



Friendship Aspire Academy Public Charter School ARKANSAS

Current Landscape Analysis for Friendship Aspire Academy Pine Bluff-Hazel

I. Brief Performance Snapshot

Provide a concise overview of the school's current academic standing. (Last year)

Friendship Aspire Hazel received an **F rating** due to low overall growth, limited progress among our lower-performing students in ELA, Math, and Science, and weak growth across most student groups. Our school also demonstrated below-average performance in postsecondary readiness indicators. Several contributing factors—including inconsistent attendance, elevated behavior incidents, and high student mobility—further impacted academic outcomes and disrupted instructional continuity. Because we serve a high-need population, these results suggest that last year's systems were not sufficiently aligned to intentional goals for *all* students, including our novice teachers and the significant number of scholars with unfinished learning.

The data makes it clear that our core instructional structures, intervention systems, and progress-monitoring practices did not fully meet the academic and developmental needs of our learners. As we move forward, we must adopt clear, targeted goals; strengthen coaching and support for new teachers; and ensure that every student—especially those performing below grade level—receives consistent, data-driven, small-group and Tier 1 instruction. Additionally, addressing attendance, behavior, and mobility—alongside strong instructional practices—will be essential to accelerating growth and improving student outcomes across all content areas.

II. Identified Root Causes

1. Core Instruction & Curriculum

- Instruction is not consistently aligned to Arkansas academic standards, particularly in math; lessons often emphasize procedural practice over conceptual understanding and problem-solving.
- High-quality instructional materials are used inconsistently; pacing and rigor vary widely between teachers and courses.
- Formative assessment practices are uneven, and data are not systematically used to adjust instruction or provide timely support.

2. Observation and Coaching Cycles

- Coaching and feedback cycles for teachers are inconsistent, with limited follow-up on implementation.
- Teams do not regularly analyze data by student group (e.g., lowest quartile, special education, English learners) to identify who is off track and why.
- Action steps following data meetings, when they occur, are not clearly documented or monitored for implementation and impact.

3. Curriculum Pacing and Common Formative Assessments

- Variance in adherence to the established pacing expectations across classrooms in core content areas.
- CFA data is not systematically used to inform reattach cycles or targeted intervention.
- Insufficient teacher support for pacing and assessment implementation.

4. PLC's and Data Meetings (Last year)

- There is no schoolwide, structured routine for reviewing interim assessment data, district common formative assessments, and ATLAS results.
- Teams do not regularly analyze data by student group (e.g., lowest quartile, special education, English learners) to identify who is off track and why.
- Action steps following data meetings, when they occur, are not clearly documented or monitored for implementation and impact.

III. Current Actions & Improvement Plan Components

_____ is prioritizing schoolwide instructional improvement in response to low proficiency in literacy, math, and science; inconsistent implementation of high-quality instructional materials; and limited use of data to drive teaching and learning. This CAP outlines four strategic priorities to strengthen core instruction, coaching systems, pacing and assessments, and PLC effectiveness.

Priority 1: Core Instruction and HQIM Implementation

Goal: Ensure all students receive rigorous, grade-level instruction every day.

Key Actions:

- Implement HQIM for ELA, Math, and Science with clear instructional non-negotiables.
- Conduct weekly lesson internalization using the gradual release model..
- Facilitate collaborative planning focused on priority standards and exemplar student work.
- Monitor standards mastery to implement real time feedback and intervention.

Priority 2: Strengthened Observation & Coaching Cycles

Goal: Build teacher capacity through high-quality feedback and consistent coaching.

Key Actions:

- Implement weekly/biweekly observations using the *See It, Name It, Do It* coaching model.
- Provide actionable teacher practice steps with follow-up within 48 hours.
- Increase coaching frequency for tested grades and teachers needing support.

- Track coaching impact through observation data and student outcomes.

Priority 3: Curriculum Pacing & Common Formative Assessments (CFAs)

Goal: Align pacing, assessment, and instructional adjustments to ensure mastery of grade-level standards.

Key Actions:

- Adherence to provided pacing guides across all grade levels.
- Administer biweekly CFAs aligned to priority standards.
- Use CFA and exit-ticket data in PLCs to plan targeted reteach.
- Align interventions with specific skill gaps identified in data.

Priority 4: PLCs & Data Meetings

Goal: Build high-functioning PLCs that drive instructional improvement through data-driven collaboration.

Key Actions:

- Hold weekly PLCs using a consistent protocol and agenda.
- Analyze student work and priority-standard data to identify misconceptions.
- Conduct monthly Data Deep Dives to monitor schoolwide trends.
- Review PLC artifacts (agendas, minutes, action steps) for quality.

Overall Commitment

These four priorities work together to ensure Hazel Elementary delivers rigorous, standards-aligned instruction supported by effective coaching, aligned pacing, and strong data practices. The school will monitor progress monthly and report updates at the March CAP meeting.