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Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

For an overview of the indicator, including explanation of the measurement, please access the SPP/APR modules: [SPP/APR Basics, What you Need to Know](https://dasycenter.org/spp-apr-basics-what-you-need-to-know/). For more detailed information please access the current [FFY Part C SPP/APR Package](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/grantees/#SPP-APR,FFY20-25-SPP-APR-Package). The Measurement Table language is also included at the beginning of the indicator in the SPP/APR template/platform.

**What to Know About this Indicator**

* Part C Indicator 9 is a report on the number of due process complaints that were resolved through a resolution session.
* Indicator C-9 is applicable only if the state adopts the Part B due process procedures.
* A unique factor about Indicator 9 is that baseline and targets are only required if the number of resolution sessions is 10 or more.
* This indicator is a results indicator and states set rigorous targets based on data analysis and stakeholder engagement.
* Targets can be provided in ranges or without ranges.

When the number of resolution sessions is less than 10 the result of the calculation is reported but there will not be a comparison to a target.

General Tips

* Review and respond to information included in the sections “OSEP Response” and “Required Actions” from the previous year’s APR for this indicator. Include the state’s response in " Prior FFY Required Actions" section for the SPP/APR reporting platform.
* Ensure that all information is entered into the appropriate fields in the platform.
* Check that your numbers exactly match the OSEP pre-populated/auto-calculated numbers.

Exclude extraneous information that may cause confusion or create additional questions for the reader.

1. Indicator Data

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Indicated “yes” if the indicator is not applicable
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided an explanation as to why it is not applicable
 |  |  |  |

2. Historical Data

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Indicated whether using target ranges [Option 1 is without ranges for Targets table. Option 2 is with ranges. Historical tables will display any previously reported target ranges in prior years for both options]
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Indicated whether data reported in this indicator are NOT the same as data reported under Section 618 of IDEA *[Indicating yes will make all of the numerator and denominator fields in the FFY SPP/APR table editable]*
 |  |  |  |
| 1. *If yes,* Provided an explanation
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints related to number of resolution sessions (*Pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints related to number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements(*Pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Described stakeholder input (*Populated if Introduction description is shared with all indicators*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified or changed baseline year (*Previous data pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified or changed baseline data (*Previous data pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of historical data (*Pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of historical targets (*Pre-Populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy or changed targets for current FFY and future FFYs using Option 1 or Option 2 (*Pre-populated - End target for FFY 2025 must be higher than baseline data*)
 |  |  |  |

Tips (if baseline changed)

* Change both the baseline year (FFY) and the baseline data in the “Historical Data” section. Baseline can be changed to reflect the current FFY or a prior FFY.
* Record the baseline data so it is consistent with the state’s data for that FFY as reported in the “Historical Data” section or in the “Current FFY Data” section. Do not round up or round down the numbers (e.g., use 89.52% not 90%).
* Describe how stakeholders were involved in the decision to keep or change baseline and/or targets. Include the kind of information/data was shared to inform their input (e.g., trend data, improvements in data quality issues, state initiatives impacting the data). Include this information in the “Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input” section unless information specific to changing baseline and/or targets for this indicator is included in the “Introduction” and the stakeholder engagement information is checked to repeat for each indicator.
* Describe the justification/reason(s) for resetting baseline and/or targets in the “Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input” section unless information specific to changing baseline and/or targets for this indicator is included in the “Introduction” and the stakeholder engagement information is checked to repeat for each indicator. Reasons for changing baseline most frequently impact comparability of data across FFYs, such as changes in state data collection tools, methodology, or data source. Reasons for changing targets should reflect such things as improved data quality, change in baseline, initiatives or state priorities impacting indicator data.

See the following resources for more information on justifications for resetting baseline and targets:

* + [Target Setting Guide](https://dasycenter.org/target-setting-guide/)
	+ [OSEP’s Universal TA for FFY 2020-2025](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/Universal-TA-for-FFY-2020-2025-SPP-APR.pdf)
	+ [IDEA Part C SPP/APR User Guide](https://osep.communities.ed.gov/#program/spp-apr-resources)

2. FFY SPP/APR Data

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Verified accuracy of number of resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements using Option 1 or Option 2 (*Pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of number of resolutions sessions using Option 1 or Option 2 (*Pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of prior FFY data using Option 1 or Option 2 (*Pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of current FFY target using Option 1 or Options 2 (*Pre-populated*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of current FFY data using Option 1 or Option 2 (*Auto-calculated by dividing number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements by number of resolutions sessions*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of status regarding meeting or not meeting target using Option 1 or Option 2 (*Auto-calculated by comparing current FFY data to current FFY target*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of slippage statement using Option 1 or Option 2 (*Auto-calculated using OSEP’s definition of slippage - see* [*IDEA Part C SPP/APR User Guide*](https://osep.communities.ed.gov/#communities/pdc/documents/21546) *[page 25]*)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Described reasons for slippage using Option 1 or Option 2, if applicable
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided additional information about this indicator, if needed (*e.g., responding to OSEP Response/Required Actions from prior year’s APR*)
 |  |  |  |

Tips (if slippage occurred):

Consider factors that have impacted slippage (e.g., policies and procedures are not clear, change in local leadership, personnel/workforce shortage, providers not understanding requirements and procedures, natural disaster) when describing reasons for slippage See [State Examples of Slippage](https://dasycenter.org/spp-apr-checklists-and-tips/SlippageExamples_Acc.pdf).
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