Practice Cases and Prepared Example

Use Case A Taylor. Cases B Morgan, C Riley, and D Avery are optional. Copy one case. All assessment scores are fictional, not norm-table calculations.

Case A Taylor

Student label: Taylor (fictional training case)

Age/Grade: 9, grade 4

Disability Category: Specific Learning Disability in reading

ACADEMIC – READING

Reading Performance Data: Oct. 2026 review: adult reading support needed for grade 4 science/social studies. Fictional KTEA-3 (Sept. 2026), standard scores: Reading Composite 72 (3rd percentile); Letter & Word Recognition 78 (7th percentile; GE 2.6); Reading Comprehension 68 (2nd percentile; GE 1.8).

Kentucky Summative Assessment Reading: Spring 2026, grade 3 KSA Reading: 474, Novice (fictional).

Other Reading Performance Data: Fall 2026, grade 4 MAP Growth Reading: RIT 176; fictional 13th percentile; illustrative Lexile 230L-380L (not a verified conversion). See interpretation guide.

Previous Reading IEP Goal(s): Given a teacher-read passage at an approximate grade 2 instructional level and five oral comprehension questions, Taylor will answer at least 4 of 5 correctly on three consecutive probes, measured by teacher-created probes every two weeks.

Current/End-of-Cycle Reading Progress: Prior read-aloud goal met on the last three probes, 4/5 on each. This measures listening-supported comprehension, not independent reading.

Reading Strengths: Contributes ideas during oral science discussions, enjoys animal topics, locates explicitly stated details when an adult models returning to the text.

Reading Needs/Concerns: Answering comprehension questions after independent reading and returning to text to check an answer. Teacher observes guessing without rereading.

Reading Baseline/Localized Probe Data: October 2026, four unfamiliar 100-150-word narrative passages at an approximate grade 2 instructional level, five oral questions each (three literal, two inferential). Taylor independently read each passage silently, kept the text available, and answered orally without adult reading or answer cues: 1/5, 2/5, 2/5, 2/5 = 7/20, 35%. In a separate set of comparable teacher-read passages, Taylor answered 16/20, 80%. Conditions are different and must remain separate.

Reading Observation/Teacher/Parent/Student Input: Parent reports understanding improves with read-aloud. Taylor says, "I like learning about animals, but reading by myself takes longer."

Current or Linkage to Needed Accommodations: Read-aloud access when independent reading is not measured, extra time, and modeling return to text during instruction. Classroom supports; state-testing accommodations not determined.

Other Relevant Information: Reading-only case; service minutes, placement, and other present-level areas not supplied.

Case B Morgan Mathematics fields

Student label: Morgan (fictional training case)

Age/Grade: 12, grade 6

Disability Category: Specific Learning Disability in mathematics

ACADEMIC – MATHEMATICS

Mathematics Performance Data: Classroom work review, October 2026: Morgan needs support selecting and sequencing operations in grade 6 problem-solving activities. KTEA-3, September 18, 2026 (fictional standard scores): Math Composite 74 (4th percentile); Math Concepts & Applications 68 (2nd percentile; GE 2.8); Math Computation 82 (12th percentile; GE 4.0); Math Fluency 78 (7th percentile; GE 3.2). GE values are invented subtest examples, not calculated norm conversions. Computation is a relative strength within this profile, not evidence of grade-level mastery. All results are invented for training, not publisher-scored records.

Kentucky Summative Assessment Mathematics: Not supplied.

Other Mathematics Performance Data: i-Ready Mathematics diagnostic, September 22, 2026 (fictional scale scores): Overall Mathematics 435 (fictional report percentile 8th); Number and Operations 430; Algebra and Algebraic Thinking 421; Measurement and Data 445; Geometry 438. Fictional overall/domain instructional placement: three or more grade levels below enrollment. This placement is an invented training value, not a verified scale-score conversion or a grade equivalent. Lexile does not apply to this mathematics assessment. These results describe broad performance; they do not replace the two-step problem-solving baseline.

Previous Mathematics IEP Goal(s): Not supplied. Do not invent a prior goal or progress trend.

Current/End-of-Cycle Mathematics Progress: Not supplied.

Mathematics Strengths: Explains mathematical thinking with manipulatives and participates in partner problem solving.

Mathematics Needs/Concerns: Selecting and sequencing two operations in whole-number word problems. Frequently stops after completing the first step.

Mathematics Baseline/Localized Probe Data: Three October 2026 probes of 10 unfamiliar two-step whole-number addition/subtraction word problems with numbers within 100, no calculator, no adult prompts, and a blank organizer available: 3/10, 3/10, 3/10 fully correct (correct operations and final answer), 30%. Separate one-step probes: 8/10 on each of three forms, 80%. Keep the tasks separate.

Mathematics Observation/Teacher/Parent/Student Input: Teacher reports incomplete second steps. Parent reports homework frustration. Morgan says, "I lose my place when there are two steps."

Current or Linkage to Needed Accommodations: Blank problem-solving organizer, extra time, and manipulatives during instruction. No service minutes or testing accommodations supplied.

Other Relevant Information: Placement, other areas, and prior goal progress are not supplied. Do not invent them.

Case C Riley Functional fields

Student label: Riley (fictional training case)

Age/Grade: 8, grade 3

Disability Category: Other Health Impairment (category supplied for this fictional case)

SOCIAL / EMOTIONAL / BEHAVIORAL / ADAPTIVE

Performance Data: Classroom observations, October 2026: Riley understands familiar work when directions are explained but often waits for an adult before starting independent assignments.

Adaptive assessment: Fictional Vineland-3 Comprehensive Parent/Caregiver Form, parent report dated September 21, 2026. Composite/domain values are standard scores; subdomains are v-scale scores.

Adaptive Behavior Composite 85 (16th percentile). Communication 90 (25th percentile): Receptive 12, Expressive 14, Written 12. Daily Living Skills 78 (7th percentile): Personal 12, Domestic 9, Community 10.

Socialization 88 (21st percentile): Interpersonal Relationships 14, Play and Leisure 14, Coping Skills 10. Optional Motor Skills 96 (39th percentile): Gross Motor 15, Fine Motor 14 (not included in the Adaptive Behavior Composite). Maladaptive scales not administered. See interpretation guide.

Parent reports Riley joins games and explains familiar ideas; needs reminders for chores, materials, and interrupted routines. Teacher confirms classroom initiation difficulty. Ratings do not establish behavior function or replace the 3/10 baseline.

Previous Social/Emotional/Behavioral/Adaptive IEP Goal(s): Not supplied. Do not invent them.

Current/End-of-Cycle Progress: Not supplied.

Strengths: Positive peer relationships, participates in oral discussion, asks adults for help.

Needs/Concerns: Starting an accessible, familiar independent task after directions and materials are provided.

Baseline/Localized Data: On 10 opportunities across five days, after materials, one verbal direction, and a picture checklist were provided, Riley independently began the first relevant task step within two minutes on 3/10 opportunities (30%). An extra adult cue was needed on the other seven. A relevant first step means making the first task-related written response or manipulating the first required material. Do not score simply touching supplies or looking at a worksheet as starting.

Observation/Teacher/Parent/Student Input: Teacher reports repeated reminders. Parent reports needing reminders for homework starts. Riley says, "I do better when I can see the first thing."

Current or Linkage to Needed Accommodations: Picture checklist and one initial direction. Do not add extra cues to the independent success condition.

Other Relevant Information: Additional diagnoses, behavior function, services, placement, and other areas not supplied; do not infer from adaptive scores.

Case D Avery General intelligence and linked learning needs

For ChatGPT, copy only this case into a new conversation. Draft General Intelligence, Academic, and Social Emotional/Adaptive present levels; then propose aligned annual goals, SDI/SAS, and monitoring. Use only supplied data. Do not write an IQ-increase goal.

Teacher Input: [RAW INPUT DATA VARIABLES]

Student label: Avery (fictional training case). Age/Grade: 11, grade 5.

Disability Category: Mild Mental Disability (MMD), already established for this fictional learner. This is an IEP-drafting exercise, not an eligibility determination; an IQ score alone does not establish eligibility, placement, or assessment participation.

General Intelligence Scores: WISC-V, September 14, 2026. Full Scale IQ 65 (about 1st percentile). Primary index standard scores: Verbal Comprehension 68 (2nd percentile); Visual Spatial 75 (5th percentile); Fluid Reasoning 67 (1st percentile); Working Memory 65 (1st percentile); Processing Speed 72 (3rd percentile). Percentiles are rounded training approximations. All values are fictional, not norm-table calculations. WISC-V and adaptive results do not provide Lexile or grade-equivalent scores.

WISC-V primary subtest scaled scores: Similarities 4 (2nd percentile); Vocabulary 4 (2nd); Block Design 5 (5th); Visual Puzzles 6 (9th); Matrix Reasoning 4 (2nd); Figure Weights 4 (2nd); Digit Span 3 (1st); Picture Span 5 (5th); Coding 4 (2nd); Symbol Search 5 (5th). Subtest percentiles are rounded training approximations. Scaled scores are a different metric from index standard scores. Ancillary indexes, raw scores, and confidence intervals are not supplied.

Relevant Cognitive Strengths and Needs: Visual Spatial performance is relatively stronger within Avery's profile; it is not age-appropriate mastery. The pattern suggests a need to investigate support for language, novel reasoning, holding information in mind, and learning pace. Classroom statements below are based on direct observations, not inferred from IQ alone.

Adaptive Scores: Vineland-3 Comprehensive Parent/Caregiver Form, September 16, 2026. Fictional standard scores: Adaptive Behavior Composite 65 (about 1st percentile); Communication 66 (1st); Daily Living Skills 63 (below 1st); Socialization 72 (3rd). These are approximate standard-score percentile interpretations. Subdomain v-scale scores: Receptive 8, Expressive 9, Written 7; Personal 8, Domestic 7, Community 8; Interpersonal Relationships 10, Play and Leisure 11, Coping Skills 8. Optional motor/maladaptive scales not administered.

Academic Performance: October work review shows difficulty independently reading classroom directions, using addition for classroom purchases, and composing a complete sentence. Avery participates in grade 5 shared topics with adult explanation and adapted practice. No academic standardized scores are supplied.

Reading Baseline/Localized Probe Data: October 5, 7, and 9, 2026: unfamiliar 60-80-word narrative passages selected at approximately grade 1 instructional level, independently read silently, text available, five literal questions read aloud, oral answers, no adult passage reading or answer cues. Scores 2/5, 2/5, 2/5 = 6/15 (40%). In a separate teacher-read condition, 4/5 on each of three comparable passages (80%). Keep conditions separate.

Mathematics Baseline/Localized Probe Data: Same three dates: 10 unfamiliar one-step addition word problems with totals within 20, adult reads each problem verbatim, counters and a number line available, no solution cues or calculator. Correct means the correct addition equation and total, stated or written. Scores 4/10, 4/10, 4/10 = 40%.

Written Expression Baseline/Localized Probe Data: Same three dates: five unfamiliar picture prompts per probe; familiar word bank and lined paper available, oral directions read once, no sentence model or adult composition cues. A correct response is one independently written complete subject-verb sentence that matches the picture; spelling is not scored. Scores 1/5, 1/5, 1/5 = 20%.

Adaptive Baseline/Localized Data: October 5-9, 2026: after materials, one verbal direction, and a three-picture checklist are supplied, Avery completes all three steps of a familiar classroom materials routine without extra prompts in 2/10 opportunities (20%). The steps are collect the pictured items, place them at the work area, and put the completed bin away. Record any additional prompt; prompted completion is not independent success.

Strengths and Input: Teacher observes persistence during picture-supported sorting and participation in familiar partner routines. Parent reports interest in cooking and needing steps shown individually. Avery says, 'Pictures help me know what comes next.' Student interests include animals and preparing snacks; these are interests, not demonstrated vocational skills.

Previous IEP Goals and Progress: Not supplied; do not invent a prior goal or progress trend. Current supports: short oral directions, visual checklist, counters/number line, word bank, extra time, and explicit modeling during teaching. Keep teaching prompts separate from the independent measurement conditions.

Monitoring information: Proposed reading, mathematics, and writing probes every two weeks under the conditions above; adaptive opportunities recorded daily and summarized weekly. Passage difficulty, item quality, and scoring keys require educator review. Collection frequency and family progress-report schedule are separate; the latter is not supplied.

Other Relevant Information: No transition plan, service minutes, placement, state-testing determination, or other evaluation results supplied. Avery's task levels are probe conditions, not test-derived grade equivalents. Draft General Intelligence using cautious score interpretation and linked observed learning needs; place localized baselines in their academic/adaptive areas. Proposed targets and services require educator/ARC judgment.

Prepared Avery example and review

General Intelligence should report FSIQ 65, the five index scores, and the relative Visual Spatial strength without calling that skill average or directly observed. Explain possible instructional implications cautiously, then attribute actual learning behaviors to observations. Do not treat an IQ score as a localized baseline or write an IQ-increase goal.

Possible General Intelligence draft: On the fictional September 2026 WISC-V, Avery obtained FSIQ 65 (about 1st percentile), with Verbal Comprehension 68, Visual Spatial 75, Fluid Reasoning 67, Working Memory 65, and Processing Speed 72. Visual Spatial performance is relatively stronger within this profile. The pattern may indicate a need for concrete models, short language, repeated supported practice, and additional processing time. Direct classroom review separately documents difficulty following written directions and completing reading, mathematics, writing, and classroom routines independently. See Academic and Social Emotional/Adaptive present levels for localized baselines. These learning needs affect independent access to grade 5 classroom tasks; teachers must individualize instruction and supports using the observed evidence.

Alignment check: reading baseline is 40% after independent reading, not the separate 80% teacher-read result. Mathematics baseline is 40% with adult-read problem statements and counters/number line. Writing baseline is 20% with a word bank, and spelling is not the target. Routine completion is 20% independently with the specified checklist. Preserve these conditions in any proposed goals and monitoring.

Review task: Draft the General Intelligence section plus ONE linked academic or adaptive area, goal, SDI/SAS, and monitoring plan. Identify one score-based interpretation to verify and one decision that remains with the ARC. Additional classroom data may be needed before choosing appropriately ambitious targets.

Optional revision and missing component requests

Generate the initial set using your current form directions. Use these requests only when a draft needs correction, clarification, or an additional component. You can edit directly instead. Verify each revision against the original evidence.

Correct a changed condition

Revise the reading PLAAFP and goal. The independent baseline is 7/20 correct (35%). The 16/20 (80%) result came from separate teacher-read passages. Keep those conditions separate and use only the supplied evidence.

Clarify the goal

Review this goal for audience, observable behavior, circumstance, degree, evaluation/method, and collection frequency. Identify an ambiguous part, then propose a clearer revision without changing the target skill or inventing data.

Strengthen SDI and separate SAS

Revise the SDI to explain the adapted teaching method for the goal, including modeling, guided practice, corrective feedback, and prompt fading. Keep access supports under SAS and specify their contexts. Do not invent service minutes, placement, or state-testing decisions.

Add a missing monitoring plan or probe

Create a brief progress-monitoring plan aligned exactly with the goal. Specify task, materials, supports, question/item types, scoring rule, collection frequency, recording fields, proposed instructional review rule, and progress-report schedule to be determined/documented by the ARC. Keep teaching separate from measurement. For Taylor, use one unfamiliar 100-150-word narrative passage at approximately grade 2 instructional level with three literal and two inferential oral questions, text available, independent silent reading, oral answers, no adult reading or answer cues. Draft one practice passage and five questions with an answer key. Treat text level and parallel-form difficulty as requiring educator verification.

Check and revise the connected draft

Revise the draft using only the supplied evidence. Identify each unsupported or inaccurate statement and explain the correction. Preserve differences between independent and adult-supported conditions. Keep the baseline, goal, SDI, SAS, and monitoring task aligned. Identify missing information and educator/ARC decisions. Return the revised text and a brief explanation of what changed.

Prepared Taylor PLAAFP

Use this model if live access is unavailable. Compare it to Case A. It is one possible draft, not a complete IEP or a compliance determination. Equivalent organization and wording may be appropriate.

Performance Data Measure

October 2026 classroom review indicates that Taylor needs adult reading support to access grade 4 science and social studies text. Taylor met the prior goal: Given a teacher-read passage at an approximate grade 2 instructional level and five oral comprehension questions, Taylor will answer at least 4 of 5 correctly on three consecutive probes, measured by teacher-created probes every two weeks. The last three scores were 4/5 each. This progress reflects listening-supported comprehension; it does not establish independent reading mastery. Fictional KTEA-3, Sept. 2026 (standard scores): Reading Composite 72 (3rd percentile); Letter & Word Recognition 78 (7th percentile; GE 2.6); Reading Comprehension 68 (2nd percentile; GE 1.8). Spring 2026, grade 3 KSA Reading: 474, Novice (fictional). Fall 2026, grade 4 MAP Growth Reading: RIT 176; fictional percentile 13th; illustrative Lexile range 230L-380L (not a verified conversion). MAP has no grade equivalent. These assessment results provide broad performance information; the localized probes below provide the goal baseline. All scores are invented for training.

Relative Strengths

Taylor contributes ideas during oral science discussions, enjoys animal topics, and locates explicitly stated details when an adult models returning to the text. Taylor reports an interest in learning about animals.

Needs/Concerns

Taylor needs instruction in answering comprehension questions after independent reading and returning to text to check answers. The teacher observes guessing without rereading. The parent reports stronger understanding when someone reads aloud. Taylor says reading independently takes longer.

Baseline Data (Localized Probe)

On four October 2026 probes using unfamiliar 100-150-word narrative passages at an approximate grade 2 instructional level, Taylor independently read silently and answered five oral questions per passage, with three literal and two inferential questions. Text remained available; no adult reading or answer cues were provided. Scores were 1/5, 2/5, 2/5, and 2/5, totaling 7/20 correct (35%). On a separate set of comparable teacher-read passages, Taylor answered 16/20 (80%). These conditions must remain separate.

Adverse Effect

Difficulty understanding independently read text limits Taylor's access to grade 4 content reading and completion of tasks that require reading for information. Adult reading support improves access to content, while Taylor needs direct instruction to build independent comprehension.

Prepared goal instruction and monitoring

Proposed annual goal

Given an unfamiliar 100-150-word narrative passage at an approximate grade 2 instructional level, with the text available and five orally presented comprehension questions (three literal and two inferential), Taylor will independently read the passage silently and answer at least four of five questions correctly (80%) without adult reading or answer cues on three consecutive teacher-created curriculum-based probes administered every two weeks.

A: Taylor. B: comprehension answers after independent reading. C: unfamiliar 100–150-word narrative passage at about grade 2 instructional level, text available, three literal/two inferential oral questions, no adult passage reading or answer cues. D: 4/5 on three consecutive probes. E: teacher-created curriculum-based probes. F: every two weeks. The ARC determines whether the target is appropriately ambitious.

SDI

Explicit instruction in returning to text to locate details and combine text clues with prior knowledge for an inference, teacher think-aloud modeling, guided practice matching a question to relevant text, immediate corrective feedback with an explanation, gradual fading of verbal and visual prompts, independent practice with unfamiliar passages. Teaching prompts are appropriate during instruction and are removed during independent probes.

SAS

Read-aloud access to grade-level content when independent reading is not the target being measured, extra time for classroom reading tasks, access to the passage while answering questions. The ARC specifies needed contexts and implementation details; these classroom examples do not establish state-testing accommodations.

Progress monitoring plan

Every two weeks, administer one unfamiliar 100-150-word narrative passage at an approximate grade 2 instructional level, with three literal and two inferential oral questions. Taylor reads silently, keeps the text, and answers orally. Read questions verbatim without answer cues; do not read the passage or teach during the probe. Score each answer 1 or 0 using a reviewed answer key; accept equivalent wording. Percent = correct / 5 x 100. Record date, passage/form, level review, conditions, literal and inferential correct, total, percent, and any deviations. Graph scores. Proposed instructional review rule: if three consecutive scores fall below the planned aimline, check implementation and adjust instruction; this is an example decision rule, not a Kentucky requirement. The ARC documents the actual progress-report schedule separately. One probe is not a mastery decision.

Date and form	Literal /3	Inferential /2	Total /5	Percent	Conditions or deviation
_____	___	___	___	___	_____
_____	___	___	___	___	_____

Prepared practice probe

Educator review required. This original practice passage has not been validated for reading level or parallel-form comparability. Review difficulty, decoding demands, question quality, and the key before using it as a measure.

The bean plant

Sam put a small pot by the classroom window. He filled it with soil and planted two bean seeds. Each morning, he checked the soil. When it felt dry, he added a little water. For several days, Sam could not see a change. He wanted to dig up the seeds, but his teacher asked him to wait. On Friday, a tiny green shoot pushed through the soil. Sam smiled and called his friend over. His friend wanted to put the pot in a dark cupboard to keep it safe. Sam shook his head and pointed to the sunny window. He put the pot back where the light could reach it.

Taylor independently reads silently with text available. Read the questions verbatim and record oral answers. Do not read the passage or provide answer cues. Prompts belong in instruction, not this independent probe.

1. Where did Sam put the pot?
Response: _____

2. What did Sam plant?
Response: _____

3. What appeared on Friday?
Response: _____

4. Why did Sam smile on Friday?
Response: _____

5. Why did Sam choose the window instead of the cupboard?
Response: _____

Educator answer key and scoring

1. Literal: By the classroom window.

2. Literal: Two bean seeds.

3. Literal: A tiny green shoot.

4. Inferential: He saw that the seeds were growing / he was happy a plant had begun to grow.

5. Inferential: He understood the plant needed light to grow.

Score 1 for an accurate answer and 0 for an inaccurate or absent answer. Accept equivalent wording; grammar is not the target. Total / 5 x 100. Example: 4/5 = 80%. This is a practice sample, not a standardized assessment.

Interpreting the fictional assessment results

Percentile ranks compare performance with a norm group; they are not percentages of items answered correctly. Rounded standard-score percentiles are teaching approximations. The MAP/i-Ready report percentiles, Lexile range, placements, and KTEA-3 grade equivalents are invented training values, not verified publisher conversion-table outputs.

Taylor: KTEA-3 GE 2.6 means performance comparable to the norm group at grade 2, sixth month, on that subtest; GE 1.8 refers to grade 1, eighth month. Neither establishes overall reading placement or mastery. The Reading Composite has no grade equivalent. The illustrative Lexile range supports discussion of text complexity; it does not establish what Taylor can independently comprehend. MAP RIT is not a grade equivalent. KSA Novice is a state performance level, not a national percentile or grade equivalent.

Morgan: KTEA-3 GE 2.8, 4.0, and 3.2 refer to grade 2 eighth month, beginning grade 4, and grade 3 second month on those subtests. They do not mean Morgan has mastered those grade-level curricula. The Math Composite has no grade equivalent. The i-Ready placement describes performance relative to enrolled grade, not a traditional grade-equivalent score. Lexile is not a mathematics score.

Riley and Avery: cognitive/adaptive percentiles describe relative standing, not a percentage of daily tasks completed. Adaptive v-scale scores and WISC-V subtest scaled scores are different from composite/index standard scores. Do not assign a school grade level or mental age from IQ or adaptive scores. No Lexile or grade equivalents apply to these measures. Avery has no standardized academic achievement test in this case; teacher-selected probe levels are not grade equivalents.

For drafting: keep all assessment interpretations under performance data. Use each supplied localized baseline and its exact conditions for goals and monitoring. No score conversion makes an eligibility, placement, service, or instructional decision.