

## E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations

The annual Comparative Data Guide (CDG) contains tables of scaled scores and percentiles for institutional means and individual student scores drawn directly from test takers across the nation. The CDG can assist you in interpreting the scores from the E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) by helping you determine how your students' skills compare with the skills of students at similar institutions. The report provides descriptive statistics based on the number of students that have completed a proctored version of the EPP between 2020 and 2025. Information about an institution gathered through EPP administrations cannot be released in any form attributable to or identifiable with an individual institution. The anonymity of each institution's performance is maintained by reporting only the aggregate performance of the selected reference group.

Below are descriptions of the various tables you can generate using this service:

- **Institutional Means Total Score/Subscore Distributions** - The distributions in these tables present the number of institutions at each mean score level. These tables provide a way to compare the Total Score and Subscore means for your institution with those of other participating institutions. These tables show the mean of means (or the average of the mean scores for those institutions/programs selected) as well as the standard deviations of those means.
- **Individual Students Total Score/Subscore Distributions** - The distributions in these tables may be used to interpret results by determining what percent of those taking the test at the selected institutions attained scores below that of a particular student. Each table shows scaled score intervals for Total Score and Subscores separately. By looking up the Total Score or Subscore and reading across the row to the corresponding number in the column headed "Percent Below," the percent of individuals scoring below any interval can be determined.
- **Summary of Proficiency Classifications** - This table presents the percentage of students classified as "Proficient", "Marginal", and "Not Proficient" for each skill dimension and level. This table provides a way to compare the proficiency levels at your institution with the selected test taker population. Descriptions of the competencies and abilities measured at each Proficiency Level can be found at <https://success.territorium.com/e-proficiency-profile-performance-levels>.

The following considerations should be kept in mind when interpreting comparative data:

- This data should be considered comparative rather than normative because the institutions included in the data do not represent proportionally the various types of higher education institutions. The data are drawn entirely from institutions that choose to use E-Proficiency Profile. Such a self-selected sample may not be representative of all institutions.
- The number of students tested and sampling procedures vary from one institution to another. Therefore, it is impossible to verify that the students tested at each institution are representative of all that institution's students in that program.
- It is helpful when these comparisons involve students at approximately the same point in their educational careers. The report allows you to filter on students having attained a certain number of credit hours (e.g. Entering Freshmen, Sophomores, etc.). Students who have not identified their credit status are excluded from these calculations.
- Only those institutions testing 30 or more students in a college class were included in the analyses for that college class. Institutions with fewer than 30 test takers at that class level are excluded from these calculations.
- In certain circumstances, the score distribution used to compute these statistics will be modified to prevent the statistics from being dominated by a few very large institutions. If an institution contributes a large number of students to a data set, the score of each of its students will be weighted. If weighting is applied to the report, a footnote explaining the weighting process will appear below the table. Weighting is only applied to reports based on individual student results.

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Institution List

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Alabama State University	Chipola College
Albany College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences	Clayton State University
Albertus Magnus College	Clemson University
Alice Lloyd College	College of Charleston
American Public University	College of New Jersey, The
Anderson University - South Carolina	Colorado State University - Pueblo
Andrews University	Columbia State Community College
Appalachian Bible College	Concordia University Chicago
Arkansas Baptist College	Corban University
Arkansas Northeastern College	Covenant College
Barton College	Crowder College
Belhaven University (MS)	Denmark Technical College
Bennett College for Women	Dickinson State University
Bethel College	Donnelly College
Bethel University	Dordt College
Blue Mountain College	Dyersburg State Community College
Bluffton University	Eastern New Mexico University
Bossier Parish Community College	Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical Coll
Brescia University	Emmaus Bible College
Bryan College	FOND DU LAC TRIBAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Cabrini University	Fayetteville State University
Cairn University	Fei Tian College
Cecil College	Fisk University
Central Wyoming College	Florida National University
Chattahoochee Technical College	Forman Christian College

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Institution List

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Fort Scott Community College	Mid Atlantic Christian University
Fort Valley State University	Mid-America Christian University
Gadsden State Community College	Milligan College
Georgetown College	Mineral Area College
Grambling State University	Mississippi College
International College of Health Sciences	Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College
Jackson State Community College	Mississippi State University
Jefferson College	Missouri Baptist University
Jefferson Community and Technical College	Missouri Western State University
Keiser University	Montana Tech of the University of Montana
Keystone College	Montana Technological University
LDS Business College	Morris College
La Salle University	Motlow State Community College
Lamar State College - Orange	Murray State College
Lawson State Community College	New Mexico State University Carlsbad
Leavell College	North Dakota State College of Science
Lee University	Northeast Alabama Community College
Lincoln Memorial University	Northeast Mississippi Community College
Lincoln University (MO)	Northeast State Community College
Louisiana State University - Alexandria	Northeast State Technical Community College
Lubbock Christian University	Northeastern Oklahoma A&M; College
Maranatha Baptist University	Northwest Missouri State University
Marietta College	Northwest University
McDowell Technical Community College	Northwestern Oklahoma State University
Meridian Community College	Pacific Union College

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Institution List

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Pellissippi State Community College	Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Philander Smith College	St. Johns River State College
Point Loma Nazarene University	Stillman College
Prairie View A&M; University	Sul Ross State University - Alpine
Pratt Community College	Temple University
Presbyterian College	Tennessee State University
Presentation College	Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology
Roane State Community College	The Crown College of the Bible
Saint Mary's University	Thomas University
Saint Xavier University	Touro College
Schreiner University	Trevecca Nazarene University
Seminole State College	Trinity Valley Community College
Sentara College of Health Sciences	Union College (NE)
Seward County Community College	Union County College
Shorter College	Union University
Shorter University	University of Arkansas - Pine Bluff
South College - Knoxville	University of Central Missouri
Southeastern Louisiana University	University of Georgia
Southeastern Oklahoma State University	University of Holy Cross
Southern Adventist University	University of Memphis
Southern University at Shreveport	University of Mount Olive
Southwest Baptist University	University of Pikeville
Southwest Tennessee Community College	University of Saint Katherine
Southwestern Christian College	University of Sciences in Philadelphia
Southwestern College	University of South Carolina - Aiken

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Institution List

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

University of Southern Indiana	Volunteer State Community College
University of Tampa	Walters State Community College
University of Tennessee - Chattanooga	Washburn University
University of Tennessee at Martin	Welch College
University of West Alabama	West Georgia Technical College
University of the Cumberlands	Wiley College
Vanguard University of Southern California	York College

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Institution List Summary

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Total Number of Institutions	Total Number of Students
164	93,354

Only those institutions testing 30 or more students in a college class were included in the analyses for that college class.

## E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations

### Distribution of Institutional Mean Total Scores

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Mean Total Score	Number of Institutions	Percent of Instns. Below
470 to 500.0	0	100
469 to 469.99	0	100
468 to 468.99	0	100
467 to 467.99	0	100
466 to 466.99	0	100
465 to 465.99	0	100
464 to 464.99	0	100
463 to 463.99	0	100
462 to 462.99	0	100
461 to 461.99	1	99
460 to 460.99	0	99
459 to 459.99	1	99
458 to 458.99	0	99
457 to 457.99	1	98
456 to 456.99	2	97
455 to 455.99	1	96
454 to 454.99	2	95
453 to 453.99	4	93
452 to 452.99	2	91
451 to 451.99	1	91
450 to 450.99	4	88
449 to 449.99	5	85
448 to 448.99	4	83

Mean Total Score	Number of Institutions	Percent of Instns. Below
447 to 447.99	3	81
446 to 446.99	5	78
445 to 445.99	2	77
444 to 444.99	5	74
443 to 443.99	5	71
442 to 442.99	6	67
441 to 441.99	14	59
440 to 440.99	8	54
439 to 439.99	6	50
438 to 438.99	5	47
437 to 437.99	4	45
436 to 436.99	10	38
435 to 435.99	5	35
434 to 434.99	5	32
433 to 433.99	5	29
432 to 432.99	6	26
431 to 431.99	8	21
430 to 430.99	5	18
429 to 429.99	4	15
428 to 428.99	4	13
427 to 427.99	2	12
426 to 426.99	0	12
425 to 425.99	2	10
400 to 424.99	17	0
<b>Total Number of Institutions 164</b>		
<b>Mean 438.3</b>		
<b>Standard Deviation 9.9</b>		

## E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations

Distribution of Institutional Mean SubScores

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

### Skills Subscores

Mean Subscore	Critical Thinking		Reading		Writing		Math	
	No. of Instns.	Pct. Below	No. of Instns.	Pct. Below	No. of Instns.	Pct. Below	No. of Instns.	Pct. Below
126 to 130.0	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100
125 to 125.99	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100
124 to 124.99	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100
123 to 123.99	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100
122 to 122.99	0	100	2	99	0	100	0	100
121 to 121.99	0	100	4	96	0	100	0	100
120 to 120.99	0	100	12	89	0	100	0	100
119 to 119.99	0	100	11	82	0	100	2	99
118 to 118.99	0	100	18	71	0	100	2	98
117 to 117.99	0	100	23	57	4	98	3	96
116 to 116.99	1	99	23	43	8	93	3	94
115 to 115.99	2	98	17	33	19	81	10	88
114 to 114.99	8	93	16	23	24	66	12	80
113 to 113.99	10	87	15	14	33	46	18	70
112 to 112.99	14	79	8	9	22	33	35	48
111 to 111.99	23	65	5	6	23	19	27	32
110 to 110.99	32	45	3	4	12	12	24	17
109 to 109.99	18	34	5	1	6	8	10	11
108 to 108.99	28	17	1	1	4	5	9	5
107 to 107.99	13	9	0	1	3	4	4	3
106 to 106.99	7	5	1	0	3	2	3	1
100 to 105.99	8	0	0	0	3	0	2	0
<b>Number of Institutions</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>164</b>		<b>164</b>		<b>164</b>	
<b>Mean</b>	<b>110.2</b>		<b>116.2</b>		<b>112.8</b>		<b>112.1</b>	
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>2.4</b>		<b>3.1</b>		<b>2.5</b>		<b>2.6</b>	

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Distribution of Institutional Mean SubScores (continued)

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

**Context-Based Subscores**

Mean Subscore	Humanities		Social Sciences		Natural Sciences	
	No. of Instns.	Pct. Below	No. of Instns.	Pct. Below	No. of Instns.	Pct. Below
126 to 130.0	0	100	0	100	0	100
125 to 125.99	0	100	0	100	0	100
124 to 124.99	0	100	0	100	0	100
123 to 123.99	0	100	0	100	0	100
122 to 122.99	0	100	0	100	0	100
121 to 121.99	0	100	0	100	0	100
120 to 120.99	1	99	0	100	0	100
119 to 119.99	0	99	0	100	0	100
118 to 118.99	0	99	0	100	4	98
117 to 117.99	10	93	0	100	13	90
116 to 116.99	9	88	4	98	14	81
115 to 115.99	16	78	6	94	29	63
114 to 114.99	28	61	18	83	30	45
113 to 113.99	32	41	18	72	19	34
112 to 112.99	18	30	35	51	24	19
111 to 111.99	23	16	27	34	15	10
110 to 110.99	14	8	22	21	4	7
109 to 109.99	7	4	15	12	6	4
108 to 108.99	4	1	5	9	3	2
107 to 107.99	1	1	10	2	2	1
106 to 106.99	1	0	3	1	1	0
100 to 105.99	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Number of Institutions</b>	<b>164</b>		<b>164</b>		<b>164</b>	
<b>Mean</b>	<b>113.3</b>		<b>111.7</b>		<b>114.0</b>	
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>2.3</b>		<b>2.3</b>		<b>2.4</b>	

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Distribution of Individual Student's Total Scores

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Scaled Score	Percent Below						
500	>99	475	94	450	68	425	24
499	>99	474	93	449	66	424	22
498	>99	473	93	448	63	423	20
497	>99	472	92	447	62	422	20
496	>99	471	91	446	61	421	17
495	>99	470	91	445	59	420	16
494	>99	469	90	444	57	419	15
493	>99	468	90	443	56	418	13
492	99	467	89	442	54	417	12
491	99	466	87	441	52	416	11
490	99	465	87	440	50	415	10
489	99	464	86	439	48	414	9
488	99	463	85	438	47	413	7
487	98	462	84	437	44	412	7
486	98	461	83	436	43	411	6
485	98	460	82	435	41	410	5
484	98	459	81	434	39	409	4
483	97	458	79	433	37	408	4
482	97	457	78	432	36	407	3
481	97	456	78	431	34	406	3
480	96	455	76	430	32	405	2
479	96	454	74	429	30	404	2
478	95	453	72	428	29	403	1
477	95	452	71	427	27	402	1
476	95	451	69	426	25	401	1
						400	0

<b>No. of Students*</b>	81,687	<b>90th percentile</b>	468
<b>Mean</b>	440.4	<b>75th percentile</b>	454
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	20.3	<b>50th percentile</b>	440
		<b>25th percentile</b>	426
		<b>10th percentile</b>	415

\* The score distribution used to compute these statistics has been modified, to prevent the statistics from being dominated by a few very large institutions. If an institution contributed more than 1800 students to this data set, the score of each of its students has been weighted by the fraction  $1800/n$ , where  $n$  is the number of students from that institution. For example, if an institution tested 3600 students, the score of each of its students would receive a weight of  $1800/3600 = 1/2$ . In computing the statistics, each of its students would count only half as much as a student from an institution that tested 1800 or fewer students. Therefore, an institution testing 3600 students would influence the statistics just as much as if it had tested only 1800 students.

## E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations

Distribution of Individual Students SubScores

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

### Skills Subscores Percent of Students Below Each Scaled Score

Mean Subscore	Critical Thinking	Reading	Writing	Math
	Percent Below	Percent Below	Percent Below	Percent Below
130	>99	98	>99	>99
129	>99	97	>99	99
128	>99	93	>99	99
127	>99	91	>99	98
126	99	88	>99	98
125	98	80	>99	96
124	97	79	99	93
123	96	72	94	92
122	96	65	94	90
121	91	65	90	89
120	89	58	88	87
119	88	51	80	81
118	83	49	73	79
117	79	49	73	78
116	75	41	64	69
115	73	37	56	66
114	67	33	54	64
113	61	31	41	51
112	59	28	38	47
111	57	24	32	38
110	44	19	24	31
109	41	18	21	27
108	38	13	14	17
107	27	9	12	15
106	23	6	8	9
105	19	4	6	7
104	11	3	4	3
103	8	1	3	2
102	4	1	1	2
101	3	0	1	1
100	0	0	0	0
<b>No. of Students*</b>	<b>81,687</b>	<b>81,687</b>	<b>81,687</b>	<b>81,687</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>110.6</b>	<b>116.8</b>	<b>113.2</b>	<b>112.6</b>
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>
<b>90th percentile</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>75th percentile</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>50th percentile</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>25th percentile</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>10th percentile</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>106</b>

\* The score distribution used to compute these statistics has been modified, to prevent the statistics from being dominated by a few very large institutions. If an institution contributed more than 1800 students to this data set, the score of each of its students has been weighted by the fraction  $1800/n$ , where  $n$  is the number of students from that institution. For example, if an institution tested 3600 students, the score of each of its students would receive a weight of  $1800/3600 = 1/2$ . In computing the statistics, each of its students would count only half as much as a student from an institution that tested 1800 or fewer students. Therefore, an institution testing 3600 students would influence the statistics just as much as if it had tested only 1800 students.

**E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations**

Distribution of Individual Students SubScores (Continued)

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

**Context-Based Subscores  
Percent of Students Below Each Scaled Score**

Mean Subscore	Humanities	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences
	Percent Below	Percent Below	Percent Below
130	>99	>99	99
129	>99	>99	99
128	98	>99	99
127	97	98	99
126	95	97	99
125	94	96	98
124	94	96	94
123	87	94	87
122	84	89	86
121	83	88	85
120	81	85	71
119	72	81	67
118	72	73	66
117	64	73	64
116	62	69	49
115	53	65	48
114	52	59	44
113	50	54	40
112	43	51	33
111	31	47	27
110	29	37	25
109	26	32	19
108	21	25	13
107	10	25	10
106	10	13	6
105	8	10	4
104	3	6	2
103	0	3	2
102	0	2	1
101	0	0	0
100	0	0	0
<b>No. of Students*</b>	<b>81,687</b>	<b>81,687</b>	<b>81,687</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>113.7</b>	<b>112.2</b>	<b>114.4</b>
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.0</b>
<b>90th percentile</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>75th percentile</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>50th percentile</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>25th percentile</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>10th percentile</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>107</b>

\* The score distribution used to compute these statistics has been modified, to prevent the statistics from being dominated by a few very large institutions. If an institution contributed more than 1800 students to this data set, the score of each of its students has been weighted by the fraction 1800/n, where n is the number of students from that institution. For example, if an institution tested 3600 students, the score of each of its students would receive a weight of 1800/3600 = 1/2. In computing the statistics, each of its students would count only half as much as a student from an institution that tested 1800 or fewer students. Therefore, an institution testing 3600 students would influence the statistics just as much as if it had tested only 1800 students.

## E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations

### Summary of Proficiency Classifications

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

### Percent of Students Classified as

Skill Dimension and Level	Proficient	Marginal	Not Proficient
Reading Level 1	58%	19%	22%
Reading Level 2	31%	19%	50%
Critical Thinking Level 3	3%	18%	79%
Writing Level 1	53%	30%	18%
Writing Level 2	15%	32%	53%
Writing Level 3	6%	20%	73%
Mathematics Level 1	48%	26%	25%
Mathematics Level 2	24%	24%	52%
Mathematics Level 3	5%	14%	81%

**Total Number of Students: 93,354, Total Weighted Number of Students\*: 81,687**

\* The score distribution used to compute these statistics has been modified, to prevent the statistics from being dominated by a few very large institutions. If an institution contributed more than 1800 students to this data set, the score of each of its students has been weighted by the fraction  $1800/n$ , where  $n$  is the number of students from that institution. For example, if an institution tested 3600 students, the score of each of its students would receive a weight of  $1800/3600 = 1/2$ . In computing the statistics, each of its students would count only half as much as a student from an institution that tested 1800 or fewer students. Therefore, an institution testing 3600 students would influence the statistics just as much as if it had tested only 1800 students.

## E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations

### Demographic Summary

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Age Range	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
<20	37%	38%
20 to 29	53%	52%
30 to 39	7%	6%
40 to 49	3%	3%
50 to 59	1%	1%
>60	<1%	<1%

Gender	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
Female	57%	58%
Male	43%	42%

Ethnicity	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
African American	16%	15%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1%	1%
Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander	4%	4%
Black Hispanic	1%	1%
Hispanic	7%	7%
Latin American	2%	2%
White	65%	65%
Other	3%	3%

Best Language	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
English	81%	81%
Other Language	14%	14%
Both Equal	5%	6%

Enrollment Status	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
Full Time	91%	91%
Part Time	9%	9%

\* The score distribution used to compute these statistics has been modified, to prevent the statistics from being dominated by a few very large institutions. If an institution contributed more than 1800 students to this data set, the score of each of its students has been weighted by the fraction  $1800/n$ , where  $n$  is the number of students from that institution. For example, if an institution tested 3600 students, the score of each of its students would receive a weight of  $1800/3600 = 1/2$ . In computing the statistics, each of its students would count only half as much as a student from an institution that tested 1800 or fewer students. Therefore, an institution testing 3600 students would influence the statistics just as much as if it had tested only 1800 students.

## E-Proficiency Profile (EPP) Comparative Data Report for Proctored Administrations

### Demographic Summary (continued)

All Students

Combined Class

July 2019 through June 2024

Credit Hours Transferred	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
Not a Transfer	75%	76%
0-15 Hours Transferred	7%	7%
16-30 Hours Transferred	6%	6%
>30 Hours Transferred	12%	11%

Hours Working For Wages	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
1-15 Hours	27%	27%
16-30 Hours	26%	26%
>30 Hours	19%	17%
None	28%	29%

Cumulative GPA	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data*
3.50-4.00	43%	43%
3.00-3.49	34%	35%
2.50-2.99	17%	17%
2.00-2.49	5%	5%
1.00-1.99	1%	1%
Less than 1.0	<1%	<1%

\* The score distribution used to compute these statistics has been modified, to prevent the statistics from being dominated by a few very large institutions. If an institution contributed more than 1800 students to this data set, the score of each of its students has been weighted by the fraction  $1800/n$ , where  $n$  is the number of students from that institution. For example, if an institution tested 3600 students, the score of each of its students would receive a weight of  $1800/3600 = 1/2$ . In computing the statistics, each of its students would count only half as much as a student from an institution that tested 1800 or fewer students. Therefore, an institution testing 3600 students would influence the statistics just as much as if it had tested only 1800 students.