

Meeting Minutes: Community Supervision Working Group

Date: 08/10/2026

Prepared by: Anna Kaiser

In-Person Location: Pung Conference Rooms, 1450 Energy Park Drive Suite 200, Saint Paul, MN 55108

Virtual Location:

<https://minnesota.webex.com/minnesota/j.php?MTID=m536b9e2e9401e8d1fa967eebb5c5fc57>

Website: <https://mn.gov/doc/about/legislative-info/community-supervision-working-group/>

Member Attendance

- Safia Khan, Department of Corrections
- Kwesi Pasley, Department of Corrections
- Laurie Jandro, Department of Corrections
- Kelly Mitchell, Department of Corrections
- Nicole Hanson, Otter Tail County Administrator (virtually)
- Greg Kryzer, Wright County Administrator
- Neal Gaalswyk, Cass County Commissioner (virtually)
- Bethany Cox, Washington County Commissioner

Also Present:

- Kelly Haff, Department of Corrections (virtually)
- Kendra Sanders, Department of Corrections
- Sarah Burdash, Department of Corrections
- Emilio Lamba, AMC (virtually)

Action Items

- Consider an ideal transition timeline / September 9, 2026
- Schedule next two upcoming meeting dates / Anna Kaiser / September 9, 2026

Agenda

- Attendance / Mitchell
- Recent Transitions / Mitchell
- Statutes that Govern Delivery System Transitions / Mitchell

- Comparison of Key Provisions in the Laws / Mitchell
- Case Study / Mitchell
- Next Meeting Date / Khan
- Adjourned / Khan.

Meeting Notes

1. Recent Delivery System Transitions

Members discussed the 2023 statutory change that consolidated eight separate funding streams into a single statewide formula, noting that the prior model lacked equity in allocations. Following the establishment of the community supervision funding formula, 8 counties chose to transition from the DOC/CPO model to the CCA model.

- a. Members identified common themes that were emerging:
 - i. Benefits-related concerns are the most consistent challenge.
 - ii. DOC identified the additional workload for Finance and HR, which included determining county-level allocations and navigating overlapping resolutions submitted by multiple counties.
 - iii. Timing and staffing challenges arise when counties initiate transitions concurrently, because DOC traditionally project-manages transitions but lacks capacity to do so.

2. Review Statutes Governing Delivery System Transition

Mitchell introduced a comparative analysis of the four statutes governing delivery system transitions to help identify areas of similarity and difference.

- a. All four transition statutes include a shared requirement that displaced employees must be hired by the receiving entity, at no loss of salary, with full credit for prior years of service for sick and vacation accrual.
- b. Differences across statutes were highlighted:
 - i. Two statutes require that the employee be hired into a similar position; the other two statutes are silent.
 - ii. Only one statute requires employees transferred to state service to serve a six-month probationary period.
 - iii. Only one statute requires negotiated seniority with the bargaining unit for transferred employees.
 - iv. Some statutes include “transfer in grade” language; others do not.
 - v. One statute includes provisions on layoff status and rights if employees are not hired by the receiving county.
- c. Discussion included:
 - i. Differences between county and state pay and benefit structures can create frustration.

- ii. Statutes do not impose reciprocal obligations on DOC and counties when receiving employees.
 - iii. Need to evaluate how “seniority” should be defined, including consideration of specialized work (sex offenders, juveniles, supervision).
 - iv. MAPE consultation was recommended to review historical interpretations of seniority.
- d. The group agreed statutory protections should apply to employees who choose to transfer as protected staff. Employees who resign instead receive payouts according to their existing contracts, which differs from the legal protections afforded during formal transitions.
- e. A member summarized core interpretive issues:
 - i. Statutory language is inconsistent across systems.
 - ii. The meaning of each provision is not always clear in practice.
 - iii. The Working Group must make recommendations on the desired future statutory language.
- f. The Working Group will identify consensus elements and build new, consolidated statutory language while separately addressing fiscal considerations.

3. Case Study

Members discussed a fictional case study involving the transition of Flamingo County from the CCA to DOC/CPO delivery system.

The first step is for a county to do an analysis of the current model and what change would look like. As an example, Otter Tail hired a consultant for a 6- to 9-month analysis covering multiple delivery models. DOC emphasized the importance of retaining a seat at the table during this phase to have an equal opportunity to present information. One member raised whether requiring an interim step (e.g., DOC → CPO → CCA) would be beneficial to give the county the ability to build out its infrastructure before taking on all supervision.

The second step is the county decision making process. A member explained that advisory boards typically review and recommend changes to county commissioners, though practice varies. Counties hold a hearing and then adopt a resolution to either maintain or change their delivery system. Members suggested that counties could provide notice of intent to consider a transition and that a general timeline could be defined in statute. The timeline would have to take into account county and state budget cycles.

Once a county has decided to transition to another delivery system, a transition team is recommended as a best practice, including administrative staff, probation leadership, and HR from both delivery systems. Though effective, members agreed transition team requirements should remain operational guidelines rather than statutory mandates.

HR and Staffing are the most complex issues in the transition. As discussed earlier, there are differences in the statutes. Different counties and the DOC may also have different collective bargaining and notice requirements for layoffs. Members noted that these notice requirements

should be considered in the timeline. Additionally, offer letters should be provided early to allow employees time to consider their options.

4. Next Steps

- a. Continue case study analysis.
- b. Begin outreach to MAPE to review seniority standards.
- c. Prepare a preliminary structure for a unified transition statute, including timing, employee protections, and transition process.

5. Adjourn

Next Meeting

Date: 09/09/2026
Time: 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
In-Person Location: Itasca Conference Room, 1450 Energy Park Drive Suite 200, Saint Paul, MN 55108
Virtual Location: <https://minnesota.webex.com/minnesota/j.php?MTID=m1a440b846181e6a81882d1478f7633f3>
Webinar number:
2488 730 1902
Webinar password:
g8tUZYmXb35 (48889969 when dialing from a phone or video system)
Join by phone
+1-415-655-0003 United States Toll
Access code: 248 873 01902
Website: <https://mn.gov/doc/about/legislative-info/community-supervision-working-group/>