FINAL CERTIFICATION REPORT

Master in Business Communication

Resolution:	**FAVORABLE**
Score:	**84.83**
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: 8.000

FC: 1.1.1 a). The Master's program defines and publishes on its Cualificam webpage two clearly differentiated admission profiles: (1) applicants holding a Bachelor's degree or an equivalent qualification, and (2) applicants with a minimum of three years of documented professional experience in positions requiring competencies equivalent to that academic level. This dual admission pathway ensures that students possess a solid academic or professional foundation before commencing the program. The publication of these admission requirements meets the required standards of transparency and accessibility of information.

FC. 1.1.2 b). The admission profiles are consistent with the level of competency complexity required by the Master's graduate profile, which is focused on senior-level responsibilities in design, coordination, leadership, and innovation. The requirement of a university degree or equivalent professional experience ensures that students possess the cognitive and professional maturity necessary to achieve the intended learning outcomes. Therefore, there is a clear alignment between the entry requirements and the level of qualification that the program is designed to develop.

FC. 1.1.2 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. The available information is consistent with the professional focus of the Master's in Business Communication and with its career opportunities in the field of business communication.

FC. 1.1.2 b)The graduate profile adequately addresses the needs of the sector, aligning with the challenges identified in the program's rationale. The correspondence between the graduate profile and the described career opportunities demonstrates that the curriculum has been designed to provide an effective response to these needs. There is complete consistency between the programme's structure, the distribution of the teaching load and the published learning 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. 1.2.3. During the on-site visit, the extensive list of work placement agreements and the rest of the requested documentation were verified

SC. 1.3.2 Insufficient evidence has been provided to fully verify the existence, scope and added value of the programme's relationships or partnerships with other institutions. Whilst institutional or professional collaborations may exist, their nature, effectiveness and impact on stakeholders will need to be verified during the visit. Evidence of implementation must be provided during the monitoring process.

Subdimension 1.4: Ethics, Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Score: 2.500

FC. 1.4.1. The program has defined a process for handling suggestions, complaints, and appeals, with a corresponding mailbox accessible through the official CUALIFICAM website. Although this mailbox is inherently

available on the Cualificam platform, students should be clearly informed of its existence; therefore, it should be easily accessible via the program's own website or even through the virtual campus

FC. 1.4.2. The programme management makes information publicly available via the CUALIFICAM portal and the programme's website, enabling stakeholders to access key details about the master's degree, its structure, outcomes and relevant academic information. There are no significant shortcomings that would prevent this criterion from being considered met. Awards, press coverage, graduation rates, efficiency indicators, academic performance, and graduate employability rates should be displayed, as well as sustainability reports or non-financial statements. These are also highly relevant data for other stakeholders, such as employers and sponsors.

SC. 1.4.3. a). The program leadership demonstrates a general commitment to the principles of the European Higher Education Area, focusing on improving educational quality, employability, and students' practical training. However, strategic planning within the program needs to be clearly evidenced.

SC. 1.4.3.b). The program leadership demonstrates a general commitment to the principles of the European Higher Education Area, focusing on improving educational quality, employability, and students' practical training. However, strategic planning within the program needs to be clearly evidenced.

Dimension 2: Academic and Administrative Resources and Processes

Subdimension 2.1: Website and Virtual Campus

Score: 11.000

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

FC. 2.1.1 b). The information published on the programme's own website is consistent with that available on CUALIFICAM. Both platforms provide details of the programme, its delivery mode, curriculum structure, entry requirements, graduate profile and key academic elements, with no significant discrepancies apparent.

FC. 2.1.2. The virtual campus provides assurance of reliability, security, and availability. The platform is designed considering key aspects such as security, scalability and load capacity, robustness, system sizing, and the storage of teaching materials, among others.

Subdimension 2.2: Academic and administrative processes

Score: 14.000

FC. 2.2.1. 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. However, no direct access, credentials, or technical evidence of the virtual learning environment were provided during the documentary review. In addition, the documentation does not sufficiently demonstrate the existence of information security measures, system availability guarantees, identity verification mechanisms, or technical performance controls associated with the platform.

FC. 2.2.2. During the visit, evidence was provided to demonstrate the clarity, transparency, etc. of the enrolment process.

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 Master in Business Communication. 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 defined a credit recognition process that is publicly available before enrolment and generally aligned with the admission and academic management procedures of the Master in Business Communication. The documentation reviewed describes the main recognition pathways and establishes criteria related to professional experience and previous academic studies.

FC. 2.2.4. During the visit, evidence was provided to demonstrate the clarity, transparency, etc. of the case management 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. Required 2.2.6. Regarding the management of academic certificates, the programme has defined a complete process covering their issuance and formalisation. The documentation suggests that this process is properly established within the academic administration system. Overall, the process appears to be complete and adequately defined..

FC. Required 2.2.7. During the visit, evidence was provided to demonstrate the clarity, transparency, signing, registration, etc. of the degree award process.

FC. 2.2.8. Regarding the review of the system, the programme has defined a process that supports its periodic evaluation and updating within the academic management framework. Overall, the process appears to be established and appropriately defined

Dimension 3: Teaching Staff and Training Program

Subdimension 3.1: Teaching Staff

Score: 5.833

FC. 3.1.1 a). The programme provides information about part of the teaching staff, including professional profiles and academic experience. However, 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 program, nor to verify compliance with the requirement that at least 60% of the teaching staff 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.

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 Master in Business Communication, 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. 3.1.2 a). The programme provides information about part of the teaching staff, including professional profiles and academic experience. However, the information provided consists only of links to LinkedIn profiles, which cannot be considered sufficient or equivalent to a formal academic 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 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. 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.

PC. 3.1.2 b). The programme does not provide sufficient evidence of recent positive teaching evaluations for the full teaching staff in this or similar 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. Evidence of implementation must be provided during the monitoring process.

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

Score: 4.000

FC. 3.2.1. The programme identifies the academic tutors assigned to participants, and the tutor-to-participant ratio is sufficient in relation to the benchmark of one tutor for every 80 participants. The tutors are responsible for academic support, supervising assignments and monitoring participants' progress, and their profiles are consistent with the programme's requirements.

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: 3.000

FC. 3.1.1. 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).

Subdimension 3.4: Training plan

Score: 6.166

FC. 3.4.1The training programme is structured in accordance with a qualification level equivalent to MECES 3 / EQF 7, defining the graduate's professional profile, the expected work environment and the learning outcomes associated with the various subjects. The academic documentation includes learning outcomes formulated in terms of knowledge, competences and skills.

SC. 3.4.2 a). The programme provides teaching guides for the modules, the final project and the work placements, which are made available via CUALIFICAM and are consistent with the programme's structure. However, it would be advisable to expand on their content to include greater detail regarding the reading list, timetable, teaching staff, methodologies and assessment criteria.

SC. 3.4.2. The teaching guides list the necessary components, although it is noted as an area for improvement that some of these 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 drawn up.

SC. 3.4.3 a) The programme includes academic tutoring and student support mechanisms provided by teaching staff, tutors and the programme co-ordinators. However, it is not sufficiently clear how teaching staff's availability timetables are formally communicated, nor how any breaches of these are monitored.

SC. 3.4.4 b) The programme offers academic support through tutors, programme coordinators, and coaches who guide students throughout their learning process. The documentation reviewed outlines the tutoring system and academic support framework, indicating the presence of various support mechanisms. However, some of this information is only accessible with login credentials, which restricts its full verification. Moreover, the evidence provided does not clearly show how the availability of academic staff is formally communicated to students, nor how adherence to tutoring duties is monitored and ensured.

CP. 3.4.3 b) 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 be utilised, or that innovative teaching approaches be adopted.

FC. 3.4.5. The programme clearly demonstrates that Programme Management effectively plans, reviews, updates, and communicates the schedule of subjects, activities, and assessments, ensuring alignment with the intended learning outcomes and preventing overlaps. A detailed and well-structured calendar is made available to students, presented in a clear and easily accessible manner.

Subdimension 3.5: Practical dimension and professional orientation

Score: 4.500

CS. 3.5.1a). The programme shows that internships are organised through a structured and operational framework, with clearly defined support mechanisms for students, active involvement of host organisations, and appropriate monitoring throughout the placement period. However, the lack of sufficiently detailed and verifiable information on certain key aspects—such as the composition and management of the internship pool, allocation procedures, and comprehensive supporting documentation—limits the ability to fully confirm compliance with all requirements. These processes were analysed and clarified during the visit. Improvements have been suggested regarding the appropriateness of students producing the report themselves, as well as the need to systematise the process.

SC 3.5.2. b). The programme shows that internships are organised through a structured and operational framework, with clearly defined support mechanisms for students, active involvement of host organisations, and appropriate monitoring throughout the placement period. However, the lack of sufficiently detailed and verifiable information on certain key aspects—such as the composition and management of the internship pool, allocation procedures, and comprehensive supporting documentation—limits the ability to fully confirm compliance with all requirements

SC. 3.5.1 c) The programme informs students about the availability of work placements and the general procedures for organising them. However, there is insufficient evidence of formal communication regarding existing agreements, the number of places available per organisation, or the specific criteria for allocating work placements.

FC: 3.5.2. The programme has established and implemented a structured JE process that encompasses the management of employment opportunities, engagement with employers, application support, and the maintenance of job opportunity records. The reviewed documentation outlines the workflow, roles, and performance indicators associated with this process. Additionally, the evidence provided includes an up-to-date portfolio of employment and internship opportunities across a broad range of sectors and organisations. Overall, the available information suggests that students are granted access to employment opportunities through a well-organised and operational system that integrates formal procedures with personalised support from the Internship Department.

FC. 3.5.3 The programme has established a Professional Network framework that integrates students, alumni, academic staff, and partner organisations, with the aim of fostering networking, collaboration, and opportunities for professional growth.

FC. 3.4.6.a) The programme has established and put into practice a structured PO process designed to enhance students' career development and employability. The reviewed documentation details a range of activities, including individual and group guidance sessions, personalised career development plans, workshops, networking events, and career counselling services, all supported by clearly defined records, roles, and monitoring indicators.

FC. 3.5.3 b).The programme delivers a range of professional orientation and employability initiatives designed to support students in their transition into the labour market.

Dimension 4: Results

Subdimension 4.1: Academic results

Score: 8.000

FC. 4.1.1 a).The programme delivers a range of professional orientation and employability initiatives designed to support students in their transition into the labour market.

FC. 4.1.1 b). The planned learning activities and assessment methods are delivered in line with the learning plan and enable the acquisition of learning outcomes to be assessed. The available evidence demonstrates the use of activities, assignments, case studies, projects and marking schemes that are aligned with the intended competences.

Subdimension 4.2: Student satisfaction

Score: 3.000

CP. 4.2.1 The program has a defined process for analyzing student satisfaction and provides evidence regarding the evaluation of teaching and faculty performance. However, the information presented does not sufficiently allow for an assessment of student satisfaction with other groups involved in the program's delivery, such as academic tutors, coaches, advisors, and support staff.Evidence of implementation must be provided during the monitoring process.

CS 4.2.2. The program has mechanisms in place to analyze student satisfaction and provides evidence on key aspects of the Master's program. However, the lack of specific data in some areas, along with the planned

inclusion of such indicators in future assessments, prevents full verification of compliance with all requirements established under this criterion.

Subdimension 4.3: Links with Alumni

Score: 3.333

SC. 4.3.1. The program has mechanisms for monitoring graduate employability, job placement, and alumni outcomes. However, the documentation provided does not allow for conclusive verification of the systematic implementation of alumni satisfaction surveys or the periodic analysis of their results.

Subdimension 4.4: Reputation

Score: 4.000

CS. 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.

FC. 4.4.2. 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 proces.

00664430Y
FEDERICO MORAN
(R: G83351346)

Firmado digitalmente por 00664430Y FEDERICO MORAN (R: G83351346)
Fecha: 2026.07.10 13:41:36 +02'00'

Federico Morán Abad

Director of the Madrimasd Knowledge Foundation