UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Susannah Scott
Chair, Assembly of the Academic Senate
Faculty Representative, UC Board of Regents

Academic Senate

Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607

senate.universityofcalifornia.edu

CAMPUSES
Berkeley
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
Merced
Riverside
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz

MEDICAL CENTERS
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
San Diego
San Francisco

NATIONAL LABORATORIES
Lawrence Berkeley
Lawrence Livermore
Los Alamos

November 20, 2026

Ralph Hexter
Provost and Executive Vice President
University of California

Re: Approval of UCB Master of Instructional Design (MInD)

Dear Provost Hexter,

In accordance with the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"), and on the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the Academic Council has approved the UC Berkeley division's proposal to establish a self-supporting Master of Instructional Design (MInD).

Because this is a new degree title, and the Assembly of the Academic Senate is not meeting within 30 days of CCGA's approval, Council must approve the program per Senate Bylaw 125.B.7.

I am enclosing CCGA's report on its review of the new program, and respectfully request that your office complete the process of obtaining the President's approval.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Susannah L Scott

Susannah Scott
Chair, Academic Senate

cc: Academic Council
UCB Division Chair Philip
UCB Senate Division Executive Director Banaria
Director of Academic Planning and Policy Corona
Institutional Research and Academic Planning Analyst Wilson
Senate Executive Director Lin

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Academic Senate

Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607

senate.universityofcalifornia.edu

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
Eleonora Grandi, Chair
egrandi@ucdavis.edu

November 10, 2026

CAMPUSES
Berkeley
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
Merced
Riverside
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz

MEDICAL CENTERS
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
San Diego
San Francisco

NATIONAL LABORATORIES
Lawrence Berkeley
Lawrence Livermore
Los Alamos

Susannah Scott
Academic Senate Chair

Dear Chair Scott,

At its November 4 meeting, CCGA discussed a proposal for a self-supporting Master of Instructional Design (MInD) from the Berkeley division. After discussion, the proposal was approved 10-0-1.

The proposed Master of Instructional Design (MInD) is a practice-oriented graduate program designed to meet increasing national and global demand for professionals capable of designing equitable, technology-enhanced learning environments. This program integrates cutting-edge digital pedagogy, ethical AI practices, and real-world experiential learning while providing flexible, high-quality graduate instruction. The curriculum is built around foundational courses in learning sciences and instructional design; students will complete a capstone project and benefit from internships, strong industry partnerships, and online/hybrid immersive learning experiences. Market research confirms strong interest in a flexible, hybrid, 12-month (full time) and 24-month (part time) MInD program with applied learning opportunities, small cohort sizes, and a focus on learning technology and innovation.

The proposal was sent to five reviewers, two of whom were UC faculty. Overall reviewer feedback was consistently positive, praising the program's necessity, its intellectual depth, and the high caliber of its faculty. However, the reviewers also offered suggestions for improvement and expressed some concerns. The Lead Reviewer communicated the reviews to the proposers requesting that concerns be addressed. The program proponents have given a substantive response that provides necessary

clarifications and makes corrective revisions, when required. The proposal now lists explicit commitments by faculty to program leadership and to teaching duties. A faculty/course matrix has also been provided. These revisions suitably clarify faculty involvement and administrative leadership. The Lead Reviewer's report is attached.

While recommending CCGA approval, UCPB suggested that the pace of staff and lecturer hiring be commensurate with actual enrollment. (The report from UCPB is also attached.) In response, the MInD program has revised its hiring plan accordingly. It has also established an annual process for monitoring enrollment and staffing to ensure the financial sustainability of the program.

As you know, CCGA's approval is the last stop of the Academic Senate side of the systemwide review and approval process except when a new degree title must be approved by the Academic Council. I submit this for your review; please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions regarding the proposal.

Sincerely,



Eleonora Grandi
Chair, CCGA

cc: Academic Senate Vice Chair Nuru-Jeter
Academic Senate Executive Director Lin
Academic Senate Assistant Director LaBriola
CCGA Members
Director of Academic Planning and Policy Corona
Institutional Research and Planning Analyst Wilson
UCB Dean of the Graduate Division Bedolla
UCB Senate Executive Director Banaria
UCB Senate Associate Director Quiggle

CCGA Review of Master of Instructional Design (MInD) proposal from UC Berkeley

CCGA received a proposal from the Berkeley School of Education (BSE) to establish a Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Program (SSGPDP) for the Master of Instructional Design Degree (MInD). It was sent out for external review and feedback was obtained from 5 referees of whom 2 are non-UC faculty. Overall reviewer feedback was consistently positive, praising the program's necessity, its intellectual depth, and the high caliber of its faculty. The reviewers also offered suggestions for improvement and expressed some concerns. The CCGA lead communicated the reviews to the proposers requesting that referee concerns be addressed. The program proponents, Dean Michelle Young and Associate Dean Glynda Hall, have given a substantive response that provides necessary clarifications and makes corrective revisions, when required. As a result, the CCGA lead enthusiastically recommends that the MInD proposal be approved by CCGA.

The MInD aims to equips students with the skills to create learning environments across educational, corporate, and nonprofit sectors. The curriculum is built around foundational courses in learning sciences and instructional design, with concentrations in E-Learning Development, Curriculum Design, Learning Analytics and Evaluation, AI in Education, and Learning Technology and Innovation. The degree requires a minimum of 30 credits and allows 6 optional additional credits. The course structure – its common core of 12 credits including a 3-credit capstone project, the 12 credits of concentration coursework, a supervised internship and other elements – has been made amply clear in the revised proposal. The course schedule is meant to be flexible ranging from 12 months of full-time study to 24 months of part-time study.

The proposal now lists explicit commitments by faculty to program leadership and to teaching duties. A faculty/course matrix has also been provided. These revisions suitably clarify faculty involvement and administrative leadership.

MInD is a fully online program that will leverage BSE's immersive virtual classroom infrastructure. The proponents agreed with a reviewer comment about the attractiveness of synchronous online instruction and reiterated that active synchronous participation will be a signature pedagogical feature.

Referee feedback on other aspects of the program were also addressed well in the revised proposal as summarized in the proponent's response.

Sutanu Sarkar, CCGA Lead Reviewer

September 28, 2026

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Academic Senate

Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607

senate.universityofcalifornia.edu

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
Robert Brosnan
rjbrosnan@ucdavis.edu

June 3, 2026

CAMPUSES
Berkeley
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
Merced
Riverside
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz

MEDICAL CENTERS
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
San Diego
San Francisco

NATIONAL LABORATORIES
Lawrence Berkeley
Lawrence Livermore
Los Alamos

Partho Ghosh
Chair, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Education

RE: UC Berkeley Masters in Instructional Design (MInD) Proposed Self-Supporting Program

Dear Partho,

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) discussed the UC Berkeley School of Education proposed self-supporting Masters in Instructional Design (MInD) at our June meeting. The lead reviewer's report is attached to this letter.

Members agreed that the proposal is a unique addition to UC offerings, and there appears to be a market for graduates with this degree. A focus on diversity in recruiting and instructional focus on equity principles was noted with approval during discussion.

One concern shared by the committee is that in order to establish self-supporting status, the program needs to achieve the planned enrollment targets. Compared to four existing, non-UC programs, the MInD program falls at the higher end of both enrollments and price points, similar to Harvard's in size and between Harvard and Columbia in price. One projection shows that at the downside model of enrollment, the program only becomes net profitable after 7-9 years and still requires an enrollment of 94, which is higher than other comparative programs.

In addition, the program proposes hiring four full time staff by Year 1. The staff expenditures present a large, upfront cost for the new program. A lecturer, hired in Year 1 but beginning instruction in Year 2, adds to the planned hiring load. UCPB suggested that slowing the rate of hiring,

perhaps hiring part-time staff with plans to increase to FT should enrollment targets be met, might help ensure that the program is self-supporting. In addition, careful tracking of enrollment and enrollment trends would enable Berkeley to determine if the program will be successful in the proposed timeline.

Because the only concerns expressed by the committee focused on the large upfront costs and the high numbers of students needed to pay for them, UCPB recommends that CCGA approve this program with the suggestions for monitoring enrollment and modifying the hiring plans.

Sincerely,



Robert Brosnan
Chair

cc: UCPB

UCPB Proposed Self-Supporting Professional Degree Program Review

Name and Location of Program:
UC Berkeley Masters in Instructional Design (MInD), Berkeley School of Education (BSE)

Lead reviewer(s):
Michael Beman

Academic justification:
From the proposal: "The field of instructional design has grown significantly over the past two decades, shaped by the rapid advancement of digital technologies, the increasing demand for scalable learning solutions, and a growing awareness of the need for inclusive, equity-driven pedagogical design. As education increasingly adopts hybrid and online models across K–12, higher education, corporate, and nonprofit sectors, with 72% of public schools now using blended learning methods and 63% of postsecondary institutions offering such formats, the need for professionals who can thoughtfully integrate technology, pedagogy, and justice has never been greater.

The proposed Master of Instructional Design represents a new chapter in BSE's strategic growth, extending its impact into the rapidly growing field of digital learning and instructional innovation. The program is also a response to the success and national visibility of peer offerings at institutions like Stanford Graduate School of Education and Harvard Graduate School of Education… While these programs are strong in innovation and technology integration, BSE's program is uniquely positioned to lead in the development of instructional design professionals who center equity, culturally responsive pedagogy, and ethical uses of AI."

Planning and Budget overview:

1. Proposed initial tuition and any rate of increase:

$65,000 for whole program, 1 year or 2 year option

2. Target enrollments for years 1-3:

25	60	80

Growing to ultimate target of 138 over 6 years

3. Projected net revenues for years 1-3:

-$693K	-$533K	$133K

Values reflect Years 0-2 in Budget Model in Appendix B

4. Proposed indirect cost rate (IDC):
15%

Detailed areas of review:

5. How was the proposed IDC rate determined? Does the proposed rate appear to cover all indirect costs (facilities, IT, etc.)? What are the space needs of the program?

Unclear how the IDC rate (i.e., campus assessment percentage) was determined. Assume set by campus policy. Program is online and requires no space, outside of some use of classrooms on campus at off hours. Will make use of 'Immersive Virtual Classroom' necessitating IT support.

6. What are the proposed uses of net revenues? How will they supplement [enhance] state-funded programs? Are there other ways that the program, if successful, will benefit the UC mission (e.g., filling a need not covered by state-supported programs)?

Revenues go to: faculty director and head graduate advisor (HGA) with 1 and 2 course buyouts, course buyout for some faculty (see #8 below). Lecturer also included starting in Year 1 yet described to start in Year 2 (see #8 below). 4 staff FTE hired by Year 1: Academic Coordinator/Graduate Student Affairs Officer (GSAO) II: Base $152,000; fully loaded $226,480. Student Services Advisor 3: Base $85,000; fully loaded $126,650. Career Specialist 3: Base $90,000; fully loaded $134,100. Marketing/Recruiter 2: Base $82,888; fully loaded $123,503. Also classroom expenses and $100K in marketing each year.

Fate of NET revenue unclear from proposal, and please note differences in upside and downside models in terms of when the program reaches profitability (Appendix A).

7. How are any potential negative impacts on state-funded programs and the research mission of the UC mitigated?

From the proposal: "As a self-supporting graduate professional degree program (SSGPDP), the proposed program is designed to operate independently of state funds and will not draw on existing departmental

resources that support undergraduate or state-funded graduate programs. Careful enrollment management, recruitment strategies, and the use of program-generated revenue to support instructional costs will ensure that the program's launch does not negatively impact existing BSE master's and doctoral programs, nor other related graduate offerings on campus."

Additional review steps included in revision (see blue text on pages 47-48 of the proposal itself).

8. Describe disposition and compensation of **faculty** serving the program. What is the proposed ratio of UC Senate faculty to non-UC adjunct faculty? For the former category, differentiate between ladder rank and P/LSOE. How will UC Senate faculty be compensated? On-load (i.e., course buyout), overload, or some combination thereof?

From the proposal: "We anticipate Senate Faculty will teach approximately 50% of the courses in the SSGPDP accomplished through a combination of course buyouts and overload teaching. Faculty participation is voluntary and based on alignment with scholarly interests, availability, and mutual agreement regarding workload and compensation. Recruitment of BSE Senate and Adjunct faculty will be conducted through an open, opt-in process. No faculty member is required to teach, advise, or serve in the program as a condition of appointment, merit, or promotion."

"In the start-up phase (Years 1–2), we anticipate that up to five Senate faculty members from the Berkeley School of Education will teach courses in the Master of Instructional Design (approximately 25% of the unit's total Senate faculty). Each Senate faculty member will teach one additional course in the SSGPDP per year on top of their state-supported teaching load.

As the program reaches steady state (Years 3–5), courses will be taught by Senate faculty through a combination of overload and course buyout, roughly through a 60/40% split. This balance is designed to maintain faculty engagement while accommodating other research and service responsibilities.

The program does not require hiring new tenure-track faculty in the first three years. However, we anticipate hiring two to three part-time lecturers beginning in Year 2 to cover specialized courses and provide flexibility in scheduling."

See comment above about added review steps.

9. Describe how the program will ensure accessibility and encourage diversity. Note: these concerns may be addressed through return-to-aid used for need-based fellowships, although programs may address accessibility and diversity in a variety of ways and UCPB does not set a standard return-to-aid percentage.

"Consistent with the University of California's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals, including Regents Policy 4400, the proposed Master of Instructional Design program is designed to advance equitable access in graduate education, both through its recruitment and retention strategies and through its curricular focus on justice-centered instructional design. Diversity is not a peripheral aim of this program; it is embedded in its intellectual foundations, faculty expertise, and social purpose."

Extensive diversity plan provided in the proposal – a strength rather than a weakness of any kind. 10% return to aid.

10. Describe the market analysis used to justify demand and price point for the proposed program. Will the program compete with others in the system? What are projected percentages of California resident, domestic non-resident, and international students in the program?

Extensive market analysis conducted by UCB's New Academic Ventures (NAV-B) included in Appendix A. MInD was compared with four existing programs outside UC. Note that the MInD program falls at the higher end of both enrollments and price points, similar to Harvard's in size and between Harvard and Columbia in price. Downside model only becomes net profitable after 7-9 years and still requires an enrollment of 94, which is higher than other comparative programs.

List of comparable programs in UC provided in proposal Table 3. 5 were identified and this is distinct: "no UC campus currently offers a self-supporting graduate professional degree program (SSGPDP) in Instructional Design with the applied, interdisciplinary, and equity-centered focus of the proposed Master of Instructional Design."

Student projections:

- Year 1: 25 students (first cohort)
- Year 5: 124-138 students (steady state; includes overlapping cohorts)
- Composition: 90% domestic, potentially 10% international—does not rely on international students

11. Describe relevant consultation and assessment from lower levels of

review, external assessments of the proposal, and the like.

Proposal went through review and revision in response to comments on Berkeley campus. Endorsed by all Senate committees, faculty, and admin.

12. Any other planning and budget concerns?

Previous rounds of review flagged the relatively large size of the program in comparison to other comp programs, and the need for this scale in order to reach financial sustainability. Text on financial oversight was added, including annual evaluation in comparison to expectations, and recalibration as necessary. The front loading of substantial expenses (esp. 4 staff FTE) quickly places the program in deficit and requires comparatively large enrollments to dig out from.

13. Any academic-quality or related concerns to flag for CCGA?

No. 30-36 units—in line with typical UC MS degree—with several sample plans provided. Option for full time or part time and various foci.

14. Are there specific areas of concern that the mandated review after the third year of operation ought to capture?

Annual evaluation of enrollments and deviations from financial modeling seem critical.

Conclusions and recommendation:

While demand for this program seems high and it is unique with the UC system, the large costs associated with it require comparatively large enrollments to reach profitability. I recommend a slower ramp up phase if possible and constant evaluation of enrollment relative to expectations, with a floor set.