



Vlindersingel 220
NL-3544 VM Utrecht
+31 30 87 820 87
www.AeQui.nl
info@AeQui.nl

Master in Theatre Zuyd University of Applied Sciences

*Report of the limited programme assessment
27 and 28 November 2019*

Utrecht, The Netherlands
February 2020
www.AeQui.nl
Assessment Agency for Higher Education

Colophon

Programme

Zuyd University of Applied Sciences

Master in Theatre

Location: Maastricht

Mode of study: fulltime

Studyload: 85 EC

Croho: 40118

Result of institutional assessment: positive

Panel

drs. Raoul van Aalst, chair

Tom Bonte, domain expert

drs. Lucia van Heteren, domain expert

Julia Nabbe, student

drs. Linda van der Grijsparde, secretary

The panel was presented to the NVAO for approval.

The assessment was conducted under responsibility of AeQui VBI

Vlindersingel 220

3544 VM Utrecht

The Netherlands

www.AeQui.nl

This document is best printed in duplex

Table of contents

Colophon.....	2
Table of contents	3
Summary	4
Introduction	6
1. Intended learning outcomes.....	7
2. Teaching-learning environment.....	9
3. Student assessment.....	14
4. Achieved learning outcomes	16
Attachments.....	19
Attachment 1 Assessment committee.....	20
Attachment 2 Programme of the assessment	21
Attachment 3 Documents.....	22

Summary

On 27 en 28 November 2019 an assessment committee of AeQui visited the Master programme Theatre at Hogeschool Zuyd. The committee judges that the programme meets each standard; the overall quality of the programme **meets the standard**.

Intended learning outcomes

The assessment committee assesses that the intended learning outcomes **meets the standard**. The programme has a clear and ambitious profile aiming to prepare performance practitioners to (re)define their position within the changing contemporary performing arts fields. The programme is based on the intended learning outcomes as set in the national Theatre profile, together with some programme specific basic values. These intended learning outcomes are well described in terms of level and orientation. The professional field participates in the reflection on the relevance of these intended learning outcomes.

Teaching-learning environment

The assessment committee assesses that the teaching-learning environment **meets the standard**. The programme of 85 EC is designed in a conducive manner to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The programme provides an extensive programme of knowledge and skills around recent developments in the rapidly changing contemporary performing arts field, that are necessary for the students to autonomously define a position in this field. The programme ties closely in with the qualifications of the incoming students and the selective character of the programme safeguards its high quality. The programme is set up around three lines: artistic project, artistic research and project plan and is divided in three blocks. These three lines are well balanced and strengthen each other. The programme is highly integrated with the workplace of students. Student cohorts are small, ensuring a highly interactive learning and tutoring environment with a great deal of attention for the student's individual needs, performance and development. The staff is highly qualified, enthusiastic

and supportive for the students. The accommodation and material facilities (infrastructure) are sufficient for the realisation of the programme.

Student assessment

The assessment committee assesses that the student assessment **meets the standard**. The assessments support the students' own learning processes. Each of the three blocks concludes with formative and summative assessment moments that follow the development of the three lines: artistic project, artistic research and project plan. The assessments in the first two blocks are assessed by one assessor from the team. The three assessments in the third block are assessed by a jury, consisting of three assessors. The students receive detailed written feedback on their performances from the assessors. In this feedback, the relation to the competences could be improved. The quality of examinations is sufficiently safeguarded and meets the quality standards.

Achieved learning outcomes

The assessment committee assesses that the achieved learning outcomes **meet the standard**. The students reach a high level of achievement and are well prepared to autonomously redefine their position in the changing contemporary performing arts field. The achievement of the intended learning outcomes is demonstrated by the results of the three graduation assessments. As visible in these products, the quality of the students' craftsmanship is high. A thorough thinking process is also visible in the products.

Recommendations

The young programme has already realised a solid level. In order to bring the programme to an even higher level of quality in the future, the committee issues the following recommendations:

- The committee suggests to provide more periodic team consultations. Especially in a young programme, this could be a way to reinforce assessment, and interpreting dynamics in the student-group more broadly, for example.
- The committee suggests the theoretical workshops could be further strengthened by additional attention to the latest developments in the arts, including e.g. technology, diversity and inclusivity.
- The committee supports the intention of the programme to make efforts to attract more students with different backgrounds. As these students do not necessarily fit the formats of the existing theatre landscape in the Netherlands and Flanders, this can be a challenging task, but all the more important to an inclusive development of that landscape.
- With regard to assessment, the committee suggests to switch to a two-point scale with fail and pass, which may better fit the focus on professional growth of the student.

All standards of the NVAO assessment framework are assessed positively; the assessment committee therefore awards a positive recommendation for the accreditation of the programme.

On behalf of the entire assessment committee,
Utrecht, February 2020

drs. Raoul van Aalst
Chair

drs. Linda van der Grijspaarde
Secretary

Introduction

This report describes the limited programme assessment of the master's programme in Theatre offered by the Toneelacademie. The Toneelacademie is part of Zuyd University of Applied Sciences.

The institute

The Toneelacademie was established in 1950, initially as a Catholic counterpart to the Amsterdam Theater School. Since 1955, the academy has been located in the partly seventeenth-century building complex in the center of Maastricht. Next to the master in Theatre, the core activities of the Toneelacademie are the full-time Bachelor's degree in Theater and the part-time Bachelor's degree in Theater in Education. In addition, there is a range of masterclasses, workshops, subject-specific conferences and festivals.

The programme

The programme is a one-and-half year full-time master programme of professional orientation, amounting to 85 ECTS. The programme started in September 2016 with its first cohort of students. In September 2019 the fourth cohort started.

The programme runs in English. The reason for the use of this language of instruction is twofold. First, it prepares students for an international field of work or career, which has rapidly become a reality in the field of performing arts. Secondly, it allows for a stronger teaching- and learning environment, because it opens the programme to both international students and teachers. This is important to the programme, as it recognises diversity as fundamental to its goals. The committee agrees with the motivation of the programme.

In the programme, artists with an acquired artistic identity can explore new artistic practices and develop their qualities as an artistic researcher.

The programme is set up around three lines that stretch from the start of the programme to the

end. Students develop an artistic project (the heart of your path), they develop artistic research and work on their project plan.

The assessment

The Toneelacademie assigned AeQui VBI to perform a quality assessment of its master in Theatre. In close co-operation with the programme management, AeQui convened an independent and competent assessment committee. A preparatory meeting with representatives of the programme was held to exchange information and plan the date and programme of the site-visit.

In the run-up to the site visit, the assessment committee has studied the self-evaluation report on the programme and reviewed all eight graduation projects accepted during the past years. The findings of the report and the results of the review of the graduation projects were input for discussions during the visit.

The site visit was carried out on 27 and 28 November 2019 according to the programme presented in attachment 2. The committee has assessed the programme in an independent manner. At the end of the visit, the chair of the assessment committee presented the initial findings of the committee to representatives of the programme and the institution.

In this document, the committee is reporting on its findings, considerations and conclusions according to the NVAO framework for limited programme assessment. A draft version of the report was sent to the programme management. Its reaction has led to this final version of the report.

1. Intended learning outcomes

The assessment committee assesses that the intended learning outcomes **meet the standard**. The programme has a clear and ambitious profile aiming to prepare performance practitioners to (re)define their position within the changing contemporary performing arts fields. The programme is based on the intended learning outcomes as set in the national Theatre profile, together with some programme specific basic values. These intended learning outcomes are well described in terms of level and orientation. The professional field participates in the reflection on the relevance of these intended learning outcomes.

Findings

The programme focuses on performance practitioners, offering an experimental environment, which provides them with a context and a network to develop new aspects in their artistic practice. The essential goal is that the master's students are aware of the important developments within the changing contemporary performing arts field, the art world, and society, and can autonomously (re)define their position within these realms.

The programme is based on the learning outcomes as set in the national master programme profile Theatre. The learning outcomes are described in the following seven competences, each divided in five to seven indicators:

1. Creative ability: The graduate creates meaningful theatrical work that reflects his personal artistic vision and ambition
2. Professional ability: The graduate uses broad instrumental skills and knowledge professionally in theatrical products in new, unfamiliar and complex situations
3. Capacity for research and reflection: Through (artistic) research and reflection, the graduate develops his judgement and research methods and can use these in a substantiated way in an artistic and social context.
4. Capacity for development: The graduate is capable of continually developing and deepening his own work and methods, and thus contributes to the development of his field and of society.
5. Entrepreneurial ability: The graduate is capable of developing his ambitions effectively in

an interdisciplinary and national/international professional field.

6. Capacity for communication: The graduate is capable of effective interaction within a wide range of professional contexts.
7. Capacity for collaboration: The graduate, in his capacity, contributes independently and actively to the creation of a theatrical product.

In addition to the national competences, the programme adapts the following basic values as intended learning outcomes:

- The generosity to seek, to fail, to change, and to open that search to others.
- The focus on a collective context as the locus of development of new ideas that enrich the individual (artistic) trajectory.
- The fundamental importance for the creation of a diverse and inclusive environment beginning with a belief in the richness of difference.
- Horizontality as input for learning situations, departing from a basic curiosity in one another and the belief that everyone is a specialist.

Artistic research as a tool for artistic development has been given a very important role in the programme. To this end, the programme has worked closely with the Maastricht University/Faculty of Culture and Social Sciences and the Research Centre for Arts, Autonomy and the Public Sphere at Zuyd Hogeschool. The direct and continuous dialogue with theatre professionals, inside and outside the programme, is the other important

systematic input in the development of the programme.

The programme intends to be responsive to both the needs of professional artists who want to grow and to remain vigilant in observing developments in the professional landscape. When the programme's identity has stabilised somewhat and there is a larger group of alumni, the programme intends to investigate whether the realised learning outcomes are effective and have had a positive effect on the trajectory of artists who participated in the programme, and whether their programme retains a lasting importance in the artistic field.

Considerations

The committee established that the master programme offers the students the possibility to gain skills on master level that are important for the optimisation of their individual artistic growth process. The profile is reflected into the

competences that the programme presents as its intended learning outcomes. According to the committee, these competences, divided in indicators, are well described in terms of level and orientation and are in line with the domain-specific requirements for theatre. The programme has a clear target group in mind: it offers a context and a network of performance professionals who want to develop their competences in a laboratory environment or want to introduce a new aspect to their existing artistic practice.

The committee appreciates the reflection of the programme on the relevance of the intended learning outcomes and the involvement of the professional field in this reflection.

Based on the interviews and assessment of the underlying documentation, the assessment committee establishes that the intended learning outcomes **meet the standard**.

2. Teaching-learning environment

The assessment committee assesses that the teaching-learning environment **meets the standard**. The programme of 85 EC is designed in a conducive manner to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The programme provides an extensive programme of knowledge and skills around recent developments in the rapidly changing contemporary performing arts field, that are necessary for the students to autonomously define a position in this field. The programme ties closely in with the qualifications of the incoming students and the selective character of the programme safeguards its high quality. The programme is set up around three lines: artistic project, artistic research and project plan and is divided in three blocks. These three lines are well balanced and strengthen each other. The programme is highly integrated with the workplace of students. Student cohorts are small, ensuring a highly interactive learning and tutoring environment with a great deal of attention for the student's individual needs, performance and development. The programme is working on putting together as diverse a student group as possible, considering discipline, age, sex, gender, cultural background and nationality. However, the number of artists with different cultural backgrounds, that do not necessarily fit the formats of the existing theatre landscape in the Netherlands and Flanders, could be higher. The staff is highly qualified, enthusiastic and supportive for the students. The accommodation and material facilities (infrastructure) are sufficient for the realisation of the programme.

Findings

Contents and structure

The programme is set up around three lines. The heart of the programme is the development of an artistic project. Besides, the students develop artistic research and work on their project plan. The artistic project accumulates to the master proof. This is presented as a performance (installation) in the cultural field. The artistic research accompanies the development of the artistic project. It can be closely related in theme, but can also highlight a broader topic or aligned motif. The artistic research leads to a critical reflection. The critical reflection can take many forms and the best form to communicate this process is informed by the research itself. The track project plan helps the students to realize the artistic project. It concerns the logistical and organizational share of realizing an artistic project and trains the students to think about their preferred work environment. These three lines are intertwined; every meeting or assignment can be of help to the research, the project or the project plan.

The first year contains of two blocks of 30 EC each. The third block of 15 EC starts at the beginning of

the second year, but can be followed in the students own pace in the finalization of their project and research in that phase.

The first block has a focus on organized meetings and workshops, and is termed as the exploration phase.

The second block is less organized and is seen as the integration phase. From the phase of input and acquiring new skills in method and research, the second block asks of students to integrate the new information into a final plan on how to realize the artistic project and artistic research. The end of the second block marks an important evaluation moment in the programme. Students are ready to realize their master proof and further their artistic research with a concrete research question.

The third block is the realization phase. The students create their master proof to finalize the artistic project, and translate the process of their artistic research in a critical reflection. There are few organised meetings. This final block concludes the transition from an organized programme to a self-organized itinerary.

The organised part of the programme takes place on Mondays and Tuesdays. On these days, there is a threefold programme: a workshop programme, a mentoring programme, and the set-up of a reflexive community.

For the students who start the programme, the workshop programme is a compulsory part of their programme. Students of the third block are explicitly invited to the workshops of block 1 and 2. The alumni are also kept informed and are always welcome. The curation of the workshop programme is defined by a speculative look at current trends in the performing arts landscape, transdisciplinarity, the broader art world, and society. Workshops are short and many, so students receive a multitude of input from different angles. The emphasis in the programme is primarily on workshops that focus on artistic research and its methodologies. The other six competences are also taken into consideration in the workshop programme. Craftmanship as one of these competences is relatively underrepresented in the workshop programme because through the selection process it can be assumed that the artists already have an established skill set in their craft when starting the programme.

The workshop *Travel Companions* is the only longer workshop, lasting twelve sessions in the first block. This workshop starts from an academic input on artistic research and focuses on communicative and analytical skills (spoken and written). Students develop a shared language to speak about (their) artistic research. As part of the first block, a solid introduction into Art Theory and History is provided through a cooperation with Maastricht University.

The students the committee spoke to are positive about the workshops. In the student chapter, a student describes this as follows: 'Diversity of the workshops and academic focus points: unique in that I felt encouraged to open myself to any form of artistic input and other practices and at the

same time find the point at which to gather my thoughts and apply them to my practice.'

The programme is convinced that the reflexive community formed by the student group is the most important and valuable gift of the Master's. Not as an end in itself, but as the rich breeding ground for an individual trajectory. This has been confirmed by the students the committee spoke to and is confirmed in the Student Chapter. In the Student Chapter, students write the following: 'the true strength of this programme; a diverse group of people who get to know each other over the course of the programme in various ways, during which everyone can share insights and experience as well as receiving them.' And: 'Most of all the master in theatre has given me a safe space, where in all openness I found peers to relate to and together question what theatre can and should be, who we want to be as creators, and where I want to go.'

Students compile an identity kit to get a better insight into their competences, to make considered choices about how they want to put them into operation, and to determine which competences they want to give extra attention to. The identity kit is an artistic self-definition with competences put into operation, created in the first block of the programme. At every feedback moment – both in formative and summative assessments – the identity kit is used as a benchmark and reference for peers, the team, workshop leaders, and evaluators.

Incoming students

There are three selection moments per year (March, June, and September). Prospective students are encouraged to contact the team before the official selection procedure to check whether the programme is the right fit for them as an informal first selection. Candidates must have a bachelor's degree in the performing arts, or a different bachelor's degree combined with demonstrated relevant practical experience in the performing arts. The selection dossier includes a programme vitae, a motivation letter, a description of

the artistic project and the artistic research that form the core of the Master's programme, copies of the necessary diplomas, and a portfolio. Candidates also bring supporting material that documents their professional context and their contacts around production possibilities. They can be invited to an interview on the basis of their registration file.

The selection committee for the programme is composed of the programme coordinator and two mentors. In the conversation with the applicants, their artistic identity and context, their motivation, their reflexivity, openness for a collective environment, and their expectations are being considered. An additional assignment is a possibility.

Staff

The programme is offered by, among others, the workshop organisers, the mentors and professionals invited for feedback and assessments. According to the self-evaluation document, they are prominent and pioneering artists and/or researchers in Dutch, Belgian, and international art contexts with a great attention for research in the Arts. For long-term relationships, besides artistic excellence, the most important qualities are the competence to accompany the development and growth of artists, the flexibility to relate to very different artistic universes, and the willingness to think together about an artistic pedagogical project.

Infrastructure

The home base for the programme is the Toneelacademie. The facilities it offers are available to the programme. The programme has its own workspace. This is important for the development of the identity of the programme. Along with the workshops at the academy, there is also a conscious policy to go and meet artists in their own habitat within their personal network. Also, the Master Proof performances, which are presented in a professional context, are moments when the whole group through open rehearsals

and premieres crosses the threshold of different professional houses.

Tutoring and student information

The generic nature of the workshops means they cannot respond directly to the very diverse and specific requirements of individual artists in terms of skill development. To this end, students are able to use an individual mentoring budget of fifty mentoring hours for their specific trajectory, to be distributed over artistic research and artistic project. In this individual mentoring, the students concentrate on those competences that they specifically want to develop and, based on this, they choose their personal mentors (scientists, theoreticians, specialised professionals, artists from their own or some other discipline, etc.).

In addition, mentoring by mentors closely involved in the programme, is a compulsory part of the programme and is often linked to specific assessment moments within the course. In this generic mentoring, attention is paid to all the national competences with the focus depending on the specialty of the mentor. The mentoring with the coordinator is continuous throughout the programme and each student has at least two encounters with him during each block. Discussion subjects are the general well-being of the student in the programme and every subject that this will raise.

Besides the mentoring by the coordinator, in block 1 there is an individual mentoring session foreseen around the artistic project plan and two collective mentoring sessions on artistic research. In block 2 there is individual mentoring around the artistic project and around artistic research. In block 3 individual mentoring is organised around the artistic research trajectory.

Considerations

The committee has established that the contents of the programme in the three blocks enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The programme is highly integrated with the

workplace of students. The three lines (artistic research, project plan and development of an artistic project) are well balanced and strengthen each other. The more theoretical workshops are thorough in form and content, and thus provide a solid basis for the students. The committee believes these workshops could be further strengthened by additional attention to the latest developments in the arts, including e.g. technology, diversity and inclusivity.

The second year is more student-driven. The committee suggests to add some compulsory meetings in this third block, in accordance with wishes from students, who feel the difference between the first and second year is too big. They are fed by the community in the first year and would wish to continue this in the second. A possibility according to the students is to make the 'state of the art' presentations compulsory, so students see each other's work and learn from each other.

The committee feels the teaching-learning concept structures the programme and is supportive for the learning process of the students. Students dare to rediscover or reinvent themselves as an artist. In a good way, everyone gets an 'identity crisis'.

A strong feature of the programme is its small scale which stimulates interactive learning and provides ample opportunities for feedback between students and staff. The committee suggests that students learn more methodologies to provide feedback. Although there is a good atmosphere in which students feel challenged to give feedback to each other, they indicated that they do not always feel well equipped for doing this.

The committee is enthusiastic about the strong mentoring environment with a great deal of attention for the student's individual needs, performance and development. With the mentoring system and the introduction of the identity kit, the

programme gives opportunities for personalized, deep learning.

According to the committee, the programme ties in closely with the qualifications of the incoming students. The selective character of the programme safeguards the high quality of the programme. Furthermore, it leads to a motivated, ambitious and talented cohort of students. The assessment committee feels that the admission procedure functions well and is informative for students and the management.

The committee considers it a strength of the programme that artists with different backgrounds are brought together. By pushing the boundaries of the performative, with amongst others the visual arts, the socio-cultural field and activism, the programme creates an environment where the student group functions as a reflexive community in a theatre laboratory. The committee noted that the programme is actively working to create as diverse a student group as possible, considering discipline, age, sex, gender, cultural background and nationality. However, the committee agrees with the programme management that the number of artists with different backgrounds could be higher. The committee supports the intention of the programme to make efforts to attract more students with different backgrounds. The committee both recognises the difficulty, and the importance of this, as these students do not necessarily fit the formats of the existing theatre landscape in the Netherlands and Flanders.

The assessment committee observes that the staff team is highly qualified for the realization of the programme in terms of content and educational expertise. They are very motivated to work with this specific group of students. The students have ample personal contacts with the teaching staff, who are easily accessible. They are recognized within the work field. The committee appreciates the increasing use of guest lecturers to accelerate the possibility of cultural diversity. The committee suggests to provide more periodic team consul-

tations. This could be a way to reinforce assessment and to interpret dynamics in the group more broadly for example.

The infrastructure, such as accommodation and material facilities, is sufficient for the realization of the programme. The committee notes that when students start pushing technological boundaries in their work, this may require the programme to additionally (find ways to) provide for this in its facilities and support.

The committee agrees with the programme that written manuals, protocols, and contextualization should be concretized. Students do not always feel sufficiently informed, the committee noticed.

The committee established that the programme is aware that a sufficient provision of information is important in a programme that makes the students responsible for determining their own frame of reference and plans to improve this.

Based on the interviews and assessment of the underlying documentation, the assessment committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

3. Student assessment

The assessment committee assesses that the student assessment **meets the standard**. The assessments support the students' own learning processes. Each of the three blocks concludes with formative and summative assessment moments that follow the development of the three lines: artistic project, artistic research and project plan. The assessments in the first two blocks are assessed by one assessor from the team. The three assessments in the third block are assessed by a jury, consisting of three assessors. The students receive detailed written feedback on their performances from the assessors. In this feedback, the relation to the competences could be improved. The quality of examinations is sufficiently safeguarded and meets the quality standards.

Findings

As described, the development trajectory of the students is given form in three lines throughout the programme: A performance project that is realised in the professional field, the project plan of that performance and an artistic research trajectory. Each block concludes with formative and summative assessment moments that follow the development of these three lines through the three blocks of the programme. The assessment system consists of the following assessments:

End of the first block

- Artistic Research I: Final Paper Travel Companions (15 EC);
- Project Plan I: Production and Organisation I (10 EC);
- State of the Art I (formative assessment).

End of the second block

- Artistic Research II: Research proposal 2.0 (15 EC);
- Project Plan II: Production and organisation 2 (10 EC);
- Artistic Project II: Preparation for Master Proof (10 EC);
- State of the Art II (formative assessment).

End of the third block

- Artistic Project III: Master Proof (15 EC);
- Project Plan III: Evaluation production dossier (2 EC);
- Artistic Research III: Critical Reflection (8 EC).

The assessments in the first two blocks are assessed by one assessor from the team. The three assessments in the third block are assessed by a jury, consisting of three assessors. In addition, there is a continuous feedback that adopts different, more informal forms (in workshops, peer-to-peer, mentoring, state of the art, etc.).

All assessments are constructed with standardised assessment forms with different emphasis depending on the assessment component. Students are informed in advance of the criteria used in the assessment and are explicitly asked to indicate the competences that are important to them within the specific assessment and the associated feedback.

The Assessment Committee guarantees the quality of the assessment and of the achieved learning outcomes by designating qualified assessors, monitoring the multiple-eyes principle, and through consultation with the field of study on the master's level of the programme. The assessment committee assesses the tailor-made pathways in which the assessment of artistic competences is always a compulsory part.

Considerations

The committee has established that the programme has an adequate assessment system and

procedures. The assessment procedures are sufficiently implemented in the programme. The assessments are aligned with the learning outcomes. The committee sees a clear progression in the system over the years, where the programme is looking for a suitable balance between communication, institutionalization and formalization. The committee appreciates the implementation of the identity-kit in the programme. This ensures that the personal learning objectives of the students are linked to the assessment and to the feedback on the performance of the students.

The assessment forms provide scope for informal input, embedded in a formal system. The quality of the written feedback from assessors is good. The explanations per competence are strong and detailed. According to the committee, the link to the indicators of the competences could be improved to show the relationship between the student's starting point and his growth. It is now visible to a limited extent what the student has already brought in competences and qualities and

what the Master's degree has brought. In addition, the traceability can be better for the student why the assessment is insufficient, sufficient or good. The committee suggests to switch to a two-point scale with fail and pass, which may better fit the focus on professional growth. The value of the performance can be stated in the feedback.

According to the committee, the Board of Examiners performs thoroughly and pro-actively its tasks to control the quality of the exams, the assessment procedures and master projects. The Board shows good knowledge of the programme and its assessment.

Based on the interviews and assessment of the underlying documentation, the assessment committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard.**

4. Achieved learning outcomes

The assessment committee assesses that the achieved learning outcomes **meet the standard**. The students reach a high level of achievement and are well prepared to autonomously redefine their position in the changing contemporary performing arts field. The achievement of the intended learning outcomes is demonstrated by the results of the three graduation assessments. As visible in these products, the quality of the students' craftsmanship is high. A thorough thinking process is also visible in the products.

Findings

The individual development trajectory of the students in the three lines artistic project, artistic research, and project plan leads to three graduation assessments: a Master Proof, a Critical Reflection, and an evaluation of Production Plan.

The artistic project is realized in the professional field with professional partners who are part of the working context of the artist. The presence of this professional context is one of the criteria for the admission in the programme. Another possibility is that the student is committed to the exploration of a new professional context to start the Master's. In that case, the team will accompany the artist in the development of this new network and context for the artistic project. The professional context can adopt very different and radical forms. Depending on the artistic ambitions of the student, the Master Proof can be a cutting-edge performance on the border between visual arts and theatre, educational theatre, community theatre, a fashion event, an installation in public space, etc.

The Master Proof is assessed on performative and performance qualities by a jury consisting of (at least) three members. The jury consists of a juror from the professional context of the project (with knowledge of the development of the trajectory in that context), a juror from the team of the Master's (who knows the development of the student in the Master's), and a jury member from the professional field with (artistic or other) affinities with the concept of the project (but without specific knowledge of the student and project). The jury

member from the team contextualizes the moment of assessment within the programme and explains the assessment forms that serve as a guideline for the three jurors. The jury acts as a formal examiner and sets out the written final assessment.

In block 3, the student gives shape to the Critical Reflection in a format that communicates the research. The programme does not commit to a written text as the final communication form for the research, from the belief that artistic research also needs to be an investigation into its form of communication. So far, this research into the right form for the communication of research has led to the following critical reflections: an essay, a portfolio, a podcast, a lecture-performance, a film essay, and finally a cross between a performance, a guided exhibition, a debate, and a choreography. An important decision, which is linked to the content and form of the research, is the choice of the target audience for communication.

The jury for the Critical Reflection is composed according to the same logic as that of the Master Proof and functions in the same way. In order to conclude their project plan, students are asked to reflect, in addition to the complete project plan with the handling of the financial organization, also (briefly) on the logistical, organizational, and financial elaboration of the artistic project and how all these elements have influenced the artistic project. Or another individual assignment is given to the student who fits their development needs and trajectory.

The third phase of the project plan is assessed by the jury who assesses the Master Proof and follows the same procedure.

Considerations

The committee assessed the eight completed graduation projects of the programme, consisting of a Master Proof, a Critical Reflection and an evaluation of the Production Plan. The committee established that they met the requirements for graduation. The judgments of the juries are similar to the judgments of the committee. The goal of the programme is to deliver professionals who know the most important developments within the changing contemporary performing arts field, art world, and society, and autonomously define a position. According to the committee, the quality of the master projects illustrate that the students have achieved this goal. As autonomous artists, the alumni have developed their competences in a way that suits the intended learning outcomes, but also in a way that fits with their personal needs regarding concrete artistic positioning. It has become clear to the committee that the quality of the students' craftsmanship is high. A thorough thinking process is also visible in the products. The self-reflections have really been lived through: what has the process done to the student as an artist? The results are sustainable; they are also applicable to the work that the

alumni will do after graduation. The presentation of the written work of the students stood out positively: it looks very professional and applies to the chosen theme.

During the site visit, the committee has seen four productions (a phase in the programme called 'state of the art') that form the basis for the final Master Proof. The committee is impressed by the high quality of these productions. They clarify clearly, together with the final products, what the profile of the programme is and what it has to offer.

As the young programme only has a few graduates, it is still limited to see what the contribution to the professional field is. The committee is, based on the documentation and the discussions, confident that the professional field will increasingly appreciate the added value of the alumni on artistic deepening and renewal and will use the programme more and more as a support in their accompaniment of artists.

Based on the interviews and assessment of the underlying documentation, the assessment committee establishes that the programme **meets this standard**.

Attachments

Attachment 1 Assessment committee

drs. Raoul R. van Aalst	Programmamanager bij TenneT
drs. Tom Bonte	Algemeen en artistiek directeur Beurschouwburg Brussel
drs. Lucia D.M.E. van Heteren	Universitair docent Kunsten, Cultuur en Media, RUG
Julia Nabbe	Student UU

Attachment 2 Programme of the assessment

Toneelacademie Maastricht
Lenculenstraat 31-33

Wednesday 27 November

11.00	Arrival committee
11.15	Tour of the Toneelacademie
11.45-13.00	Internal consultation committee
13.00-13.30	Lunch
13.30-14.30	Meeting with management
14.30-15.00	Showcase
15.00-16.15	Meeting with students
16.15-18.00	Three showcases

Thursday 28 November

9.15-10.00	Internal meeting committee
10.00-11.00	Meeting with staff
11.00-12.00	Meeting with alumni and work field
12.00-13.00	Lunch
13.00-14.00	Meeting about quality assurance (assessment board, quality advisor)
14.00-15.00	Internal consultation committee
15.00-15.15	Oral report findings committee
16.00-17.30	Development dialogue between programme and committee

Attachment 3 Documents

- Self-evaluation Document Mater in Theatre, Toneelacademie. November 2019.
- Education and Examination Regulations 2019-2020
- Manual Master in Theatre
- Year Programmes
- Example application dossier & communication
- Examples of assessments & workshops
- Example Identity Kit
- Overview staff
- Overview students
- Guidelines graduation
- Graduation Projects of eight students