Postbus 5050
NL-3502 JB Utrecht
+31 30 87 820 87
www.AeQui.nl
info@AeQui.nl

Master in Theatre

Zuyd University of Applied Sciences

Advisory report of the assessment of the existing programme
24-25 November 2025

Summary

On 24-25 November 2025, the master's programme in Theatre of Zuyd University of Applied Sciences was assessed. The panel's overall judgement is positive. The programme comprises 85 EC and aims to offer professional performance practitioners a context in which they examine their artistic process and explore new artistic paths, using artistic research as a tool for their development.

Intended learning outcomes

The domain-specific requirements, formulated in seven national competences at level 7 of the National Qualification Framework, are the basis for the programme's intended learning outcomes. Students use these competences as a point of reference to define their individual trajectory through the programme. The panel appreciates that the programme is strongly linked to the work field. Students are active professionals, and the programme involves members of the professional field as teachers, mentors and assessors. This ensures that the programme is responsive to the needs of professional artists and to developments in the field.

The panel thus concludes that the programme meets this standard.

Teaching-learning environment

The teaching-learning environment is organised as a self-learning community and horizontal network. Teachers and students constantly exchange and share knowledge and practices, which helps students to develop into reflexive practitioners. Students and alumni describe the programme as a safe and generous environment to experiment and explore new directions. Mentoring sessions are an important part of the programme, addressing both the evolution of the student in the training and the student's general well-being. Students find their mentors very helpful, not only in negotiating their study path, but also in practical matters such as extending their network. The building is currently not suitable for students with physical disabilities, but in a broader sense the programme always makes tailormade solutions for students if extra support is needed.

The curriculum is organised in three blocks. The first block offers weekly two-day workshop sessions. The second block requires more self-organisation. The focus shifts to mentoring and the development of the students' individual trajectories, resulting in a project and research plan. In the third block, students are completely self-organised and work on the completion of their artistic project and research. At the end of each block, all students and teachers come together in the so-called State of the Art-sessions, where students present their work and get feedback. Sessions are scheduled on Mondays and Tuesdays only, enabling students to combine their studies with (professional) commitments.

The intake and selection process is well-designed and ensures a good match between students and programme. The recent intake (5 students) is not in line with the programme's ambition. The programme feels the need for a stronger visibility in order to attract more students. The panel advises formulating the programme's vision and didactic approach more explicitly, on the basis of a narrative shared by all team members, and including its unique selling points as formulated convincingly by students and alumni during the site visit.

Because of the international character of the artistic field and the wish to attract a culturally diverse group of students, the language of instruction and communication is English. Within this context, the panel confirms that the English

proficiency of staff and students is sufficient. The teaching team is well-qualified and strongly committed. They meet regularly, mainly to discuss issues related to the programme and the progress of students. It would be helpful to also discuss the roles within the team. This would help students to know whom to turn to with specific questions or problems.
The panel thus concludes that the programme meets this standard.

Student assessment

The assessment system is a well-balanced mix of formative and summative assessments. The assessments are valid, reliable, independent and transparent through the use of standardised assessment forms, the involvement of multiple assessors and clear guidelines and criteria. The continuous feedback culture with the involvement of the whole community is a strong point of the programme. The Examination Committee fulfils its role adequately. The panel advises drawing up a more explicit assessment plan and increasing the number of qualified examiners.
The panel thus concludes that the programme meets this standard.

Achieved learning outcomes

On the basis of a sample of fifteen final works, the panel confirms that the graduates have achieved the intended learning outcomes. All competences are covered at the appropriate level and the graduates are able to reflect on them in their conversation with the jury. Both the alumni and professional field emphasise the importance of the programme as a place to think and reflect and open up new perspectives. The alumni validate their new competences through experience working in the professional field.
The panel thus concludes that the programme meets this standard.

Recommendations

The master's programme in Theatre meets the four accreditation standards. With an eye on the future, the panel offers the following recommendations for consideration:

- formulate the programme's vision, didactic approach and unique selling points more explicitly;
- clarify the roles and responsibilities in the teaching team;
- formulate a more explicit assessment plan and increase the number of qualified examiners.

All standards of the NVAO framework have been positively assessed. On this basis, the panel provides a positive recommendation regarding the accreditation of the master's programme in Theatre.

On behalf of the entire site visit panel,
Utrecht, January 2026

Ab Groen
Chair

Marianne van der Weiden
Secretary

Introduction

Profile

Zuyd is a university of applied sciences strongly anchored in Limburg and the Euregio Meuse-Rhine. Its core activities are education for students, research for companies and institutes, and training courses and study programmes for professionals. Zuyd offers 34 bachelor's, 9 master's, 3 associate degree and 1 prebachelor programme to 14,600 students. With its research centres, internships and graduation projects, Zuyd contributes significantly to the economic and social development agenda of the region. Its study programmes cover a wide range of subject areas: Economics and Management, Management and Law, Health Care, Education and Society, Arts, Language and Communication, Engineering and Construction, and IT.

The master's programme in Theatre is part of the Toneelacademie Maastricht and started in 2016. The programme is intended for mature artists looking for a context and a network to explore new territories. It consists of three semesters, spread over two years, and offers an individual development trajectory within a collective context. It combines a focus on artistic research with extensive mentoring of an individual artistic project. All meetings are scheduled on Mondays and Tuesdays. The majority of collective sessions are organised during the first semester, allowing students to combine the programme with other commitments.

The assessment

Zuyd has commissioned AeQui to carry out the current assessment of the programme (see Attachment 1 for the administrative details). For this purpose, AeQui, in collaboration with the programme, has assembled an independent and knowledgeable panel, see Attachment 2. A preparatory meeting with representatives of the programme has taken place.

The assessment was conducted based on the Accreditation Framework for Higher Education in the Netherlands, according to the programme outlined in Attachment 3. The institution has a positive institutional audit decision, and therefore four standards were assessed.

An open consultation hour was scheduled prior to the site visit; two registrations were received for this session.

Recommendations for further development were made during the previous assessment. The programme has taken action in response (see Attachment 4). The panel has integrated this follow-up into its considerations for the current assessment.

The panel conducted the assessment independently; the panel received the necessary information to arrive at a judgement. At the end of the assessment, the programme was informed of the findings and conclusions.

This report was sent in draft to the programme; the programme's responses have been incorporated into this final report.

At the initiative of the programme, a development meeting will take place in the spring of 2026. The results of this development meeting will not affect the assessment presented in this report.

Intended learning outcomes

Standard 1: The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.

Findings

The master's programme in Theatre of Zuyd aims to offer professional performance practitioners an environment for further development. The point of departure for the programme's intended learning outcomes are the domain-specific requirements, formulated in seven national competences:

1. Creative ability;
2. Capability for craftsmanship;
3. Capacity for research and reflection;
4. Capacity for development;
5. Entrepreneurial ability;
6. Capacity for communication;
7. Capacity for collaboration.

The further definition of each competence shows the level of autonomy and abstraction that are appropriate for the master's level as defined nationally and internationally in the Dublin descriptors and level 7 of the National Qualification Framework (NLQF). Based on their history, identity and context, students use these competences as a point of reference to define their individual trajectory through the programme and to set their priorities. As an example, the programme explained during the site visit that a student may have built up such an extensive career in theatre that, for this student, the development of craftsmanship is less of a priority during the programme. The individual trajectories are discussed with the student at the intake to determine if the programme offers the right context for the student's intended development, during the training to monitor the development, and in the final assessment to establish whether the student meets the required master's level.

The intended learning outcomes are strongly geared to the needs and expectations of the professional field. Firstly, the national competences have been defined together with the professional field. Secondly, students are professional performance practitioners with an existing practice, which means that their artistic work has a relevance to their field of work and that their choices in the training process are shaped by their interactions with these communities. Thirdly, the programme actively involves the professional field in teaching, guidance and assessment, as peers, teachers, coaches, guest workshop leaders and external jurors. Fourthly, the final project presentation is realised in the professional field, thus functioning in relation to the logic of that field.

Considerations

The panel considers the programme's intended learning outcomes appropriate and very relevant, both academically and professionally. The master's level is assured by the link with nationally defined competences at NLQF level 7. The continuous dialogue with and involvement of the professional field are strong and ensure that the programme is responsive to the needs of professional artists and developments in the field.

Taking these considerations into account, the panel assesses that the programme meets this standard.

Teaching-learning environment

Standard 2: The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Findings

Curriculum structure

The programme comprises 85 EC, organised in three blocks. In the first year, students work on block I and II. Block I (September-January) offers a schedule of weekly workshops and meetings, focusing on artistic research and providing space for exploration and contextualisation. The two-day workshops provide students with a wide range of input about current trends in the performing arts landscape, transdisciplinarity, the broader art world, and society. In the workshop Travel Companions, lasting ten sessions, students focus on spoken and written communicative and analytical skills and develop a shared language to speak about (their) artistic research. Over the years, a stable set of workshops has been developed that serves as a shared starting point for the students' individual trajectories.

Block II (February-June) expects more self-organisation of the students. Workshops are organised every two weeks and the focus shifts to mentoring and the development of the students' individual trajectories. Students complete a plan for their artistic project and artistic research.

In block III, students are completely self-organised, finalise their artistic project and communicate their artistic research. Third-block students are present in the workshops of blocks I and II as hosts for the new group of students.

A second curriculum element consists of the personal and individual mentoring sessions about the students' own research and practice. The generic monitoring is provided by mentors closely involved in the programme. It is a compulsory part of the curriculum, takes place at least twice during each block and is often linked to specific assessment moments. Attention is paid to the national competences and the student's evolution in the training. Competences already achieved are recognised, when formulating individual priorities and focus. The programme focuses on what is meaningful for each student.

In addition to the general mentoring, students have an individual budget of 40 mentoring hours for their specific artistic research and project. With this budget, students can choose external mentors, such as scientists, theoreticians, specialised professionals, or artists from their own or another discipline.

The State of the Art meetings (SOTAs) are the third part of the curriculum. At two moments per year, the students are invited to present their progress, describe where they are in their artistic and research work, and ask for feedback. These SOTAs are attended by all students, the mentors and people from the field. Alumni are also welcome at these sessions.

Meetings are scheduled on Mondays and Tuesdays only and are communicated long in advance, allowing students to plan ahead and combine the programme with their professional trajectory or personal commitments.

The programme can theoretically be completed in 1.5 years, but, in practice, the finalisation of block II and especially the duration of block III are spread over a longer period of time, sometimes up to three years. Finding an appropriate production place or organising the artistic

research in block II and organising the production of the final project in block III often depend on external factors such as the professional production partner, and cause delay. Students do not consider the delay as a problem or actually not even as a delay; they consider the fact that there is 'time' a selling point of the programme. Students may dis-enrol during this period and re-enrol when their project picks up speed again. The programme management uses the term 'satellites' for this group of students, as they are still part of the programme, but at a distance. The programme management intends to stimulate students to aim for a study duration of three years.

Didactic approach

The programme is based on a number of core values. The focus on a collective context to develop new ideas is essential. This context is characterised by horizontality and the generosity to share ideas and networks, and is created by a diverse and inclusive community that believes in the richness of difference. The panel clearly recognised these values in the meetings with students, alumni and teaching team during the site visit. Students emphasise that an important characteristic of the programme is that they are constantly requested to explain how and why they do things and are thus encouraged to reflect on their choices and development. They find it enriching to explain their way of working to other disciplines, which is not always as obvious as they thought. They describe the learning environment as a safe space for experimentation, enabling them to broaden and deepen their perspectives. Classmates play a crucial role, because they are always there as permanent coaches.

The horizontal approach of the programme includes the expectation that students take responsibility for both their own learning path and those of their classmates. Teachers and mentors are there to help and provide additional feedback but the emphasis is on the students' own responsibility. Students are challenged to explain and justify their choices when they discuss their progress with mentors and teachers. During the site visit, these conversations were often referred to as 'negotiations'. This approach works well for the adult professionals who join the programme. Nevertheless, in this structure of negotiation it is important to be clear for all involved about what is negotiable and what not.

Intake

The programme organises three selection moments each year (March, June and September). 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 curriculum 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, proof of English proficiency, and a portfolio. Candidates also bring supporting material that documents their professional context and their contacts around production possibilities. Prospective students are encouraged to contact the teaching team before the official selection procedure to check whether the programme is the right fit for them.

Based on their registration file, candidates can be invited to an interview. In this conversation, the selection committee, consisting of the coordinators and two mentors, consider the applicant's artistic identity and context, their motivation, reflexivity, openness for a collective environment and expectations. Requirements are a clear positioning of the artist (identity, history and context) and a reflexive, critical and open research attitude. Students confirm that the

admission criteria were clear to them. They agree that the programme works best for students with a practice, because such students not only absorb, but contribute actively to the learning community.

The selection committee aims for diversity and difference, in order to create a dynamic, challenging and inspiring group. During the site visit, the panel recognised the diversity in discipline, age, sex, gender, cultural background, professional context and nationality in the groups of students and alumni. Ideally, the group consists of 8-10 students. This year, the intake was smaller, leading to a group of 5 students. Despite this low number, the critical mass for peer learning remains sufficient because students of year 1 and 2 mingle and are joined by the 'satellites'. The panel agrees with the programme management that the programme needs a strategy for stronger visibility in order to attract more students. The panel advises asking the help of students and alumni to explain the merits of the programme and to formulate its unique selling points. The panel found the students and alumni very convincing and true ambassadors, and expects this would help to attract more students, even in a time of precarity when it is increasingly difficult for artists to 'take time off'.

English

The language of instruction and communication in the programme is English. The programme's argumentation for this choice are the international character of the Dutch and Belgian performance scene, the fact that a significant part of workshop leaders has a foreign background and communicate in English, and that much of the literature and theatre texts used in the curriculum are in English. In addition, a diverse and international classroom with professionals from other performance cultures stimulates students to question the unconscious and unexplored obviousness of their own performing arts culture and thus adds to the reflexivity the programme aims for.

The panel agrees with the argumentation for English as the working language. Students have to prove their English proficiency as part of the selection procedure. They confirm that the level of English of their teachers, mentors and workshop leaders is up to standard. The panel observed that there are clear differences in English proficiency across students and staff, but, overall, proficiency is sufficient to ensure clear and meaningful communication and interaction.

Students informed the panel that they may use their native language when creating. For those who want to do so in Dutch, enough mentors are available to coach. Other languages, such as Italian or Spanish, are welcomed too and present no problem. In those cases, feedback and assessment are done in English.

Guidance

Mentoring sessions are an important part of the programme. As mentioned above, the evolution of the student in the training is the main topic, but, naturally, this is closely linked to the student's general well-being. Students and alumni told the panel that they greatly appreciate their mentors and find them very helpful, not only in contextualising their project, but also in practical matters such as finding residencies or subsidies and extending their network.

The programme is aware that the building is not accessible for students with physical disabilities, as stairs are unavoidable to go from one place to another. Some necessary repairs and adaptations of the building are planned in the near future and accessibility is one of the determining factors for the alterations. The programme is

aware of the needs of students with other types of disabilities, such as dyslexia, and adapts the working and assessment methods when needed. Instead of writing a paper, a dyslectic student may communicate and present in a different format. The students appreciate this awareness of special needs.

Teaching staff

Based on the meetings with members of the teaching team and the feedback provided by students and alumni, the panel is able to confirm that the team involved in the organisation of the programme, the workshop organisers, the mentors and professionals invited for feedback and assessments are prominent and pioneering artists and/or researchers in Dutch, Belgian and international art contexts. The teaching team values its relationship with the Research Centre for Arts, Autonomy and the Public Sphere of Zuyd and with MERIAN (Maastricht Experimental Research In and through the Arts Network). Important qualities of the team members 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. Despite the unfortunate high degree of turnover in management in the past year (see appendix 4 for details) the team consists of dedicated staff. During the year, team members meet regularly to discuss the aims of the programme and the progress of their students, such as on selection days and when discussing research projects in SOTA-meetings. It is, however, less clear within the team and for students how roles and responsibilities in the team are defined and which team member students should be referred to with specific questions or problems. The panel advises making this more explicit.

Considerations

The panel appreciates how the curriculum structure allows students to take time to experiment and get a better understanding of themselves as an artist, without losing touch with the professional field. The link with the professional field in workshops, SOTAs, and through the students' projects is strong and is good for the student's future career.

The panel considers the design of the teaching-learning environment as a self-learning community and horizontal network a strong point. The generosity of staff and students in the constant sharing of practices helps the students to develop into reflexive practitioners. The diversity of the group, with its different backgrounds, admitted into the programme, is used to become aware of one's assumptions and adds to the development of reflexivity. Research creates a common language, enabling all involved to give feedback that is understood by the receiver. The use of English as the language of communication is justified and teachers have sufficient command of English. The framework of national competences is used as a way for students to position themselves and develop their individual study path instead of the obligation to go through all of them. Designing and monitoring the individual study plans in consultation with the mentors is done conscientiously and leads to meaningful trajectories. Nevertheless, the panel advises clarifying what is negotiable and what is not.

The teaching team is well-qualified and strongly committed. The building is currently not suitable for students with physical disabilities, but in a broader sense the programme always makes tailormade solutions for students if more support is needed.

The programme has addressed the previous panel's recommendations adequately. The workshops provide the basic building blocks expected for this type and level of programme. The selection of students has led to a diverse group, although the programme would benefit from a larger group of students since the learning community is an essential part of the programme. The panel agrees with the programme management that a strategy for higher visibility is needed, and advises asking the help of students and alumni to explain the merits of the programme and to formulate its unique selling points. The teachers, workshop leaders and mentors work together as a dedicated team. They meet regularly, formally and informally, mainly to discuss issues related to the aim of the programme and the progress of students. It would be helpful to also discuss the team as a team and be more explicit about roles. This would help students to know whom to turn to with specific questions or problems.

Taking these considerations into account, the panel assesses that the programme meets this standard.

Student assessment

Standard 3: The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Findings

The assessment system combines formal summative assessment moments with a strong and continuous feedback culture. During the programme, students work along three lines: Plan, Project and Research. The assessment structure follows the development of these three lines through the three blocks of the programme.

Block I closes with two summative assessments: an essay for Research I and a first version of the production plan (Plan I). Because block I and II form a continuity in the development of most artistic projects, the artistic project and research line are only formally assessed at the end of the second block.

Block II closes with two summative assessments: the artistic research plan (Research II) and a project plan that combines the two lines of project plan and artistic project (Project & Plan II). Project II is an artistic-substantive description and Plan II provides a logistical-organisational and financial elaboration of the artistic project.

In Block III, the artistic project line is finalised with a performance project that is presented in a professional context, which is assessed as Project III. The evaluation of Plan III is part of the Project III assessment. The artistic research line leads to a final assessment of Research III in the context of a SOTA.

The validity of the summative assessments is assured by the use of standardised assessment forms, based on the national set of competences, with different emphasis depending on what is assessed (project, plan or research). 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 feedback they look for. This way of working is part of the 'negotiation culture' mentioned above (standard 2), with the purpose to shape the different parts of the training in a meaningful way for each individual student. Transparency of the assessments is further guaranteed by clear guidelines, criteria and deadlines. Students confirm that they know what is expected from them.

The summative assessments of the first and the second block are done by an assessor of the team. The final juries of the two elements of the third block (Project & Plan, Research) are composed of two external jurors and one team assessor who has an overview of the student's trajectory in the master's programme. This composition is in line with the multiple-eyes principle. The students propose the names of relevant experts from the professional field as their external jurors, but the programme coordinator takes the decision. The team assessor is always a qualified examiner, designated by the Examination Committee.

Following the advice of the previous accreditation panel, students are now graded on a two-point scale with fail and pass, that better fits the focus on professional growth of the student than a detailed numerical grading scale.

Each block has continuous feedback within the workshops and in the mentoring sessions. At the end of blocks I and II, all participants of the programme (team and students) are present at SOTAs, an important part of the continuous feedback culture. It is a feedback moment in which all the current master students of different cohorts look back, look at their actual positioning or look ahead to the next steps in their trajectory. They choose the topics and questions

they want to present and indicate the feedback that would benefit them the most. All attendees provide written feedback on feedback forms. In addition, there is a direct moment of oral feedback in a more limited circle. It is clear from the meetings with students, that the SOTAs play an important role in the programme and are a strong expression of the feedback culture in the programme. Students learn how to ask the right questions to get their research further.

Since January 2025, the Examination Committees of the Toneelacademie (Theatre) and the Conservatorium (Music) have been merged into one Examination Committee Performative Arts. This is part of a strategy to better position the arts education in Maastricht and the region. A joint marketing communication team and joint committee on quality assurance are in development. The Examination Committee is convinced that the master's programme in Theatre with its holistic and integral assessment system can be an inspiration for other programmes. The Examination Committee has ascertained on the basis of student work that the intended master's level is achieved in all cases, although the alignment between the intended learning outcomes (national competences), individual trajectories and assessment is not easy to grasp from the documentation. The Examination Committee writes in its annual report that drawing up an assessment plan for the Toneelacademie is on the agenda for the current academic year (2025-2026). The panel agrees that this is an important step and can be useful in explaining the focus of the programme as well as the alignment between the programme's specific pedagogy and its vision on assessment to outsiders.

In addition to the check on the final level achieved by graduates, the Examination Committee guarantees the final level by designating qualified examiners and monitoring the multiple-eyes principle. The Examination Committee told the panel that it has currently designated four examiners for the master's programme. The internal member of the final jury is always one of these designated examiners and chairs the jury meetings. A designated examiner must have been working in the programme for a few years. A Basic Qualification in Examination (BKE) is not a formal requirement. The arts departments have developed their own qualification for teaching and examination. This new qualification works well, because it focuses on assessment in arts and on the quality of feedback. The panel advises continuing this development, to ensure that all team members involved in formative and summative assessments are adequately prepared and the pool of qualified examiners can be extended.

Considerations

The panel considers the assessment system of good quality: the combination of formative and summative assessments is balanced and assessments are valid, reliable, independent and transparent. The continuous feedback culture with the involvement of the whole community is a strong point of the programme. The Examination Committee fulfils its role adequately. The panel advises drawing up a more explicit assessment plan and increasing the number of qualified examiners.

Taking these considerations into account, the panel assesses that the programme meets this standard.

Achieved learning outcomes

Standard 4: The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

As described above (standard 3), students prove their achievement of the intended learning outcomes in three products. The artistic project is realised in the working field and is assessed on its performative and performance qualities. The plan is finalised with a reflection on the financial, logistical, organisational and/or financial context of the artistic project, and on how all these elements have affected the artistic project. The final product of the research line can take various forms (essay, portfolio, podcast, lecture-performance, film essay, website etc.), depending on the final communication format decided by the nature and demands of the research itself.

In preparation of the site visit, the panel has examined the products of all fifteen graduates who finished the programme in 2023, 2024 and 2025. Both the performance and its jury assessment were provided in videos, the other materials as written documentation. In addition, the panel attended the presentation of two performances on the eve of the site visit. On this basis, the panel confirms that the graduates have achieved the intended learning outcomes. All competences are covered at the appropriate level and the graduates are able to reflect on them in their conversation with the jury. The two performances, including the research output provided, were useful illustrations of what the programme and its graduates are able to achieve.

This was further demonstrated in the meetings with alumni and representatives of the professional field. The alumni described how the programme broadened their perspective and practice, by asking them to make explicit how they work, which methods they use and why they take certain steps. This brings in different perspectives and broadens their questions and research beyond their original discipline (theatre, dance, photography etc.) to different fields of art or science. One alumnus described it as the expansion of their analytical brain.

The programme acts as a laboratory and gives students the time to dive deeper, to experiment and to strengthen and shift their artistic perspective. Both the alumni and professional field emphasise the importance of having a place to think and reflect, to take some time out from the fast pace of work and its pressure and to open up new perspectives. The alumni validate their new competences in their professional context and consider this important for the field of art. In Flanders, this validation is part of Development in the Kunstendecreet.

Considerations

The panel considers the programme of great added value both for the graduates and the professional field. The final works show that the master's level is effectively achieved. The competences of alumni are recognised in the professional field where such reflexive professionals are needed. People who are able to open up and try new things in the course of their career are important for the field.

The panel concludes that the programme is important both for the individual artists and for the field, by providing a safe lab for experimentation. The panel is impressed by the articulate manner the alumni expressed the value of the programme and what they have been able to

achieve. They are true ambassadors for the programme.

Taking these considerations into account, the panel assesses that the programme meets this standard.

Attachment 1: Administrative details of the programme

Institution	
Name in RIO	Zuyd Hogeschool
Address	Postbus 550, 6400 AS Heerlen
Website	www.zuyd.nl
BRIN-number	25JX
Status (funded or unfunded)	Funded
ITK (yes or no)	Yes
Programme	
First name, as in RIO	Master Theatre
Location	Maastricht
Programme number in RIO	40118
Orientation and level (wo/hbo/ad/ba/ma)	HBO Master
Research master?	No
Language of instruction	English
Legal professional requirements (yes or no)	No
All programme tracks/specialisations	Not applicable
Joint programme degree	No
Special feature	No
Degree and addition	Master of Arts
Studyload in EC (60, 90, 120, 180, 240, 360)	85 EC
Modes: fulltime, parttime, dual	Fulltime
Working with units of learning outcomes (full-time, part-time, dual)	No
Assessment cluster	Unique
Submission date	01-05-2026
Other (e.g. name change or extension of study duration)	--

Attachment 2: Assessment panel

dr.ir. Ab Groen, chair
Organisational consultant and supervisory board member in education and the public domain

dr. Sigrid Merx, member
Director of Education and Associate Professor of Media and Culture Studies at Utrecht University

dr. Pascale de Groote, member
Chair of AP University College Antwerp and board member of (inter)national educational and arts organisations

Inneke Taalman BA, student member
Student at Master of Arts in Fine Art and Design at Willem de Kooning Academy Rotterdam

The panel was supported by drs. Marianne van der Weiden, certified secretary.

All panel members have completed and signed a statement of independence and impartiality, and these have been submitted to NVAO.

Attachment 3: Site visit programme

Thursday November 20th, 2025

15.30-17.00	Preliminary consultation by panel and secretary (online)

Friday November 21st, 2025

13.00-14.00	Open consultation for staff and student (online) One student and one alumnus attended – chairperson panel spoke with them both

Monday November 24th, 2025
Site visit
Location: Lenculenstraat 31–33, 6211 KP Maastricht

16:30	Arrival at the academy, introductions
17:30	Go out for a bite
19:00	Introduction by management
19:20	Presentations of 2 graduation projects

Tuesday November 25th, 2025
Site visit (continued)
Location: Lenculenstraat 31–33, 6211 KP Maastricht

09:30-1000	Preliminary meeting of the panel
10:00-11:00	Meeting with the teaching team
11:15-12:15	Students and alumni on artistic research
12:15-13:00	Break
13:00-14:15	Students and alumni on autonomous development of their individual trajectories
14:15-14:30	Break
14:30-15:30	Students, alumni and stakeholders on the relationship with the professional field
15:30-16:15	Meeting with management and examination committee
16:30-18:00	Committee deliberation
18:00-18:15	Feedback session

Attachment 4: Recommendations from previous assessment

Self-evaluation report, page 15:

In the last visitation's feedback (2020), the committee suggested to provide more periodic team consultations. We really took this point serious and made these meetings work. Unfortunately, last year became a de facto transition year: the new coordinator, Sina Seifee, got selected for the (fulltime) Professional Doctorate-program of Merian in Maastricht. Consequently, he had to give up the coordination of the Master program. Sanne van Rijn became the head of the Centrum voor Leven en Intuïtie in Utrecht and left us and her important workshop (Artist's Recipe). Anne de Loos became team leader of the Toneelacademie and could focus less on the Master. Ulrike Scholtes of the Lectorate was pregnant and gave birth and Frank Mineur, responsible for the long line workshop Travel Companions, retired.
In that sense, the rhythm of the periodic team consultations has been a bit disturbed. Parallel with the visitation procedure, we are looking for a new coordinator. We are looking forward to the fresh energy and input and the constancy a new coordinator can bring. It can also be said that the strong base and the flexibility of the Master have made this moment of musical chairs relatively smooth.

The committee in the last visitation suggested the theoretical workshops could be further strengthened by additional attention to the latest developments in the arts, including e.g. technology, diversity and inclusivity.
Because of the changes within the team, Vladimir Miller and Anna Luyten became more prominent (respectively with a line of 5 days on artistic research and as the new Travel Companions guide.) The themes mentioned are of great importance to them.
We just want to add that diversity and inclusion are basic values for the training so they run as a base note through all encounters.

The committee supported our intention to make efforts to attract more students with different backgrounds. We experience the care for an inclusive environment has brought us a number of participants, active in the Netherlands and Belgium with a different cultural background who in other (educational) contexts maybe would not have been able to connect. Regrettably, another target group seems less present in recent years. Dutch and Flemish established artists in the funded performing arts became less present in the Master. Again, Covid, but also the growing competition in the art field, could be reasons for these lower numbers.

As suggested by the committee, we now use a two-point scale with fail and pass, that better fits the focus on professional growth of the student.

Attachment 5: Reviewed documents

- Self-evaluation report
- Manual Master in Theatre
- Workshop programme and workshop leaders 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26
- Generic Mentoring and Personal Mentoring
- EER Master Theatre 2025-2026
- Schematic programme overview
- Annual report Examination Committee Performative Arts 2024-25
- Overview of team members
- Overview of connections with the work field
- Motivation of English as the language of instruction
- Work and assessments Block I Plan and Project I (three students)
- Work and assessments Block II Plan and Project II (three students)
- Work and assessments Block II Research II (three students)
- Work and assessments Block III (Graduation work) of 15 students, graduated in 2023, 2024 and 2025

© AeQui Nederland, 2026