**Section 256.150 Program Monitoring**

Annual monitoring of the grant programs created under this Part will be conducted by the State Board. Monitoring procedures and indicators will be set by the State Board and made available before the start of the fiscal year, at the time information is provided regarding the annual application for funding.

a) Monitoring frequency and level will be determined through a risk assessment of factors, which will include system data, programmatic compliance, financial management, the number of program quality indicators that are met through the program, and the disparities and gaps in the performance of special populations. All grantees will receive programmatic monitoring conducted through semiannual calls. Additionally, based upon the results of the risk assessment, grantees may receive remote monitoring or an on-site monitoring visit. The components that will be monitored are system personnel, including qualifications and training, the program's size, scope, and quality (see Section 256.160), and system and board of control operations.

b) If findings are indicated through the monitoring process, a collaborative, continuous improvement process will be initiated by the State Board to address those findings. The grantee must respond to the findings by identifying who is responsible, what actions will be taken, anticipated date of completion, how the actions will be documented, and how the results of the action will be evaluated to determine the improvement:

1) is not meeting size, scope and quality requirements;

2) does not have qualified educators teaching in the program; or

3) is not meeting performance levels identified in the approved Perkins State Plan.

c) An eligible recipient that fails to meet at least 90 percent of the State-Determined Performance Measures must develop and implement a program improvement plan, in consultation with local stakeholders and the State Board, no later than January 31 of the first program year succeeding the program year in which the eligible recipient failed to meet the State-Determined Performance Measures. The program improvement plan should include an analysis of the performance disparities or gaps identified between any subgroup or special population and an analysis of the performance of all CTE concentrators served by the eligible recipient. These analyses shall include a quantifiable description of the progress of each subgroup or special population of students served by the eligible recipient has made in meeting the State-Determined Performance Measures.