

Subdimension 2.2: Academic and administrative processes

Score: 10.667

FC. 2.2.1.During the visit, evidence was provided to demonstrate the clarity, transparency, etc. of the enrolment process.

FC. 2.2.2. The admissions process is clearly defined and implemented, with identified responsible parties, established entry requirements, mandatory documentation, academic validation procedures, formal communication with applicants, and systematic record-keeping of admissions files. The evidence also includes an average admission confirmation time of 2.15 days, which is below the benchmark of five working days. Therefore, the criterion is considered to be met.

FC. 2.2.3 a). The programme has defined a credit recognition process that is publicly available before enrolment and generally aligned with the admission and academic management procedures of the MBA. The documentation

reviewed describes the main recognition pathways and establishes criteria related to professional experience and previous academic studies.

FC. 2.2.3 b). The programme has established regulations and a formal procedure for the recognition of credits, aligned with the criteria set out by CUALIFICAM. The process clearly defines the eligible categories of credit recognition, the required documentation, the individuals responsible for the process, the stages of assessment and decision-making, and the associated record-keeping procedures. In addition, monitoring indicators are provided, showing that one application was processed, 100% of decisions were issued, and the response time was five days, which is below the maximum timeframe established.

FC. 2.2.4. During the visit, evidence was provided to demonstrate the clarity, transparency, signing, registration, etc. of the degree award process.

FC. 2.2.5. During the visit, evidence was provided to demonstrate the clarity, transparency, signing, recording, etc. of the processes relating to academic records.

FC. 2.2.6. The programme has a defined process for the management of academic certificates, covering the application, verification of academic and financial records, issuance, signing, stamping, delivery, and retention of certificates. The procedure clearly identifies the responsible parties, inputs, outputs, records, and stages of the process. It also includes a performance indicator showing an average certificate issuance time of 2.5 days, compared with the benchmark of five working days. Therefore, the criterion is considered to be met.

FC. 2.2.7. The programme has a defined degree-awarding process that includes prior verification of compliance with academic and administrative requirements, degree issuance, signing, communication with the student, delivery or dispatch, record-keeping, and the management of duplicate certificates. The evidence provided includes supporting documentation and a performance indicator relating to issuance times, showing that a provisional certificate is made available within five working days while the final degree certificate is being processed.

PC. 2.2.8.The visit revealed that they do not have a formal annual monitoring and review process in place. Although they do carry out such a review on an informal basis, they do not document it properly with the necessary evidence covering all the processes involved. Evidence of implementation must be provided during the monitoring process.

Dimension 3: Teaching Staff and Training Program

Subdimension 3.1: Teaching Staff

Score: 5.833

SC. 3.1.1 a). The programme provides information about part of the teaching staff, including professional profiles and academic experience. However, in some cases the is no cv information and in the others the information provided consists only of links to LinkedIn profiles, which cannot be considered sufficient or equivalent to a formal academic CV. As a result, it is not possible to fully evaluate whether the teaching staff have the appropriate academic and professional profile for all subjects of the MBA, nor to verify compliance with the requirement that at least 60% of the teaching staff should have a senior professional profile. This issue should be clarified during the evaluation visit by reviewing full academic CVs and complete information on staff assignment. It is suggested that they include a profile of each teacher on the institution's website

PC. 3.1.1 bThe programme formally identifies the individuals responsible for management, coordination and academic oversight, as well as the roles of academic tutor and educational coach assigned to the intake. However, the evidence provided in this section does not allow for a full verification of the suitability of these individuals' professional and teaching profiles for the MBA, as it does not include detailed information on their qualifications, professional experience and teaching experience. Evidence of implementation must be provided during the monitoring process.

SC. 3.1.1 a) The programme provides partial information on the teaching staff, including some references to professional profiles and academic backgrounds. However, in some cases no CV information is available, while in others only links to LinkedIn profiles are provided, which cannot be considered sufficient substitutes for formal academic CVs. Additionally, some of the available links require restricted access (e.g. passwords), preventing

proper review of the documentation. Consequently, it is not possible to fully assess whether the teaching staff meet the academic and professional requirements for all MBA subjects, nor to verify compliance with the requirement that at least 60% of the faculty should have a senior professional profile. Following the visit, it is suggested that, as an improvement, a brief profile of the lecturers be included on the website, in addition to the link to LinkedIn.

SC 3.1.2 b). The evidence provided shows overall student satisfaction with teaching, with an NPS of 44.80 and predominantly favourable qualitative comments about the teaching staff. During the visit, it was noted that the quantitative rating scale is out of 5, and it was suggested that this be changed to a 10-point scale as an area for improvement. Very positive ratings.

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

Score: 4.000

FC. 3.2.1 The cohort includes one academic tutor assigned to a group of 13 enrolled students, resulting in a ratio that comfortably meets the benchmark of one tutor for every 80 participants. In addition, the tutor is linked to modules within the programme as well as to the final project, and holds a senior profile with professional and teaching experience in areas relevant to the MBA. Therefore, the criterion is considered to be met.

FC. 3.2.2. The programme appears to have appropriate support staff and academic assistance structures, with roles and functions that are generally aligned with student support and guidance needs.

Subdimension 3.3: Academic assignment

Score: 2.000

SC. 3.3.1 Regarding the allocation of teaching duties, the programme generally complies with the requirement, as the Programme Management appears to plan and assign the academic workload in alignment with the needs of the curriculum and students, taking into account the profiles, availability, and roles of the academic staff (professors, tutors, coaches, and support staff). During the visit, it became clear that there is a need to formalise all procedures so that the academic project can be properly planned and managed, taking all stakeholders into account. Although this is currently being done to some extent and in a positive manner, it is based on informal, undocumented and sub-optimal processes.

Subdimension 3.4: Training plan

Score: 6.500

FC. 3.4.1. The evidence reviewed demonstrates that the programme is structured in accordance with the expectations associated with a master's level qualification within the EHE Area. The programme clearly defines the graduate profile, qualification level, intended professional outcomes and overall learning objectives of the programme.

SC. 3.4.2 a) Regarding the course guides (teaching guides), the programme generally complies with the requirement, as these appear to be defined in alignment with the structure and objectives of the curriculum. It is, however, suggested to include more detailed information within the guides, such as bibliography, identification of teaching staff, a detailed weekly schedule of activities, internship and a more specific description of the assessment methods. The teaching guides do not follow the format and content required of a teaching guide. In addition to the items mentioned, the competences and skills to be developed in the relevant subject are not included. The visit revealed that there are no formalised, standardised teaching guides. This is suggested as an important area for improvement.

SC. 3.4.2 b) Regarding the course guides, the programme generally complies with the requirement, as these are aligned with the structure and objectives of the curriculum. The guides are coherent with the intended learning outcomes, which are in turn aligned with the learning activities and assessment methods. Although it is noted as an area for improvement that some need to be developed further. Specifically, the assessment section should specify the type and number of assessments to be carried out, as well as the weighting of each one in the final mark. It is also recommended that a weekly schedule of activities be established.The teaching guides do not

adhere to the format and content required of a teaching guide. In addition to the points mentioned, they do not include the competences and skills to be developed in the relevant subject.

SC. 3.4.3 a).The programme provides academic support through tutors, programme coordinators, and coaches who assist students throughout their learning journey. The documentation reviewed describes the tutoring and academic support structure and shows the availability of different support mechanisms. Furthermore, the evidence provided does not clearly demonstrate how the availability schedules of academic staff are formally communicated to students, nor how compliance with tutoring responsibilities is monitored and managed.

SC. 3.4.3 b) The programme provides academic support through tutors, programme coordinators, and coaches who assist students throughout their learning journey. The documentation reviewed describes the tutoring and academic support structure and shows the availability of different support mechanisms. However, access to some of this information requires login credentials, which limits its verification. Furthermore, the evidence provided does not clearly demonstrate how the availability schedules of academic staff are formally communicated to students, nor how compliance with tutoring responsibilities is monitored and managed.

SC. 3.4.4 Once the teaching materials have been reviewed, it is recommended that the content, structure and style be updated and adapted, and that different types of teaching resources and teaching-learning methodologies, or pedagogical innovation, be utilised. This aspect is one of the main areas for improvement identified, and is likely to be updated in line with the needs of students whose profiles are changing and who are highly tech-savvy.

FC 3.4.5 The programme plans, reviews, and communicates the scheduling of modules, learning activities, and assessments, providing students with access to academic calendars and programme planning information. The evidence submitted demonstrates a coherent organisational structure designed to support the achievement of learning outcomes and to minimise scheduling conflicts and overlaps.

Subdimension 3.5: Practical dimension and professional orientation

Score: 4.500

SC. 3.5.1.a). These processes were analysed and clarified during the visit. Improvements are suggested regarding the appropriateness of students producing the final report themselves, as well as the need to systematise the process. At the same time the visit revealed that there is no integrated management process for the Work Placement Scheme, including the necessary sub-processes, tasks, responsible parties and supporting evidence. Suggestions have been made in this regard.

SC. 3.5.1 b) The programme demonstrates a structured and operational internship process, including clear support mechanisms for students, involvement of host organisations, and monitoring during placements. At the same time, the absence of sufficiently detailed and verifiable information on key aspects—such as the structure of the internship pool, allocation procedures, and comprehensive documentation—limits the ability to fully confirm compliance with all requirements.

SC. 3.5.1 c). The programme explains to students how the work placement portal works, the procedure for accessing vacancies and the process for arranging work placement agreements, including the terms and conditions, restrictions and contact details. However, the formal list of existing agreements, the number of places per company and the specific allocation criteria are not fully documented.

FC. 3.5.2. The programme has defined and implemented a structured JE process that includes the management of employment opportunities, employer engagement, application support and the maintenance of job opportunity records. The documentation reviewed describes the workflow, responsibilities and indicators associated with the process, while the evidence provided includes a current portfolio of employment and internship opportunities across a wide range of sectors and organisations. In my view, the evidence demonstrates that students have access to employment opportunities through a structured and operational system that combines formal procedures with personalised support from the Internship Department.

FC. 3.5.3 The programme has defined a Professional Network process that includes students, alumni, faculty members and collaborating organisations, with the objective of promoting networking, collaboration and professional development opportunities.

FC. 3.5.4 a). The programme has defined and implemented a structured PO process aimed at supporting students in their career development and employability. The documentation reviewed includes individual and group

guidance activities, personalised career development plans, workshops, networking events and career counselling services, together with defined records, responsibilities and monitoring indicators.

FC. 3.5.4 b). The programme regularly organises career guidance and employability activities, including induction sessions, CV reviews, one-to-one guidance, masterclasses, ongoing advice and support with finding employment through the job board and work placements.

Dimension 4: Results

Subdimension 4.1: Academic results

Score: 8.000

FC. 4.1.1 a).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.

FC. 3.4.1 b). The teaching activities and assessment methods are effectively implemented throughout the programme, with evidence provided through case studies, coursework, attendance records, grades and the final project. The documentation allows for verification of the consistency between the activities, assessment and intended learning outcomes.

Subdimension 4.2: Student satisfaction

Score: 3.000

PC. 4.2.1. The programme has defined and implemented processes for monitoring student satisfaction with professors and academic support staff involved in the MBA. The documentation reviewed shows the existence of academic supervision, student follow-up, and support mechanisms linked to professors, tutors, and programme coordination activities. The overall structure appears coherent with the support and monitoring needs of the programme. However, quantitative data on student satisfaction with professors, tutors, and academic advisors are not provided, which limits the ability to fully assess the effectiveness of these processes. Evidence of implementation must be provided during the monitoring process.

SC. 4.2.2 The programme has defined and implemented processes for monitoring student satisfaction with the main elements of the MBA, including the training plan, academic support, virtual learning environment, and overall student experience. The documentation reviewed shows the existence of student follow-up, academic supervision, and support mechanisms linked to key components of the programme, suggesting a structure aligned with the monitoring and quality assurance needs of a professional MBA. However, the analysis presented does not evidence the assessment of all required aspects, such as the programme content, website, virtual campus, academic and administrative processes, professional internships, employment services, career guidance, professional network, and overall satisfaction with the programme (particularly in cases where these services have been used).

Subdimension 4.3: Links with Alumni

Score: 3.333

SC. 4.3.1 The programme has defined a formal process for monitoring graduate employability, job placement and alumni satisfaction, including responsibilities, records, indicators and mechanisms for continuous improvement. The documentation reviewed establishes a systematic framework for collecting information on employment outcomes and alumni feedback, and includes indicators related to employment, underemployment and graduate loyalty. However, I have not been able to verify the implementation of this process for the MBA programme through standardised survey results or annual review reports, as no employability or alumni satisfaction data specific to this programme were available at the time of the evaluation.

Subdimension 4.4: Reputation

Score: 4.000

SC 4.4.1. There is evidence of mechanisms aimed at gathering feedback from companies and partner institutions regarding students' internships. However, the supporting evidence is mainly based on aggregated indicators and the continuity of collaborations, without presenting direct results that would allow for sufficiently robust verification of the effective functioning of the satisfaction assessment process.

SC. 4.4.2. The observation highlights that, while there is a clearly structured approach to gathering feedback from collaborating organisations, there is still a lack of tangible evidence demonstrating how this process operates in practice, particularly in terms of available results and documented analyse. There is evidence of a procedure in place to gather feedback from companies and employers regarding graduates, incorporated into the program's quality assurance system. However, the evidence provided focuses mainly on the description of the process, without offering sufficient specific results to analyze employers' perceptions of the graduates.

00664430Y
FEDERICO MORAN
(R: G83351346)

Firmado digitalmente por 00664430Y FEDERICO MORAN (R: G83351346)
Fecha: 2026.07.10 13:41:01 +02'00'

Federico Morán Abad

Director of the Madrimasd Knowledge Foundation