

Complete IEP Advocacy Working Packet

Prepared for Taylor Morgan family

Meadowbrook Unified School District | Complete IEP Advocacy

All names, dates, schools, scores, and case facts in this sample are invented.

WHAT I BELIEVE IS HAPPENING

Taylor's records show a capable child with longstanding reading and written-language needs. Evaluations repeatedly identified the same underlying weaknesses, but the IEPs changed labels, shortened services, and measured easier surface skills. At the same time, service interruptions and vague progress reports made it nearly impossible for the family to tell whether the plan was being implemented or working. The case needs one connected strategy, not another isolated meeting.

WHAT I AM TAKING OFF YOUR SHOULDERS

You can forward me what the school sends and contact me when something changes. I will keep the issues connected, tell you what matters, prepare the response, write the emails and requests, and stay with you through the meeting and review of the resulting IEP.

The result we are pursuing

- A plan that directly addresses Taylor's decoding, spelling, and written-expression needs
- Services described clearly enough for the family to know what should occur
- Measurable goals with current baselines and understandable progress data
- A decision about missed reading service
- A final IEP that accurately reflects the team's commitments

The case in one connected story

Taylor's early evaluation identified phonological-processing and decoding weaknesses. Later testing confirmed slow automatic word recognition and spelling difficulty. The 2024 IEP retained reading support but shifted the annual goal to passage fluency. By winter, the school described limited progress while also acknowledging provider absences and schedule changes. The 2025 draft reduced reading frequency and added a general writing goal without a baseline. Each development was discussed separately. Together, they show a plan drifting away from the needs the evaluations actually identified.

Record	What it contributes	Connection that matters
2022 evaluation	Initial decoding and phonological findings	Establishes the underlying need
2023 reevaluation	Continued weakness despite stronger oral language	Shows persistence, not a temporary delay
2024 IEP	Fluency goal and reading service	Measures speed but not the documented decoding skill
Service logs	Repeated gaps in scheduled instruction	Limits what progress conclusions can fairly be drawn
2025 draft	Proposed service reduction and broad writing goal	Moves further from the identified need without adequate data

Priority one reading instruction

The problem

The current plan treats fluency as though it fully represents reading. Taylor may read a practiced passage more quickly while still struggling to decode unfamiliar words. The plan needs to teach and measure the underlying word-reading skill directly.

What I will ask the team to change

- Add a direct decoding goal from a current baseline
- Identify the instructional sequence and provider qualifications
- State service frequency, duration, group size, and procedure for missed sessions
- Report dated decoding scores separately from fluency
- Set a review point if growth is inadequate

Proposed goal language

Given unfamiliar words representing the patterns taught, Taylor will decode the words accurately and identify the pattern used, improving from the baseline established before instruction to at least 85 percent accuracy across three consecutive weekly probes.

Words for the meeting

I am not asking the team to abandon fluency. I am asking it to stop using fluency as a substitute for measuring the decoding weakness identified in Taylor's evaluations.

Priority two written expression

What is missing

The draft says Taylor will improve written expression but does not state the current level of performance, the type of writing expected, or how organization, sentence construction, and conventions will be measured. Without a baseline, the family cannot tell what progress means.

Proposed goal structure

- Baseline from two independent writing samples
- A defined writing task and expected length
- Separate scoring for organization, sentence construction, and conventions
- Monthly unprompted writing probes
- Work samples shared with each progress report

Proposed goal language

Given a grade-level informational prompt and an agreed planning tool, Taylor will write a multiparagraph response containing a clear topic, logically ordered supporting details, complete sentences, and an ending, meeting at least 4 of 5 rubric elements across three consecutive monthly samples.

Priority three missed service

What the records suggest

Provider messages and schedule records suggest that Taylor missed at least eleven planned reading sessions. The district has not yet produced a complete service log or decided whether replacement instruction is required.

What I will do

1. Obtain the complete service logs and reconcile them with the IEP schedule.
2. Separate absences attributable to Taylor from provider or district cancellations.
3. Ask the team to determine the educational impact of missed instruction.
4. Press for a written decision on the amount, method, and timing of any replacement service.

Words for the school

Please provide the complete service log and identify each session that was delivered, missed, shortened, or replaced. After the record is complete, the team needs to decide how the lost instruction will be addressed. I do not agree to leave that question open indefinitely.

The meeting plan

Order	Issue	Decision needed
1	Service record	What instruction occurred and what was missed
2	Reading need	Direct decoding goal and explicit instructional service
3	Written expression	Current baseline and measurable replacement goal
4	Progress reporting	Named measures, dated scores, and work samples
5	Follow through	Owners, deadlines, draft date, and reconvene date if needed

What I will not allow to disappear

- The unresolved missed-service question
- The distinction between decoding and fluency
- The absence of a writing baseline
- The parent's request for understandable progress data
- Any disagreement that should be reflected in the record

How you can use me during the meeting

You do not have to track every issue while also managing the emotion of the meeting. I will keep the agenda, ask follow-up questions, bring the team back when the answer drifts, and stop to make sure you understand before a major decision is treated as settled.

Email I wrote for the parent before the meeting

Thank you for sending Taylor's draft IEP. Before the meeting, please provide the complete reading-service logs, the individual data points underlying the reading progress reports, and the current writing samples used to develop the proposed written-expression goal. Taylor's evaluations identify decoding and spelling weaknesses, but the draft primarily measures passage fluency and does not include a current writing baseline. At the meeting, we will ask the team to address those disconnects, determine how missed reading service will be handled, and identify the instruction and progress measures that will be written into the plan. Please include this email in Taylor's educational record.

Why I wrote it this way

- It requests the exact missing records before the meeting
- It connects the evaluation findings to the draft instead of making a general complaint
- It identifies the decisions the parent expects the team to make
- It creates a clear written record without unnecessary hostility

Review of the draft after the meeting

Commitment check

Meeting commitment	Draft result	Correction needed
Add decoding goal	Goal added but uses practiced passages	Replace measure with unfamiliar word probes
State reading group size	Omitted	Add maximum group size to service description
Add writing baseline	Added as emerging skills	Insert actual baseline from agreed samples
Share monthly data	Says periodic reports	State monthly scores and work samples
Decide missed service	Not addressed	Preserve for reconvened meeting and written decision

Corrections I would send

The draft does not yet reflect several meeting commitments. Please revise the decoding goal to use unfamiliar word probes, add the agreed maximum group size to the reading service, replace the phrase emerging skills with Taylor's actual writing baseline, and state that monthly scores and work samples will be shared. The missed-service issue also remains unresolved and should appear on the reconvened meeting agenda.

Where the engagement stands

Completed

- Full record review and connected case narrative
- Written advocacy strategy and proposed goals
- Pre-meeting records request and parent preparation
- IEP meeting attendance and active advocacy
- First review of the resulting draft and correction request

Still open

- District response to the draft corrections
- Written decision regarding missed reading service
- Reconvened meeting if the remaining issues cannot be resolved in writing
- Final review of the corrected IEP before the family considers agreement

What you need to do right now

Nothing new today. Forward me the district's response or revised draft when it arrives. I will compare it with the commitments and tell you what, if anything, still needs to be addressed. You do not need to reconstruct the history again each time the school sends something; I am carrying that continuity for you.

The standard for finishing

The work is not finished merely because a meeting occurred or a new draft arrived. We are looking for a plan that accurately states Taylor's needs, contains measurable goals, defines the services, preserves the unresolved decisions, and gives the family a practical way to know whether the plan is being delivered and working.

The complete case chronology

Date	What happened	Why it matters now
May 2022	Evaluation identified phonological processing, decoding, and spelling weaknesses.	Establishes needs the current plan must still address unless new data shows they resolved
March 2023	Reevaluation confirmed slow automatic word recognition and stronger listening comprehension.	Explains why Taylor may understand grade-level ideas while struggling to read them
April 2024	IEP shifted the primary reading measure to passage fluency.	The underlying decoding need stopped being measured directly
September to November 2024	Provider absences and schedule changes interrupted service.	Limits conclusions about Taylor's response to the planned instruction
February 2025	Draft reduced service and introduced a broad writing goal without a baseline.	Creates two proposed changes without the data needed to judge them

The story I will not let the school fragment

The reading goal, missed service, weak progress data, and proposed reduction are not four unrelated topics. They are one chain: the school identified a need, chose a plan, did not consistently document delivery, measured a different skill, and now proposes less support without resolving what happened.

The working issue register

Issue	Evidence	Current position	Next action
Decoding	Two evaluations and repeated classroom errors	Direct need remains	Add goal and explicit instruction
Written expression	Draft goal has no observable baseline	Cannot measure growth	Obtain samples and rewrite goal
Missed reading service	Provider emails and incomplete logs	Amount and impact unresolved	Reconcile logs and secure decision
Progress reporting	Narrative statements without scores	Parent cannot verify progress	Require dated measures and work samples
Proposed reduction	Draft cuts frequency without transfer data	Not supported yet	Maintain service pending complete review

How I use this register

Every new email, record, meeting answer, or draft change is placed against an open issue. That keeps the school from closing one question by changing the subject to another, and it keeps you from having to remember the entire case every time something arrives.

Detailed reading goal and service request

Current baseline needed

Taylor's baseline should report performance on unfamiliar words representing the patterns already taught, including accuracy, error type, and prompting. Passage rate on a practiced text cannot serve as the baseline for this goal.

Annual goal

Given unfamiliar one- and multisyllabic words containing the sound-symbol and syllable patterns taught, Taylor will decode the words accurately and identify the applicable pattern, improving from the current baseline to at least 85 percent accuracy across three consecutive weekly probes without verbal prompting.

Service description

Taylor will receive explicit, systematic specialized reading instruction addressing phonological awareness, decoding, and encoding. The IEP will state sessions per week, minutes per session, maximum group size, provider role, instructional location, and the procedure for documenting and replacing missed sessions.

Progress report the family receives

At least monthly, the family receives the dated score, pattern assessed, number attempted, number correct, error type, prompting level, and instructional adjustment. Quarterly reports summarize those actual data rather than replacing them.

Detailed writing goal and measurement plan

Baseline from real work

Using two current independent grade-level informational writing tasks, the team will record the number of complete sentences, logically ordered details, paragraph elements, spelling patterns, and level of adult support. The baseline will describe what Taylor currently produces, not simply state below grade level.

Annual goal

Given a grade-level informational prompt and an agreed planning tool, Taylor will independently write a multiparagraph response with a clear topic, logically ordered supporting details, complete sentences, and a conclusion, meeting at least four of five agreed rubric elements across three consecutive monthly samples.

How we prevent a misleading score

- Use a consistent task type and agreed planning support
- Score organization, sentence construction, conventions, and independence separately
- Preserve the actual work sample with each score
- Record any prompting, dictation, editing, or assistive technology
- Review the error pattern, not only the total rubric number

The communication I carry for the parent

When the district sends a new explanation

Forward it to me. I will compare it with the record, identify whether it answers the actual question, and write the response if it does not. You do not need to find the contradiction or worry that your email sounds too angry, too soft, or not technical enough.

When something happens at school

Contact me while it is fresh. Tell me what occurred, who was involved, what was said, and what you are afraid may happen next. I will determine whether it changes the strategy, belongs in the written record, requires an immediate response, or can wait.

Examples of what I write

- Records requests tied to a pending IEP decision
- Pre-meeting emails that define the issues the team must address
- Goal and service language the parent can propose
- Same-day meeting confirmation emails
- Corrections when the draft does not match the meeting
- Follow-up when deadlines or commitments are missed

What this gives you

You stop waking up at night trying to compose the perfect email or remember every inconsistency. The communication remains calm, specific, and tied to the evidence while the pressure of carrying it alone moves off your shoulders.

The meeting advocacy plan

Stage	What I do	What it protects
Before	Set the agenda, request missing evidence, prepare goals and service language, brief you on the pressure points	The important issues enter the meeting clearly
During	Ask follow-up questions, challenge unsupported conclusions, stop vague answers, and secure owners and dates	The team cannot move past an issue merely by talking around it
If needed	Recommend recess or reconvening when records are missing or the team cannot complete the work responsibly	You are not forced into a final decision without the necessary information
After	Confirm commitments, review the draft, write corrections, and keep unresolved issues open	What was won in the meeting survives into the written IEP

What active advocacy sounds like

I am not asking the team for a general assurance that Taylor will receive support. I am asking it to identify the instruction, frequency, provider, group size, measurement, and response if the data does not show growth. Those are the details that determine whether the plan can be understood and enforced.

Final IEP acceptance checklist

Check	Question	Required result
Need	Does the IEP accurately describe Taylor now?	Evaluation history, current data, classroom impact, and full parent concern
Goals	Can progress be measured objectively?	Current baseline, defined skill, named measure, frequency, and independence level
Services	Can the family tell what must occur?	Frequency, duration, setting, provider role, group size, and missed-session procedure
Reporting	Will the parent see the evidence?	Dated scores, work samples, prompting, and understandable reporting
Commitments	Did the written plan preserve the meeting?	Every decision, refusal, owner, deadline, and reconvene point

The final question

If someone new picked up this IEP tomorrow, would that person know what Taylor needs, what to teach, how often to teach it, how to measure it, what to share with the parent, and what to do if progress stalls? If the answer is no, the work is not finished.

What the parent receives at the end

- A connected record that explains how the case developed
- A written strategy organized around the decisions that matter
- Goals, service language, questions, and emails prepared for use
- Meeting advocacy that presses for evidence and commitments
- A written account of what occurred and what remains open
- Review of the resulting IEP against the record and meeting commitments
- Corrections pursued through the final plan

What changes for you

You no longer face each document or school message as a new emergency. The history is organized. The open issues are tracked. The language is written. The next move is clear. You can focus on being Taylor's parent while I carry the structure, strategy, and follow-through of the advocacy.

My commitment to the finish

I do not consider the work complete because a meeting ended or a document was uploaded. I stay with the engagement until the final IEP reflects the decisions reached, the remaining disagreements are clear, and you understand what the plan requires and what to watch next.