

PAIR®



AI REPORT WRITER

PSYCHED REPORT

SAMPLE REPORTS



Sally Sample

SAMPLE REPORT

PsychEd Report™

Generated by



This report was generated using generative artificial intelligence developed to support professionals in the interpretation and communication of psychological assessment results. The report may contain errors, omissions, or misinterpretations. It is provided as a draft and should not be considered final or complete without professional review. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. SEE ADDITIONAL TERMS AT <https://www.parinc.com/trust-center/pariconnect-ai-platform-end-user-license-agreement>

The interpretive information contained in this report should be viewed as only one source of hypotheses about the individual being evaluated. No clinical, educational, or legal decisions should be made based solely on the content of this report. It is the responsibility of the qualified professional to carefully review, verify, and revise the content as needed and to integrate it with all other available information before drawing conclusions or making recommendations.

PAR. 16204 N. Florida Ave. | Lutz, FL 33549 | 1.800.331.8378 | [parinc.com](https://www.parinc.com)

Copyright © 2026 by PAR. All rights reserved. This report was generated using PAR's proprietary AI-powered report writer. This copyright applies exclusively to the report template, interpretive structure, and any software used in the creation of this report.

INITIAL REPORT

Name: Sally Sample	Birthdate: 01/01/2016
Date of Report: 01/26/2026	Age: 10
Date(s) of Evaluation: 01/26/2026	

Reason for Referral

Sally is a fourth-grade student at Sunnyside School who was referred for an initial psychoeducational evaluation by the school's Student Success Team due to concerns in the following areas:

Academic performance: Sally demonstrates persistent difficulty with written expression. Teachers and parents report challenges in generating ideas, organizing thoughts, and producing written work that aligns with grade-level expectations. Although her performance in most academic areas falls within the expected range, writing has emerged as a relative weakness. She often avoids written tasks, requires additional time to complete assignments, and benefits from frequent prompts and scaffolding. Her written output is typically marked by limited detail, inconsistent grammar and punctuation, and difficulty maintaining coherent sentence structure and organization.

Behavior: Sally is consistently described as cooperative, motivated, and well-behaved in the classroom setting. She follows directions appropriately and demonstrates sustained effort during academic tasks. There are no reported behavioral concerns or indications of disruptive conduct. However, she tends to experience frustration when unable to effectively express her ideas in writing, which occasionally impacts her engagement during writing activities.

Social-emotional functioning: Socially, Sally maintains age-appropriate peer relationships and interacts positively with classmates and teachers. Her emotional regulation appears intact, with no significant concerns noted regarding mood or interpersonal functioning. The primary emotional challenge observed relates to frustration stemming from her academic struggles in written expression rather than generalized emotional distress.

Educational needs: The primary educational need identified for Sally involves targeted support in written language development. Given her difficulties in idea generation, organization, and written output quality, she requires instructional strategies that address these specific deficits while maintaining access to grade-level curriculum across subjects.

The purpose of this comprehensive evaluation is to gather data to assist the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team in determining whether Sally meets the eligibility criteria as an individual with exceptional needs under the NJ Education Code, thereby qualifying for Special Education services. If she is found eligible, the next step will be to develop an appropriate IEP that will provide Sally with a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), tailored to her unique learning needs.

This evaluation report will present a thorough analysis of Sally's strengths and areas of need, as well as recommendations to support her educational success.

Background Information

Sally is a 10-year-old fourth-grade student referred for a comprehensive psychoeducational evaluation due to persistent challenges in written expression. Both her parents and teachers describe consistent difficulties with generating ideas, organizing thoughts, and producing written work that aligns with grade-level standards. These concerns are pervasive across academic contexts, suggesting that the difficulties are not limited to specific subjects or instructional settings but reflect a broader issue in written language formulation and organization.

Developmental history indicates that Sally achieved early milestones within expected timeframes, with no significant language, motor, or social delays. There are no reported medical or neurological conditions that would reasonably account for her current academic profile. This developmental trajectory supports the interpretation that her writing difficulties are not secondary to underlying health or sensory impairments but may instead reflect specific cognitive or linguistic processing challenges.

Instructionally, English serves as Sally's primary language of learning, ensuring that her performance is not confounded by second-language acquisition factors. Teachers note that she performs within the expected range across most academic areas, which suggests intact general intellectual functioning and adequate foundational skills in reading and mathematics. However, writing has emerged as a distinct area of weakness, characterized by limited elaboration, inconsistent grammar and punctuation, and difficulty structuring sentences coherently. These observations align with reported behaviors such as avoidance of writing tasks and the need for extensive prompting and scaffolding to complete assignments.

Behavioral and social data portray Sally as cooperative, motivated, and socially engaged. She demonstrates age-appropriate peer interactions and exhibits no significant emotional or behavioral symptoms that would interfere with learning. Her frustration when unable to effectively express her ideas in writing indicates insight into her challenges and suggests that her difficulties are academically based rather than reflective of motivational deficits.

Overall, the background information delineates a student whose general development and learning behaviors are age-appropriate but whose written expression skills fall below expectations despite adequate effort and engagement. The referral for psychoeducational assessment is therefore well-founded in order to delineate the underlying cognitive and academic factors contributing to these specific writing challenges and to determine appropriate educational supports tailored to Sally's profile.

School Observation

Sally was observed during a fourth-grade language arts lesson that included both whole-group instruction and an independent writing task. Throughout the observation, Sally demonstrated appropriate classroom behavior, remaining attentive and compliant with all routines. She followed teacher directions promptly, maintained consistent eye contact, and actively participated by raising her hand to respond to questions. Her engagement during the verbal portion of the lesson indicated that she comprehended oral instructions and content at an age-appropriate level. No evidence of distractibility or off-task behaviors was noted during this segment, suggesting intact attention regulation and behavioral self-management.

During the transition to independent work, Sally exhibited a notable delay in task initiation. She spent several minutes preparing her materials, erasing, and hesitating before beginning to write. This latency period contrasted with her peers, who began their writing more promptly. Once she initiated the task,

Sally's writing pace remained slower than classmates', characterized by frequent pauses and rereading of prior work. These observed behaviors indicate potential challenges in written expression processes such as idea generation, organization of thoughts, and translation of ideas into written form.

Throughout the independent activity, Sally demonstrated persistence despite mild frustration. Observable signs included sighing and fidgeting with her pencil; however, she did not engage in avoidance or disruptive behavior. Instead, she sought clarification from the teacher regarding expectations and reassurance about her progress. This indicates self-awareness of difficulty combined with adaptive help-seeking behavior—a strength in self-regulation and coping within academic contexts.

The final written product completed by Sally was shorter and less detailed than those of peers. The brevity of her output suggests that while comprehension and motivation were adequate, inefficiencies in written production may be constraining her performance on writing tasks. The combination of slow initiation, reduced fluency, and limited elaboration supports the interpretation that Sally's primary challenges are related to written expression rather than attention or behavior management.

Across the observation period, Sally maintained positive social interactions with both teacher and peers. She responded appropriately when addressed and displayed cooperative demeanor throughout instruction. Her attention span, impulse control, and compliance were within developmental expectations for her age group. Therefore, her classroom functioning appears well regulated behaviorally and socially; difficulties observed were specific to academic output rather than general engagement or conduct.

In summary, Sally presented as an attentive and motivated student whose classroom behavior supports learning but whose written expression is characterized by slow initiation, reduced fluency, and limited elaboration compared to peers. These observed patterns suggest that her academic struggles in writing are likely linked to difficulties with planning, organizing ideas, and sustaining written productivity rather than issues with attention or motivation.

Cognitive Testing

Wechsler Intelligence Scale For Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V)

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V) is a comprehensive, individually administered measure of cognitive ability for children ages 6–16 years. It assesses intellectual functioning across five primary domains (Verbal Comprehension, Visual Spatial, Fluid Reasoning, Working Memory, and Processing Speed) and yields a Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) and multiple index scores, providing a detailed profile of a child's cognitive strengths and weaknesses.

Sally demonstrated exceptional cognitive abilities across multiple domains on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V). Her performance profile reveals strengths in fluid reasoning and processing speed, with a few notable discrepancies between subtests and indexes warranting closer examination.

Composite/Index	Standard Score	Percentile	Qualitative Descriptor
Verbal Comprehension (VCI)	121	92	Very high
Visual Spatial (VSI)	111	77	High average
Fluid Reasoning (FRI)	131	98	Extremely high

Composite/Index	Standard Score	Percentile	Qualitative Descriptor
Working Memory (WMI)	110	75	High average
Processing Speed (PSI)	141	99	Extremely high
Full Scale IQ (FSIQ)	132	98	Extremely high

Subtest	Scaled Score	Percentile	Qualitative Descriptor
Similarities (SI)	12	75	Average
Vocabulary (VC)	16	98	Very high
Block Design (BD)	9	37	Average
Visual Puzzles (VP)	15	95	High average
Matrix Reasoning (MR)	19	99	Very high
Figure Weights (FW)	12	75	Average
Digit Span (DS)	15	95	High average
Picture Span (PS)	8	25	Average
Coding (CD)	19	99	Very high
Symbol Search (SS)	15	95	High average

Sally's Full Scale IQ of 132, Extremely high, indicates superior overall cognitive functioning relative to same-age peers. This score is primarily driven by her exceptionally strong performance on the Processing Speed Index (141, Extremely high) and Fluid Reasoning Index (131, Extremely high). The 10-point disparity between her FRI (131) and PSI (141) suggests an area of particular strength in rapid information processing despite already elevated reasoning abilities.

Her Verbal Comprehension Index (121, Very high) exceeds the 90th percentile. This contrasts with her Visual Spatial Index (111, High average), which is 10 points lower but still reflects solid skills. While this discrepancy may reflect relative verbal-linguistic dominance, it does not reach the threshold of statistical significance given the 15-point benchmark for index-level differences.

A meaningful contrast emerges between Sally's verbal and nonverbal working memory skills. Her Working Memory Index (110, High average) is composed of a high Digit Span score (15, High average) and a Picture Span score (8, Average). The 7-point gap between these subtests exceeds the 3-point threshold for scaled score differences, suggesting a relative weakness in visual-spatial working memory maintenance and recall. This pattern warrants further investigation into her ability to sustain attention during tasks requiring mental imagery and spatial manipulation.

Her Block Design subtest score (9, Average) appears inconsistent with her overall cognitive profile, falling below the 40th percentile despite excelling on other visual-spatial measures like Visual Puzzles (15, High average). This discrepancy raises questions about whether task-specific factors such as fine motor coordination or visual-motor integration may be influencing her performance on complex construction

tasks. Her coding efficiency (19, Very high) and symbol search speed (15, High average) both demonstrate remarkable fluency, aligning with her strong processing speed index.

Notably, Sally’s vocabulary knowledge (16, Very high) and abstract reasoning (19, Very high) surpass her similarities understanding (12, Average) by 4 and 2 points respectively. These disparities, particularly the 4-point gap between VC and SI, exceed the typical 2-point threshold for scaled score differences and suggest she may possess advanced semantic memory that is not always effectively utilized in making conceptual comparisons. This pattern merits consideration of potential mismatches between her language-based skills and executive functioning processes required for inferential thinking.

Academic Testing

Feifer Assessment Of Writing (FAW)

The Feifer Assessment of Writing (FAW) is designed to measure three subtypes of written language disorders or dysgraphia: graphomotor, dyslexic, and executive. It differs from traditional academic achievement assessments in that it is a diagnostic measure with specific neurocognitive processes addressed directly in the test.

Index	Standard Score	Qualitative Descriptor
Graphomotor Index (GI)	80	Below average
Dyslexic Index (DI)	75	Moderately below average
Executive Index (EI)	75	Moderately below average
Compositional Writing Index (CWI)	75	Moderately below average
FAW Total Index (TI)	77	Moderately below average

Subtest	Standard Score	Qualitative Descriptor
Alphabet Tracing Fluency (ATF)	90	Average
Motor Sequencing (MS)	80	Below average
Copying Speed (CS)	80	Below average
Motor Planning (MP)	80	Below average
Homophone Spelling (HS)	73	Moderately below average
Isolated Spelling (IS)	73	Moderately below average
Executive Working Memory (EWM)	82	Below average
Sentence Scaffolding (SS)	82	Below average

Subtest	Standard Score	Qualitative Descriptor
Retrieval Fluency (RF)	90	Average
Expository Writing (EW)	72	Moderately below average
Copy Editing (CE)	80	Below average
Story Mapping (SM)	71	Moderately below average

Sally demonstrates a complex writing profile across multiple domains. Her Graphomotor Index (GI) of 80, Below average, indicates foundational difficulties with fine motor skills and graphomotor efficiency despite her performance on Alphabet Tracing Fluency (ATF; SS=90, Average) and Retrieval Fluency (RF; SS=90, Average). This discrepancy suggests she may rely on compensatory strategies during rapid symbol production tasks while struggling with more sustained or effortful graphomotor demands.

Her dyslexic index (DI) of 75, Moderately below average, aligns with moderate challenges in phonological processing and spelling accuracy, particularly evident in low scores on Homophone Spelling (HS; SS=73, Moderately below average) and Isolated Spelling (IS; SS=73, Moderately below average). These results correspond to her Rapid Symbolic Naming Composite score, indicating intact naming speed but limited application to orthographic representation tasks. Notably, her Expository Writing (EW) subtest score of 72, Moderately below average, represents the most pronounced weakness relative to peers, falling 2 points below her DI and 8 points below her CWI.

The executive index (EI) of 75, Moderately below average, reflects moderate deficits in cognitive flexibility and working memory during writing tasks. While her Executive Working Memory (EWM; SS=82, Below average) and Sentence Scaffolding (SS; SS=82, Below average) scores suggest partial compensation in these domains, her Story Mapping (SM; SS=71, Moderately below average) score reveals significant difficulty organizing narrative structures. This pattern is consistent across the Compositional Writing Index (CWI; SS=75, Moderately below average), which integrates both linguistic and organizational components.

Her Copy Editing (CE) subtest score of 80, Below average, mirrors her performance on Motor Sequencing (MS; SS=80, Below average), Copying Speed (CS; SS=80, Below average), and Motor Planning (MP; SS=80, Below average), suggesting a uniform deficit in visual-motor integration and task persistence. However, this does not fully account for her relatively stronger performance on ATF and RF, which remain consistent with her overall graphomotor inefficiency.

A 3-point gap exists between her scores on ATF and RF and her scores on MS, CS, MP, EWM, and SS. Given the established threshold for meaningful scaled score differences (≥ 3 points), this pattern warrants further investigation into potential dual processing pathways—one supporting rapid automatized tasks and another compromising effortful, strategic writing processes. The 2-point discrepancy between her DI and CWI underscores the interplay between phonological awareness and higher-order composition skills, which may require targeted intervention to address her specific needs.

Social-Emotional Functioning

Clinical Assessment Of Behavior (CAB) - Teacher Form

The Clinical Assessment of Behavior (CAB) is a standardized, broadband behavior rating scale designed to assess both adaptive and clinical behaviors in children and adolescents ages 2–18 years. Its three

forms capture behavior across home and school settings, evaluating psychosocial strengths and problem behaviors and providing a comprehensive profile of a child's adjustment.

Scale Name	T Score	Qualitative Descriptor
Internalizing Behaviors (INT)	50	Normal
Externalizing Behaviors (EXT)	50	Normal
Social Skills (SOC)	42	Normal
Competence (COM)	45	Normal
CAB Behavioral Index (CBI)	50	Normal

Scale	T Score	Qualitative Descriptor
Emotional Disturbance (ED)	68	Mild clinical risk
Social Maladjustment (SM)	50	Normal

Cluster Name	T Score	Qualitative Descriptor
Anxiety (ANX)	45	Normal
Depression (DEP)	42	Normal
Anger (ANG)	41	Normal
Aggression (AGG)	40	Normal
Bullying (BUL)	40	Normal
Conduct Problems (CP)	41	Normal
Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity (ADH)	40	Normal
Autistic Spectrum Behaviors (ASB)	40	Normal
Learning Disability (LD)	72	Significant clinical risk
Mental Retardation (MR)	50	Normal
Executive Function (EF)	40	Normal
Gifted and Talented (GAF)	40	Normal

Item	Raw Score	Qualitative Descriptor
Number of clinical cluster scores ≥ 70	1	Typical cluster profiles
Number of clinical cluster scores ≤ 30	0	Typical cluster profiles

Sally's CAB-T results indicate a generally stable behavioral profile, with most scores falling within expected limits. Her Internalizing (INT=50) and Externalizing (EXT=50) behaviors align with typical developmental patterns, suggesting minimal distress or disruptive tendencies in classroom settings. Adaptive skills, including Social Skills (SOC=42) and Competence (COM=45), also reflect age-appropriate functioning, though slightly below the midpoint of the adaptive scale's range (T=40–59). The CAB Behavioral Index (CBI=50) corroborates this pattern, with no evidence of pervasive behavioral concerns.

A notable exception is the Learning Disability (LD) cluster score of 72, which indicates elevated concern. This elevated score contrasts sharply with her performance on other clinical clusters (e.g., ANX=45, DEP=42) and adaptive clusters (EF=40, GAF=40). The discrepancy suggests that Sally may exhibit specific difficulties related to academic skill acquisition or retention that are not broadly generalized across emotional or behavioral domains. However, the absence of similarly elevated scores on related indices (e.g., Processing Speed or Working Memory composites from cognitive assessments) limits the ability to infer direct etiological links at this stage.

The Respondent Veracity Scale reveals an unusual response pattern, with one clinical cluster score ≥ 70 and none ≤ 30 . While this does not meet criteria for extreme profiles (raw ≥ 6), it warrants cautious interpretation of the LD elevation. Teachers may have perceived inconsistencies in reporting severity or prioritization of concerns, potentially influenced by contextual factors such as classroom environment or instructional demands. Cross-verification with additional informants (e.g., parents, peers) and direct academic performance data would strengthen the validity of conclusions regarding Sally's learning-related challenges.

Her Emotional Disturbance (ED=68) score shows a modest elevation compared to her Social Maladjustment (SM=50) score. This asymmetry implies that Sally may experience discrete emotional regulation difficulties not accompanied by corresponding maladaptive social behaviors. Such patterns could reflect internalized stressors or anxiety-specific concerns that do not manifest overtly in peer interactions. Given the lack of supporting data from anxiety-focused measures (e.g., SCARED, RCADS), further exploration of potential triggers or coping mechanisms is recommended.

Comprehensive Summary

Strengths: Sally demonstrates exceptional cognitive ability across multiple domains, as reflected by her Full Scale IQ of 132 (98th %ile, Extremely high). Her strongest areas include Processing Speed (SS=141, 99th %ile) and Fluid Reasoning (SS=131, 98th %ile), indicating superior efficiency in rapid information processing and abstract problem-solving. These strengths suggest that Sally can quickly perceive relationships among visual and conceptual stimuli and apply reasoning strategies with exceptional accuracy. Her Verbal Comprehension Index (SS=121, 92nd %ile) further supports advanced language acquisition and semantic knowledge, reflected in her very high Vocabulary subtest performance (Scaled Score=16, 98th %ile). In the classroom, these strengths likely enhance her oral communication, comprehension of complex instructions, and ability to grasp new academic concepts with minimal repetition. Observational data confirm that Sally maintains strong attention, follows directions efficiently, and engages positively with teachers and peers, underscoring robust executive control and self-regulation capacities.

Key Weaknesses: Despite her superior intellectual capacity, Sally exhibits a pronounced weakness in written expression as measured by the Feifer Assessment of Writing (FAW). Her Total Index score of 77 (Moderately below average) reveals broad-based challenges across graphomotor, phonological, and executive writing domains. Subtest-level data highlight specific deficits in Expository Writing (SS=72), Story Mapping (SS=71), and Homophone Spelling (SS=73), all within the Moderately below average range. These results point to difficulties with idea organization, orthographic retrieval, and sustained written output. The Graphomotor Index of 80 indicates reduced fine-motor fluency that may interfere with handwriting speed and endurance. The Executive Index (SS=75) further suggests inefficiencies in planning and sequencing written material despite otherwise intact cognitive flexibility on non-writing tasks. This pattern contrasts sharply with her superior cognitive profile on the WISC-V, suggesting a specific learning-related weakness rather than generalized intellectual impairment. Behavioral data from the Clinical Assessment of Behavior reinforce this interpretation: although Sally's overall emotional adjustment is normal across domains, a clinically significant elevation on the Learning Disability cluster (T=72) aligns with these academic findings.

Impact on Classroom Performance: The discrepancy between Sally's exceptional reasoning ability and her below-average writing performance has direct implications for daily classroom functioning. Her cognitive strengths allow her to comprehend complex material rapidly and contribute meaningfully during verbal discussions; however, when required to express ideas in written form, she experiences marked difficulty initiating tasks, organizing content coherently, and sustaining output over time. Observations confirm that she begins writing more slowly than peers and produces shorter compositions with limited elaboration despite clear conceptual understanding. These challenges lead to frustration during independent writing activities but do not extend to behavior or peer interactions. The mismatch between her high-level reasoning (e.g., FRI=131) and low-level written production skills (e.g., CWI=75) may mask her true academic potential in settings emphasizing written output. Consequently, Sally's instructional performance is likely constrained by mechanical and executive aspects of writing rather than deficits in understanding or motivation, necessitating structured support for translation of her advanced ideas into organized written work.

Action Plan and Recommendations

Short-Term Goals (0–3 months)

- Implement structured writing supports for Sally, including graphic organizers and sentence starters to facilitate idea generation and organization during writing tasks.
- Provide daily, brief writing fluency exercises (3–5 minutes) focusing on motor sequencing and copying speed to strengthen graphomotor efficiency, as indicated by FAW subtests (MS=80, CS=80).
- Introduce guided spelling instruction emphasizing phonological patterns and homophone distinctions to address deficits identified on Homophone Spelling (HS=73) and Isolated Spelling (IS=73).
- Allow extended time for written assignments and assessments to mitigate processing delays observed during classroom writing tasks and consistent with below-average FAW indices.
- Integrate keyboarding practice into academic routines to reduce motor strain associated with handwriting tasks and improve written output fluency.
- Schedule biweekly teacher check-ins to monitor frustration levels during writing activities and reinforce adaptive coping strategies noted in classroom observation.

- Use explicit modeling of sentence scaffolding techniques to support narrative coherence, targeting weaknesses reflected in Sentence Scaffolding (SS=82) and Story Mapping (SM=71).
- Ensure consistent positive feedback on writing effort rather than output volume to sustain motivation and reduce performance anxiety related to written expression.

Long-Term Goals (3–12 months)

- Develop a comprehensive written expression intervention plan that systematically addresses executive organization deficits, using multi-step composition frameworks aligned with FAW Executive Index findings (EI=75).
- Embed explicit instruction in planning, drafting, revising, and editing phases of writing to strengthen compositional structure skills consistent with Compositional Writing Index (CWI=75) results.
- Incorporate visual-spatial working memory activities—such as mental imagery or pattern recall exercises—to remediate relative weakness observed between Digit Span (15) and Picture Span (8) on WISC-V.
- Establish collaborative data reviews every quarter among teachers, parents, and specialists to track progress in spelling accuracy, sentence coherence, and task initiation latency.
- Introduce assistive technology tools (e.g., word prediction software or digital graphic organizers) to support organization and reduce cognitive load during complex writing tasks.
- Provide targeted small-group instruction focused on fine motor coordination and handwriting fluency to address graphomotor inefficiencies reflected in FAW Graphomotor Index (GI=80).
- Continue monitoring emotional functioning through teacher reports using CAB metrics, ensuring that mild elevations in Emotional Disturbance (ED=68) are addressed through supportive classroom strategies emphasizing self-regulation.
- Aim for measurable improvement in written task initiation time by reducing prewriting latency by at least 30% over a six-month period through structured prompts and visual cues.
- Maintain ongoing collaboration between general education teachers and special education staff to ensure accommodations are consistently implemented across all academic environments.

IEP Goals and Recommendations

Written Expression Goals

Goal 1: Sentence Structure and Grammar - Baseline: Sally demonstrates inconsistent grammar and punctuation usage, with below-average performance on the Feifer Assessment of Writing (FAW) subtests related to syntax and sentence formulation (Sentence Scaffolding = 82, Below average). - Annual Goal: Within one year, Sally will independently compose complete, grammatically correct sentences using appropriate punctuation and capitalization in 4 out of 5 writing samples, as measured by teacher-collected writing probes. - Measurement Criteria: Accuracy of sentence structure and punctuation will be evaluated using a standardized rubric targeting syntax, capitalization, and punctuation (80% accuracy criterion).

Goal 2: Written Organization and Planning - Baseline: Sally exhibits difficulty organizing written content, as evidenced by her FAW Story Mapping score of 71 (Moderately below average) and Expository Writing score of 72 (Moderately below average). - Annual Goal: Given graphic organizers or structured outlines, Sally will plan and organize written responses with a clear beginning, middle, and end in 4 out of 5 opportunities, achieving a minimum rubric score of 3 on a 4-point scale for organization. - Measurement Criteria: Teacher-scored writing samples using an organization rubric aligned with grade-level writing standards.

Goal 3: Written Fluency - Baseline: Sally demonstrates slow initiation and reduced fluency during independent writing tasks, consistent with Below average graphomotor efficiency (Graphomotor Index = 80). - Annual Goal: Given a grade-level prompt, Sally will increase written output from baseline to at least one paragraph (5–7 sentences) within a timed 10-minute writing task in 4 out of 5 trials. - Measurement Criteria: Writing sample length and completeness measured through teacher-collected curriculum-based writing probes.

Goal 4: Spelling Accuracy - Baseline: Sally shows difficulty with phonological-to-orthographic mapping based on FAW Homophone Spelling (73) and Isolated Spelling (73) subtests (both Moderately below average). - Annual Goal: When provided with weekly spelling lists and targeted phonics instruction, Sally will correctly spell grade-level words with regular and irregular patterns with at least 85% accuracy across three consecutive weekly assessments. - Measurement Criteria: Weekly teacher-made spelling assessments.

Executive Functioning Goals

Goal 5: Working Memory in Writing Tasks - Baseline: FAW Executive Working Memory score of 82 (Below average) indicates reduced capacity to hold multiple writing components in mind while composing. - Annual Goal: During structured writing tasks, Sally will utilize self-monitoring strategies (e.g., checklist completion or verbal rehearsal) to maintain topic focus and include all key elements in her written work in 4 out of 5 opportunities. - Measurement Criteria: Teacher observation checklists documenting independent use of planning tools.

Accommodations and Modifications

To support Sally's progress toward these goals, the following accommodations are recommended: - Instructional Supports

- Provide explicit instruction in sentence construction, grammar conventions, and paragraph organization using visual models.
- Utilize graphic organizers to support planning before writing.
- Offer exemplars of well-organized compositions for reference during instruction.
- Pre-teach vocabulary relevant to upcoming writing assignments.
- Task Presentation
 - Allow use of typing or speech-to-text technology to reduce graphomotor load.
 - Break multi-step assignments into smaller chunks with interim deadlines.
 - Provide sentence starters or transition word banks for scaffolding written output.
- Response Accommodations
 - Permit oral responses or dictated drafts when assessing content knowledge rather than written expression.
 - Allow additional time for written assignments and tests requiring extended responses.
- Environmental Supports

- Minimize distractions during writing tasks by providing a quiet workspace.
- Offer frequent teacher check-ins during independent work to ensure sustained engagement.
- **Assessment Modifications**
 - Reduce emphasis on spelling accuracy for grading when the objective is content generation or organization.
 - Permit use of word-processing tools with spell-check functions during extended writing assignments.

Recommended Services

To facilitate skill acquisition consistent with identified needs: - Specialized Academic Instruction (SAI): Focused small-group instruction targeting written expression skills at least three times per week for direct intervention in grammar, organization, and composition strategies. - Occupational Therapy Consultation: To address fine motor efficiency concerns linked to Below average graphomotor performance (Graphomotor Index = 80). - Collaboration Between General Education Teacher and Resource Specialist: Regular consultation to integrate scaffolding strategies into classroom assignments. - Progress Monitoring: Quarterly review of IEP goal attainment using curriculum-based measures of writing fluency, organization, and accuracy.

These supports align directly with the cognitive-linguistic profile evidenced by Sally's assessment data and are structured to address her documented deficits in written expression while leveraging her high cognitive potential.