

## STAAR BOY Data Dig




## Whole Group for $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade n=339

Percentage of Students


- Mastery

■ Meets
Approaches
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students


## Whole Group TVS vs. F2F



## ESL and SPED



## Eco Dis



## Dyslexia



## CPJH vs. Tomball ISD ELA $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data



## Ms. George (All TVS) <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=18
$$



## Ms. Magrini (All F2F) <br> $$
n=63
$$

Percentage of Students


- Mastery

■ Meets
Approaches
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students


## Ms. Hobbs (F2F and TVS) n=95



## Ms. Hobbs TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Kruppa (Thomas) All F2F <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=70
$$

Percentage of Students


- Mastery
- Approaches

■ Meets
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students

Does Not Meet $\quad 7$

Approaches


Masters

## Ms. Forbes <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=91
$$



## Ms. Forbes TVS vs. F2F



Standard Breakdown
Purple: Master's



## Whole Group for $7^{\text {th }}$ Grade n=290

Percentage of Students


- Mastery
$\square$ Meets
Approaches
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students


Masters

## ESL and SPED



## Eco Dis and Dyslexia

| Eco Dis $\mathrm{n}=26$ | Dyslexia $\mathrm{n}=6$ <br> $42.31 \%$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## CPJH vs. WWJH ELA $7^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data



## CPJH vs. Tomball ISD ELA $7^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data



## Ms. Yancey All F2F and TAP <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=59
$$



## Ms. Jordan (F2F and TVS) (Level and TAP) <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=89
$$



## Ms. Jordan TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Jordan TAP vs. Level



## Ms. Bird (F2F and TVS) (Level and TAP) <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=89
$$

Percentage of Students


- Mastery
- Meets

Approaches
■ Does Not Meet

## Ms. Bird TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Bird TAP vs. Level




## Whole Group for $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade $\mathrm{n}=268$



## Whole Group TVS vs. F2F



## ESL and SPED



## Eco Dis and Dyslexia

Eco Dis $n=1$

100\%

Dyslexia $n=4$


- Mastery

■ Meets

- Approaches ■ Does Not Meet


# CPJH vs. WWJH ELA $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data 



## CPJH vs. Tomball ISD ELA $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data



## Ms. Yancey (All F2F) <br> $$
n=22
$$

Percentage of Students


■ Mastery

- Approaches

■ Meets
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students


Approaches


## Ms. Lea (F2F and TVS) <br> $$
n=115
$$



## Ms. Lea TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Hagan (F2F and TVS) $\mathrm{n}=130$



## Ms. Hagan TVS vs. F2F





## Whole Group for $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade n=331

Percentage of Students


■ Mastery
■ Meets
Approaches
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students
Does Not Meet $\quad \square 37$

Masters

## ESL and SPED



## Eco Dis and Dyslexia



## CPJH vs. Tomball ISD Math $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data



## Ms. Garrett (All F2F) <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=41
$$

Percentage of Students


- Mastery
- Approaches

■ Meets
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students
Does Not Meet

Approaches


Meets

Masters


## Ms. Jones (F2F and TVS) n=144



## Ms. Jones TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Ohlman (F2F and TVS) $n=145$

Percentage of Students


- Mastery

■ Meets
Approaches
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students

Does Not Meet

Approaches

Meets

Masters

## Ms. Ohlman TVS vs. F2F



Standard Breakdown
Purple: Master's


Standard Breakdown



## Whole Group for $7^{\text {th }}$ Grade $n=248$



## ESL and SPED



## Eco Dis and Dyslexia

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Eco Dis } \mathrm{n}=26 \\ 7.69 \% \end{array}$ |  | Dyslexia $\mathrm{n}=4$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| $50 \%$ | 19.23\% |  | $50 \%$ |
|  | 23.08\% | $50 \%$ |  |
| - Mastery <br> - Approaches | - Meets <br> ■ Does Not Meet | ■ Mastery <br> - Approaches | - Meets <br> ■ Does Not Meet |

# CPJH vs. WWJH Math $7^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data 



# CPJH vs. Tomball ISD Math $7^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data 



## Ms. Garrett (F2F and TVS) <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=71
$$



## Ms. Garrett TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Jirrels (F2F and TVS) n=151



## Ms. Jirrels TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Kelley (All F2F) <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=40
$$




## Whole Group for $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade n=153



## ESL and SPED



## Eco Dis and Dyslexia

Eco Dis $\mathrm{n}=10$


■ Mastery

- Approaches
- Meets

■ Does Not Meet

Dyslexia $n=4$

100\%

- Mastery
- Approaches

■ Meets
■ Does Not Meet

## CPJH vs. WWJH Math $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data



## CPJH vs. Tomball ISD Math $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data



## Mr. Wortham (All F2F) <br> $$
\mathrm{n}=9
$$



## Ms. Kelley (F2F and TVS) <br> $$
n=43
$$

Percentage of Students


- Mastery
- Approaches

■ Meets
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students


## Ms. Kelley TVS vs. F2F



## Ms. Landgrebe (F2F and TVS) n=106



## Ms. Landgrebe TVS vs. F2F





## Whole Group for $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade n=324

Percentage of Students


■ Mastery
Approaches

■ Meets
■ Does Not Meet

Number of Students


## ESL and SPED

| ESL n=26 |  | SPED $\mathrm{n}=13$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37.5\% | 19.23\% |  | 23.08\% |
|  | $50 \%$ | 61.54\% | $15.38 \%$ |
| - Mastery <br> - Approaches | - Meets <br> - Does Not Meet | - Mastery <br> - Approaches | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Meets } \\ & \text { Does Not Meet } \end{aligned}$ |

## Eco Dis and Dyslexia



# CPJH vs. Tomball ISD Science $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade STAAR BOY Data 



