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Consistent with the mission of this upper Midwest teaching university, and the Education Policy and Accreditation Standards (2008) of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the Minnesota State University Moorhead (MSUM), School of Social Work (SSW) educates competent entry-level social work professionals with the core knowledge, values, and skills necessary to engage in ethical and empowerment-based generalist social work practice with all people in a dynamic and diverse society. Graduates are prepared to promote planned change, advance social/economic justice, and human rights, locally, nationally, and globally.

M-SSWEM II-R Model and Rubrics

Guided by its strategic mandate, SSW mentors student mastery of the 10 CSWE-mandated core social work practice competencies (C) and their requisite 41 practice behaviors (PB) (Insert A). Then, using M-SSWEM II-R, the School formatively, summatively, consistently, and manifoldly assesses student ability to engage in PBs. Practice aptitude is tracked through 11 rubrics differentiated by purpose to produce semester-specific cohort (CO) and comparison group (CG) data on behavioral mastery. Insert B clusters all rubrics by purpose and lists their report acronyms.

Insert A

10 Core CSWE Practice Competencies: 41 Practice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Competencies</th>
<th>PB 1: Client advocacy</th>
<th>PB 2: Personal reflection/self correction</th>
<th>PB 3: Professional roles</th>
<th>PB 4: Professional Demeanor</th>
<th>PB 5: Career-long learning</th>
<th>PB 6: Supervision &amp; consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1: Social work identify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: Apply Ethics</td>
<td>PB 7: Personal/professional values</td>
<td>PB 8: Ethical decision-making</td>
<td>PB 9: Tolerate ethical ambiguity</td>
<td>PB 10: Apply ethical strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3: Critical Thinking</td>
<td>PB 11: Multiple sources of knowledge</td>
<td>PB 12: Analyze models</td>
<td>PB 13: Verbal/written communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4: Diversity and Difference</td>
<td>PB 14: Cultural structure</td>
<td>PB 15: Self-awareness</td>
<td>PB 16: Difference</td>
<td>PB 17: Self as learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6: Research</td>
<td>PB 21: Practice to inform research</td>
<td>PB 22: Research to inform practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C7: Human Behavior and the Social Environment
PB 23: Conceptual frameworks
PB 24: HBSE knowledge

C8: Policy Practice
PB 25: Policy for well-being
PB 26: Collaborative policy action

C9: Practice Contexts
PB 27: Attend to changing locales
PB 28: Leadership in service delivery

Generalist Practice Composites

C10(a): Engagement
PB 29: Prepare for action
PB 30: Empathy and other skills
PB 31: Work & outcome focus

C10(b): Assessment
PB 32: Use client data
PB 33: Client assessment
PB 34: Develop intervention goals/objectives
PB 35: Select appropriate strategies

C10(c): Intervention
PB 36: Initiate actions: Organizational Goals
PB 37: Initiate action: Client enhancement
PB 38: Problem resolution
PB 39: Negotiate, mediate, advocate
PB 40: Transitions

C10(d): Evaluation
PB 41: Monitor interventions

Insert B

Assessment Rubrics (Tabular Acronyms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imbedded Classroom</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SWA400: Research Proposal Assignment ............ (RP)</td>
<td>8. SWA469: Organization Analysis .................................. (OAPr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SWA420: Individual Video Assignment ............ (VA)</td>
<td>9. SWA469: Policy Advocacy Project ................................ (PAProject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SWA440: Growth Group Assignment .................. (GGA)</td>
<td>11. SWA470: Evidence-Based Practice Project ............... (EBPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SWA450: Community Needs Assessment ............. (ComNA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SWA450: Program Proposal ........................... (ProgPro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SWA460: Policy Advocacy Proposal ................. (PAProposal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ongoing M-SSWEM II-R Data Collection

Imbedded Classroom Data
Coordinated by the M-SSWEM II-R manager, each semester faculty use M-SSWEM II-R architecture to formatively assess student classroom performance across the explicit curriculum. Once collected, faculty use DIARY to enter raw imbedded data directly into the M-SSWEM II-R archive. 7

Field Data
Each term, field instructors summatively evaluate student interns across the explicit curriculum (FBPE). Internship liaisons then enter raw field data directly into DIARY.

ASWB Data Archive
M-SSWEM II-R also manages over 24 years of Association of Social Work Board (ASWB) pass rate data to study biennially post-graduation competency. 8 This provides external longitudinal and summative perspectives of program effectiveness.

Composition of the Current Data Archive
Since M-SSWEM I was revised to accommodate 2008 CSWE-EPAS evaluation requirements, the current M-SSWEM II-R DIARY repository contains 4.5 academic years of data. This report analyzes fall 2014 data relative to all archived comparison group information from all prior semesters:

- AY1: fall-2010/spring-2011;
- AY2: fall-2011/spring-2012;
- AY3: fall-2012/spring-2013;
- AY4: fall-2013/spring-2014;
- AY5: fall-2014.

M-SSWEM II-R Data Presentation Strategy & Benchmarks
Consistent with CSWE summary reporting standards, M-SSWEM II-R examines percentages of students meeting or exceeding benchmarks established collectively during the last self-study by all faculty. At the core of this analysis strategy are 41 individual PB Excel tables. PB-level results are then aggregated within competencies to provide a more global perspective on program effectiveness to CSWE and stakeholders. 9 Then, during each biennium, the manager analyzes all data, and coordinates subsequent program improvement and reporting functions (see below).

Tables PB1-PB41 - Core Analyses Series
There is one table for each of 41 PBs. Tables contain aggregate raw student-level information integral to M-SSWEM II-R. Tables also contain initial aggregate statistical analyses of student performance that are transferred to Table D for global assessments of program performance across PBs and competencies. The following are specific structural details:

- Tables are organized around the 11 rubrics (imbedded 1-7; field 8-11, see Insert B above); 10
- Tables present raw CO_F14 data used to calculate percentages; 11, 12
- Tables present raw CG data from all prior assessment data archived in M-SSWEM II-R; 13
- Tables present row percentages for each assessment rubric of students meeting benchmarks: 14
  - Imbedded scale benchmark = 3 [range: 1-3]; 15
  - Field scale benchmark = 4 [range: 1-5]; 16
- Tables present row benchmark attainment percentages which are averaged as follows: 17
  - “Imbedded Pct.”: average percent of all classroom students attaining benchmark;
  - “Field Pct.”: average percent of all field students attaining benchmarks; and
- These two average percentages are combined into a summary omnibus average percent for each PB. 18

Table D: Percent Analysis Detail
As the second analytical phase, this table is pivotal to more comprehensive analyses of competency-level performance:

- Table PB1-PB41 summary percentages are migrated to this table for CSWE-required competency-level benchmark analyses:
  - “Imbedded Pct.”: Benchmark = 0.80 (see Table D footnote 1);
  - “Field Pct.”: Benchmark = 0.80 (see Table D footnote 2);
  - “Omnibus PB Pct.”: Benchmark = 0.80 (see Table D footnote 3); 19
- Grand competency percentages are calculated by averaging all omnibus PB percentages;
- CO-specific grand competency percentages are moved onto the required CSWE AS4 (B) form; and
- CO/CG group differences are calculated for PB rubrics/competency grand percentages. 20
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**Tables E & E1-E16: Curricular Change Decisions**

As the culminating step, faculty use the *Faculty Change Curricular Worksheet* to modify SSW curricula and enhance future student behavioral performance. Changes presented in Tables E1-E15 are presented below, and will be implemented in the fall 2015 term. Once applied, the M-SSWEM II-R evaluation sequence starts anew so that fall curricular changes will be examined in subsequent biennial reports (e.g., 2017).

**M-SSWEM II-R 2015 Analysis**

**ASWB Results**

Table A presents 24 years (1990-2013) of pass-rate data for MSUM SSW graduates. As this presentation shows, first-time pass-rates among graduates in years 2006, 2009, 2012, & 2013 fell under 90%, but remained over 85%. Because these fluctuations appear to lack any pattern/consistency, it is the judgement of the faculty that they suggest cohort effects rather than areas for program/curricular modifications. Supporting this conclusion is that, when compared to national data, SSW graduates’ yearly first-time pass-rates remain extremely strong. Moreover, in some years first-time pass-rates were almost perfect, and in one year it was (2001: 100%). Thus, aggregate first-time pass-rates show program strength, consistency exceed exceed national pass-rates, and subsequently do not indicate the need for curricular change.

**Change in Competency-Level Performance**

**Brief 2012-2014 Cohort Comparison.** When comparing 2012 CO assessment data with 2014 CO assessment data, the reader will see that in 2012, there were instances among both imbedded classroom measures and field measures where the percentage of students meeting established benchmarks fell under 80%. Indeed, there were 15 instances in the 2012 CO where PB performance data did not meet the 80% benchmark among imbedded measures (Range: 26, 53-79%); and six instances where PB performance data revealed that this was true among field measures (Range: 7, 72-79%). Additionally, there were six instances where 2012 CO Omnibus PB percentages fell under the 80% threshold (Range: 11, 68-79%). This, however, changed by 2014. Current CO assessment results show there were 15 instances where PB performance results fell the 80% benchmark, but only among imbedded measures (Range: 12, 67-79%). None were among field measures nor Omnibus PB percentages. Further, the range of underperforming imbedded measures was lower in the current analysis (12) report than in 2012 study (17). These results suggest: (a) student learning is consistently solidified during internship thus enabling graduates to reach mastery across PBs; and (b) such solidification strengthened in 2014. Thus, there is only a need for curricular/pedagogical changes in SSW classrooms this fall.

**2014 Assessment Cohort/Comparison Group Analysis.** Table D shows an overall competency-level improvement in student performance this past fall (CO) as compared to archived data of past graduates (CG) in every instance except two: the research competency where performance was stable (CO/Cg Change: 0.0 percentage points); and the theory competency (*Human behavior in the social environment-HBSE*) where performance slipped by half of a percentage point. Table D further shows that the current 2014 CO demonstrated marked improvement in several areas over past student performance (CG). For example, the most CO improvement over archived CG data in the 2014 assessment cycle was seen in students’ ability to engage diversity and difference in generalist social work practice (C4 CO/Cg Change: +10.25 percentage points). While the vast majority of students in the current cohort demonstrated competency in diversity/difference overall (CO_C4: 95.88%), so too did those in the data archive but to a lesser degree (CG_C4: 85.63%). While this was true in the 2012 assessment cycle, improvement was more modest. The same was true of student ability to engage in policy practice (CO_C8: 93%); CG_C8: 84.25%; C8 CO/Cg Change: 8.75 percentage points) though to a slightly less extent. And student ability to integrate human rights and social justice into their generalist social work practice showed the third greatest amount of improvement (CO_C5: 89.5%; CG_C5: 81.5%; C5 CO/Cg Change: 8.0 percentage points). Taken together, the range of student learning improvement this past fall semester in these three competencies (C4, C4, & C8) was commendable with their order of magnitude roughly 8-10 percentage points.

Slightly behind this in magnitude of change were 2014 cohort students who demonstrated roughly 6 percentage points of improvement over CG members in this report cycle. For example, CO members demonstrated a sound understanding of practice contexts that exceed CG members (CO_C9: 82.5%; CG_C9: 76%; C9 CO/Cg Change: 6.5 percentage points). This was also true of CO competence regarding social work ethics (CO_C2: 89.13%; CG_C2: 82.75%; C2 CO/Cg Change: 6.4 percentage points).
6.3 percentage points). And this trend held for CO competence in the ability of engage in generalist practice composites (in order of magnitude): (a) assessment (CO_C10(b): 93.88%; CG_C10(b): 87.38%; C10(b) CO/CG Change: 6.5 percentage points); and (b) engagement (CO_C10(a): 95.67%; CG_C10(a): 89.67%; C10(a) CO/CG Change: 6.0 percentage points).

Slightly less improvement—but improvement nevertheless—was seen in change comparisons in four competencies. These included (in order of magnitude) social work identity (CO_C1: 92.08%; CG_C1: 87.58%; C1 CO/CG Change: 4.5 percentage points); practice evaluation (CO_C10(d): 88.5%; CG_C10(d): 84.5%; C10(d) CO/CG Change: 4.0 percentage points); practice intervention (CO_C10(c): 90.8%; CG_C10(c): 87.2%; C10(c) CO/CG Change: 3.6 percentage points); and Critical thinking (CO_C3: 84.33%; CG_C3: 81.67%; C3 CO/CG Change: 2.67 percentage points).

Finally, stability was observed regarding Research skills comparisons (CO_C6: 82.5%; CG_C6: 82.5%; C6 CO/CG Change: 0.0 percentage points) and comparisons of students’ ability to use theory in practice (human behavior in the social environment) although a slight but very modest decline was observed suggesting a cohort effect (CO_C7: 84%; CG_C7: 84.5%; C7 CO/CG Change: -0.5 percentage points).

In summary, 2014 results show much better competency mastery over 2012 findings. To wit, the average changes in percents across competencies for these two years are as follows: the average CO/CG change in percentage points in 2012 was 1.67; the average CO/CG change in percentage points in 2014 was 5.13. Moreover, in 2012 the average CO/CG percentage points change was negative in five competencies (Range: 4.76, -0.58 to -5.25) where in the current 2014 cycle there is only one negative percentage point change, and it was very slight (C7: HBSE -0.5 percentage points).

Change in Practice behavior Performance by Competency

**Competency 1-Identity.** Data show that in four of the six constituent practice behaviors (PB 1, 3, 4, & 6), CO students formed their social work identity before their field assignment, and certainly by graduation across. The exception was PB 5-Life long Learning which is only measured in the field. Moreover, classroom assessments revealed that in four PBs (3, 4, 5, & 6), 2014 CO students improved over CG members by between 7-10 percent. In one instance (PB 1-client advocacy) there was no difference found in the CO/CG comparison; and in another (PB 2-personal reflection), student ability lost very minimal ground (-4.0 percentage points). In only one instance (Personal reflection/self correction as measured by imbedded instruments) did curricular changes seem warranted as student achievement did not reach the established benchmark of 80%, and in this case faculty elected to implement curricular modifications. 27

**Competency 2-Ethics.** In each instance CO students show improvement in mastery of social work ethics as they are applied to practice as compared to their CG colleagues.28 The range of improvement was 7 percentage points (3-10% percentage points). In only one instance did a specific PB measures suggest the need for curricular modification: students’ ability to tolerate ethical ambiguity as measured by imbedded instruments. However, CO students seemingly mastered this ethical task acceptably in the field (93%). Moreover, this pattern seems generally consistent with SSW historical CG data. However, faculty have elected to implement curricular/pedagogical changes in this instance.

**Competency 3-Critical Thinking.** Critical thinking has historically been a skill students achieved modestly in the classroom, but truly refined in the field. And results from this report cycle show no exception to this history. For example, while CO students generally performed under benchmark regarding their ability to use multiple sources of knowledge (77%), analyze practice models (79%), and communicate verbally and in writing (76%), these practice behaviors improved markedly in the field to a degree well above benchmark (PB 11: 94%; PB 12: 90%; PB 13: 90%).29 This pattern is also seen among CG respondents, and appear in the 2012 report as well.

**Competency 4-Engage Diversity & Difference.** SSW students show remarkable strengths in this domain. For example, in three of the four practice behaviors, over 90% of CO students were assessed achieving PB benchmarks using imbedded measures (93-100%); and there was even further improvement when students transitioned into their field praxis PB 14 & 16). Moreover, three of the fours PBs logged in with CO/CG change measure that met or exceeded 11 percentage points. This last finding stands in contrast to results in the 2013 report where 2012 CO students’ class and field performance in this competency was mixed and prompted curricular changes.
Competency 5-Human Rights/Social Justice. Of the three PBs in this competency, two (Oppression & Discrimination; Social/Economic Justice in Practice) were initially under benchmark when measured using imbedded instruments (75% & 78% respectively), but well exceed benchmark after students’ field experience (95% & 98% respectively). Moreover, there was consistent improvement when comparing CO student with their CG colleagues as change statistics spanned 7-9 percentage points. When compared to 2012 report cycle results, current 2014 findings show considerable improvement.

Competency 6-Research. Here too CO students vastly improved their research competencies while in the field. While imbedded measures assessed CO respondents consistently below benchmark (both PBs at 73%), these same students were assessed well over benchmark by the end of their internship (93% & 91% respectively). Interestingly, this finding is exactly opposite of that found in the 2012 data where CO students performed this competency acceptably in the classroom, but less well in the field. In addition, more stability was noted among CG members, and CO/CG changes scores suggest stability although change measures in one instance rose, and the other fell by one percentage point (PB 21—Practice to inform research: Change of 1.0 percentage points; PB 22—Research to inform practice: Change of -1.0 percentage points). Nevertheless, SSW faculty have elected to implement curricular changes here as well to strengthen this student performance in these two key practice behaviors.

Competency 7-HBSE. As with the research competency above, the same was found regarding students’ ability to understand and use theory in generalist practice. Indeed, CO students uniformly performed under benchmark in the classroom (73% in both PBs), but vastly improved their ability to reflect on and use theory in their field practice (94% & 96% respectively). Interestingly, this stands in contrast to 2012 findings where there was more instability between imbedded and field measures (PB 23—Conceptual frameworks: imbedded-86% fell to 77% in the field; and PB 24—HBSE knowledge: imbedded-86% fell to 72% in the field). However both 2012 change measures show slight CO/CG declines (PB 23—Conceptual Frameworks: Change of -1.0 percentage points; PB 24—HBSE Knowledge: Change of -2.0 percentage points). As such, SSW faculty will implement curricular/pedagogical changes to strengthen students’ classroom performance regarding these PBs.

Competency 8-Policy Practice. All PBs in this competency showed high levels of mastery and CO students performed better than their CG colleagues overall (by 10 percentage points in each PB). Moreover, there is improvement over student performance in 2012.

Competency 9-Practice Contexts. This too was similar to research and HBSE above. That is, students performed slightly under benchmark in the classroom (75% & 68% respectively), but exceeded benchmark in the field (93% & 94% respectively). Additionally, CO majors performed slightly better than their CG colleagues (PB27 Change: 6 percentage points; PB 28 Change: 7 percentage points). Faculty will make curricular changes to address classroom performance prior to students entering their field.

Competency 10a-Generalist Practice: Engagement. In each instance students performed over benchmark so no curricular changes are planned.

Competency 10b-Generalist Practice: Assessment. In one instance CO students’ classroom performance was slightly under benchmark and consequently will be address through curricular changes. However, CO performance was consistently better when compared to CG performance by as much as fifteen percentage points.

Competency 10c-Generalist Practice: Intervention. Although CO performance was very strong in this composite, in one instance (PB 40), cohort members did not reach benchmark in their classroom assessments (76%), but did later in their field assessment by a considerable amount (96%). Therefore curricular changes are planned here as well.

Competency 10d-Generalist Practice: Monitoring. In this instance students performed over benchmark so no curricular changes are planned.
Evidence-Driven Programmatic Change for this Report Cycle

Based on deficiencies noted during this 2014 report cycle, the faculty will implement several explicit curricular changes for the fall, 2015 semester in order to maximize student learning and by extension program effectiveness.

Summary of Curricular Changes

The above report findings illustrate the impact of curricular/pedagogical changes implemented at the end of the last assessment cycle (fall, 2012). To further improve the MSUM SSW program, faculty will implement changes outlined in Tables E1-E15 below to further improve student behavior mastery in order to attain maximum competency by graduation. Therefore, SSW hypothesizes that outlined changes will strengthen linear cohesiveness between classroom and field experiences and increase achieved post-field competency by graduation.

Imbedded Classroom Curricular Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1-C1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal reflection/self correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2-C2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tolerate ethical ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3-C3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Multiple sources of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4-C3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Analyze practice models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5-C3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Effective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6-C5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oppression and discrimination-practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7-C5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Social/economic justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8-C6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Practice to inform research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9-C6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Research to inform practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10-C7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Conceptual frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11-C7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Person in Environment/HBSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12-C9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Changing locales, populations, technology, and social trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13-C9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Provide service leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14-C10(b)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Use client data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15-C10(c)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Facilitate transitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflections on the M-SSWEM II-R assessment system

The M-SSWEM II-R system has proven its ability to generate a deep understanding of SSW’s performance relative to student learning. Therefore, to date faculty have opted not to revise the system. However, given the pending adoption of the new CSWE EPAS, this system will eventually be revised into M-SSWEM III to reflect the new 2015 accreditation standards.
Endnotes

1 See Figure A.
2 See http://web.mnstate.edu/socialwork/MSSWEMIIAssessment/2015AssessmentReport/
3 Comparison group data consists of all prior student assessment data collected under M-SSWEM II-R for all previous semesters.
4 Rubrics 1-7 are imbedded formative classroom assessments that use a 3-point scale to evaluate field readiness (Table B).
5 Rubrics 8-11 are summative field evaluations that use a 5-point scale to assess final behavioral mastery (Table C).
6 These acronyms are used in all reporting tabulation.
7 DIARY is a web-based data management interface built specifically for M-SSWEM II-R.
8 See TABLE A.
9 See CSWE AS 4(B) Form.
10 Column labeled “M-SSWEM II Tool”.
11 The area at the center of this table series within the light gray-shaded cluster of cells.
12 CO_14: fall, 2014 cohort.
13 The area to the far right of this table series within the dark gray-shaded cluster of cells.
14 The bright green-shaded columns in each table segment.
15 See Table B
16 See Table C
17 The light brown-shaded boxes toward the bottom of this table series.
18 Imbedded, field, and omnibus percentages that fall short of the 80% threshold along with their PBs.
19 Imbedded, field, and omnibus percentages that fall short of the 80% threshold are shaded purple in this table.
20 The dark-green shaded column on the right side of this table.
21 See http://web.mnstate.edu/socialwork/MSSWEMIIAssessment/2015AssessmentReport/
22 See the 2013 CSWE Assessment Report: Table D.
23 See this 2014 CSWE Assessment Report: Table D.
24 See Tables PB 1-PB 41 for raw data distributions and rubric-specific percentages.
25 Where “C4 CO/CG Change” indicates the change in percent between the 2014 CO group and archived data for the overall CG.
26 See SSW’s 2013 assessment report.
27 See Table E1 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
28 See Tables E2 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
29 See Table E3, E4, & E5 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
30 See Table E6 & E7 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
31 See Tables E8 & E9 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
32 See Tables E10 & E11 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
33 See Tables E12 & E13 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
34 See Table E14 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
35 See Tables E15 for fall 2015 curricular changes.
36 See Tables E, E1-E15.