# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

# Fact Sheet

## What does this indicator measure?

Indicator 15 measures the percentage of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution settlement agreements. To calculate indicator 15:

1. Take the number of resolution sessions that were resolved through settlement agreements;
2. Divide that number by the total number of resolution sessions;
3. The result is the percentage of resolution sessions that were resolved through settlement agreements.

## What are the data considerations?

### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

### How has this Indicator Changed?

Indicator 15 has not changed.

## How has Ohio performed over time?

Figure 1. Ohio’s percentage of resolution sessions has decreased over time from 43.04% in 2014-2015 to 0% in 2019-2020.

Table 1. Number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement, total number of resolution sessions, percentage and change in percentage from 2014-2015 to 2019-2020.

| Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Resolution sessions resolved through settlement | 34 | 35 | 23 | 26 | 22 | 0 |
| Resolution sessions | 79 | 70 | 56 | 48 | 61 | 29 |
| Percentage | 43.04% | 50.00% | 41.07% | 54.17% | 36.07% | 0.00% |
| Change in percentage | n/a | +6.96% | -8.93% | +13.10% | -18.10% | -36.07% |

## How has Ohio performed in relation to the targets?

The graphs below depict Ohio’s performance over time in relation to the state targets.

* The bars in each graph indicate Ohio’s performance for each year. Red bars with horizontal stripes mean Ohio did not meet the target for that year. Green bars with vertical stripes mean Ohio met the target for that year.
* The dotted black line in each graph depicts the state target for each year.
* The table below each graph calculates the difference between the state target and Ohio’s performance.

Figure 2. Ohio met the target for the percentage of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements in 2014-2015 through 2017-2018 but did not meet the target in 2018-2019 or 2019-2020.

Table 2. Percentage difference between the state target and Ohio’s dropout rate for students with disabilities. The goal for indicator 15 is to be at or above the lower end of the target range. Positive difference numbers indicate the state was above the target for that year and met the target. Negative difference numbers indicate the state was below the target for that year and did not meet the target.

| Data Year | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Difference between the lower state target & Ohio’s performance | 5.04% | 11.00% | 1.07% | 13.17% | -5.93% | -42.00% |

## What are the programmatic considerations?

1. Upon receipt of a due process request, a district must convene a resolution meeting with the parent within 15 days to attempt to resolve the issues in the request.
2. Most due process requests are withdrawn or dismissed prior to a hearing.
3. In past years, mediation has been promoted as a dispute resolution option to parents and districts. Parents and districts often prefer to waive the resolution meeting in favor of mediation. The Ohio Department of Education does not have control over parties’ preference for mediation.
4. The Ohio Department of Education monitors compliance with the 15-day timeline by requiring parties to complete resolution meeting tracking forms.
5. The Ohio Department of Education reviews the tracking forms, which provide the date the resolution meeting was held and whether the meeting was successful in that it resulted in a written settlement agreement.
6. The resolution tracking form also states whether the parties waived the resolution meeting to participate in mediation.
7. Resolution meetings may not include attorneys unless a parent is represented by an attorney. The 15-day timeline to hold the meeting typically is not enough time for parties and their attorneys to apprise themselves of the issues and possible ways to resolve the issues.

## Proposed Targets

* Targets should be rigorous, yet attainable.
* Targets may remain the same several years in a row, though the final target year (2025-2026) must reflect improvement over baseline.
* Targets may be reflected in ranges as in prior years.
* The goal for indicator 15 is to be at or above the target or to fall within the target range.

Table 3. Ohio’s previous target ranges for indicator 15.

| School Year | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Range | 38.00% - 46.00% | 39.00% - 47.00% | 40.00% - 48.00% | 41.00% - 49.00% | 42.00% - 50.00% | 42.00% - 51.00% |

Table 4. Proposed Target Table Option A – Indicator 15

| Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions | 2005-2006  Baseline | 2019-2020  Data | 2020-2021  Proposed Target | 2021-2022  Proposed Target | 2022-2023 Proposed Target | 2023-2024 Proposed Target | 2024-2025 Proposed Target | 2025-2026 Proposed Target |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percentage of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution settlement agreements | 43.04% | 0.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 43.05% |

### Option A Rationale

* The targets do not increase until 2025-2026 in recognition of the pandemic and anticipation of COVID variants. This approach requires a large increase from 2024-2025 to 2025-2026 to meet the requirement to be above baseline in the final year of targets.
* The 2025-2026 target increases due to eventual recovery from the impact of the pandemic on dispute resolution options and continued distribution of information related to resolution sessions.
* In comparison to Ohio’s 2019-2020 performance, meeting the final target of 43.05% by 2025-2026 will require **13** more resolution sessions to be resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

Table 5. Proposed Target Table Option B – Indicator 15

| Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions | 2005-2006  Baseline | 2019-2020  Data | 2020-2021  Proposed Target | 2021-2022  Proposed Target | 2022-2023 Proposed Target | 2023-2024 Proposed Target | 2024-2025 Proposed Target | 2025-2026 Proposed Target |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percentage of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution settlement agreements | 43.04% | 0.00% | 8.00% | 16.00% | 24.00% | 32.00% | 40.00% | 48.00% |

### Option B Rationale

* Option B is a more rigorous option in comparison to Option A.
* Percentages historically have been above the baseline except the two most recent years.
* The targets increase by 8% each year from the 2019-2020 performance to end above the 43.04% baseline. The increase reflects an anticipated return to prepandemic numbers.
* In comparison to Ohio’s 2019-2020 performance, meeting the final target of 48% by 2025-2026 will require **14** more resolution sessions to be resolved through resolution settlement agreements.