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Premise/Background

ENGR110 is a staple. Through 2012, ENG110 focused on choosing a major. In follow-on years, the focus has pivoted to “design your engineering experience”
Attributes: ~20% of entering ENG students take 110
250 enrollees out of ~1200
CoE advisors suggest 110 to more open minded students

Other course changes include
Time ceded to Depts from 2 hrs to 30 min/dept
Tuesday (lecture)/Fri (DA-led discussion)
Friday break-out sessions of 19/DA
Chats about values, social identity, and support

Goal: To empower ENGR110 students to make more informed decisions about choosing a major.
Hypothesis: More informed students transfer less often, there are cost and debt implications

Data Sampling

The CoE extracted data of ~5K students (2010-2015). CoE database includes:
- Entering term
- 110: Yes or no
- Incoming preferences if shared
- Declare Date #1 & Major
- Declare Date #2 & Major if applicable
- Common Transfer Directions

Conclusion: Retrospective meta analyses like this might be better gauges of Engr 110 effectiveness