DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Community Supervision Working Group

Report to the Minnesota Legislature

12/15/2026

Community Supervision Working Group

Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108
(Phone) 651-361-7200

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

As requested by Minnesota Statute 3.197: This report cost approximately <$> to prepare, including staff time, printing and mailing expenses.

Upon request, this material will be made available in an alternative format such as large print, Braille, or audio recording. Printed on recycled paper.

Table of Contents Instructions (read then delete before using template)

After you have completed your document, you can update the table of contents (TOC) below by going to **References > Update Table** in the ribbon. The table of contents will be updated to reflect the new headings that appear in your document.

Alternatively, you can insert a new table of contents by using the Automatic Table of Contents feature. This will automatically create a TOC based on the heading styles you have used and assign a bookmark to each entry. This is also a good way to see if the styles you've used are correct. Here's how to insert a TOC:

- Go to the References tab.
- Select the dropdown arrow in the Table of Contents group.
- Choose one of the Automatic Table of Contents options.
- Then modify it to include the number of levels you want to display.
- Update the TOC if you make changes to the document structure: go to **References > Table of Contents** and select Update Table.
- Delete unwanted items from the table of contents, such as "Contents" or the document title.
- Insert a page break at the end of the TOC entries. Do not use the Enter key to add extra lines. If you are just updating the existing table of contents, rather than adding a new one, simply leave the existing page break in place.

Contents

Subhead (Heading 2) ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Subhead (Heading 3)..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Executive Summary

In 2026, the Minnesota Legislature established the Community Supervision Working Group to examine and clarify the statutory responsibilities, financial obligations, and operational processes that govern transitions between Minnesota's county-operated and state-operated community supervision systems. Transitions between these models have occurred periodically across the state, often under tight timelines and with varying interpretations of statutory requirements. These transitions have significant implications for supervision staff, who must navigate employment-related changes while continuing to provide critical supervision services. Changes in compensation, benefits, work locations, organizational culture, and employment policies can create uncertainty and disruption for staff, with potential impacts on morale, retention, and workforce stability. These transitions also affect agency budgets, labor agreements, and data systems, making careful planning essential to ensure continuity and quality of services for individuals under supervision.

Recognizing the statewide significance of these issues, the Legislature directed the Working Group to identify ambiguities in current law, analyze the fiscal and administrative impacts of transitions, and provide recommendations for statutory changes to ensure consistent, equitable, and well-coordinated transitions in the future. The Working Group includes representatives from both the Department of Corrections and county administration, helping to ensure that recommendations reflect operational realities, administrative considerations, and statewide policy priorities. To inform its work, the group met regularly, consulted with required stakeholder organizations, and reviewed historical transition examples to identify recurring challenges and areas where greater statutory clarity is needed.

Across its analysis, the Working Group observed that current statutory language does not provide sufficient clarity regarding the respective roles, responsibilities, and obligations of sending and receiving entities during a transition. This lack of clarity has resulted in inconsistent approaches across counties, varying interpretations of financial responsibility, and uncertainty for employees affected by transitions. Differences between county and state employment systems, such as compensation structures, benefits administration, leave accrual practices, and collective bargaining agreements, further complicate workforce transitions. Additionally, operational elements such as data transfer, case reassignment, policy alignment, training needs, and fiscal year timing introduce logistical challenges that require more explicit statutory guidance.

The Working Group also reviewed transitions that have occurred since July 1, 2023, to assess their alignment with emerging recommendations. These recent transitions highlighted the need for a clearer statewide framework to determine which entity bears responsibility for specific transition expenses and under what circumstances legislative appropriation may be warranted.

Based on its findings, the Working Group is recommending targeted statutory changes to:

- Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of both sending and receiving entities;
- Establish consistent expectations for how employee compensation, benefits, and accrued leave are treated during transitions;

- Create uniform processes for determining financial responsibility, including timing and methods of cost transfer;
- Address operational and administrative considerations essential to sustaining uninterrupted supervision services;
- Resolve statutory ambiguities that have led to disputes or inconsistent practices across counties.

Collectively, these recommendations are intended to promote fairness, transparency, public safety, and workforce stability while reducing administrative burden and supporting continuity of services. The report that follows outlines the Working Group's findings, identifies statutory provisions requiring amendment, and presents recommended changes to establish clear, consistent statewide expectations for future transitions.

1. Statutory Authority and Legislative Mandate

1.1 Legislative Direction

The Community Supervision Working Group was established by the Minnesota Legislature through **2026 Minnesota Session Laws, SF 4760, Article 4, Section 7.** The legislation directs the Working Group to study and make recommendations regarding statutory changes needed to provide clarity concerning the roles, responsibilities, and obligations of supervision delivery systems when a county transitions between state-operated and county-operated community supervision systems.

To fulfill this charge, the Legislature directed the Working Group to examine issues related to:

- The roles, responsibilities, and obligations of sending and receiving entities during a transition;
- Employee compensation, benefits, and accrued leave;
- Allocation of financial responsibility between entities;
- Differences between county and state employment systems;
- Operational and administrative considerations, including staffing transitions, data transfers, training needs, and continuity of supervision services;
- Budgetary and fiscal impacts associated with transitions;
- Statutory ambiguities or gaps that contribute to uncertainty or disputes during transitions; and
- Other issues identified by the Working Group that may be necessary to ensure clear, consistent, and fair transition processes.

The legislation further requires the Working Group to consult with the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties, the Minnesota Association of Community Probation Officers, the Department of Corrections Field Services Director and leadership team, and labor organizations representing affected employees.

The Working Group must submit a report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over public safety and judiciary policy and finance by **December 15, 2026.**

1.2 Statutory Language

Sec. 7. **Community Supervision Working Group.**

Subdivision 1. **Establishment.** A working group is established to study and make recommendations on statutory changes needed to provide clarity regarding the roles, responsibilities, and obligations of supervision delivery systems when a county transitions between state-operated and county-operated community supervision systems.

Subdivision 2. **Membership.** (a) The working group shall consist of the following members:

(1) four representatives appointed by the Association of Minnesota Counties, at least two of whom must be county administrators from counties that have experienced a transition between supervision delivery systems; and

(2) four representatives appointed by the commissioner of corrections, with expertise in human resources, finance, compensation plans, and agency administration.

(b) Members of the working group serve without compensation.

Subdivision 3. **Meetings.** (a) The commissioner of corrections shall convene the first meeting of the working group no later than August 1, 2026, and shall provide meeting space and administrative assistance as necessary for the working group to conduct its work. The working group shall meet sufficiently enough to accomplish the tasks identified in this section.

(b) Meetings of the working group are subject to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 13D.

Subdivision 4. **Duties.** The working group shall study and develop recommendations on the following:

(1) the respective roles, responsibilities, and obligations of the sending and receiving entities when a transition occurs;

(2) the treatment of employee compensation, including but not limited to salary placement, benefits, and accrued leave;

(3) the allocation of financial responsibility between entities, including timing and method of payment for employee-related costs;

(4) differences between state and county employment systems, including compensation structures, leave systems, and benefit administration, and how those differences affect transitions;

(5) operations and administrative considerations, including timelines, fiscal year state dates, staffing transitions, data transfers, training needs, policy development, and continuity of supervision services;

(6) budgetary and fiscal impacts associated with transitions, including impacts on resources and positions shared between counties;

(7) any statutory ambiguities or gaps that create uncertainty or disputes during transitions; and

(8) any other issues identified by the working group that are necessary to ensure clear, consistent, and fair transition processes.

Subdivision 5. **Consultation.** In carrying out its duties, the working group must consult with:

(1) the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties;

(2) the Minnesota Association of Community Probation Officers;

(3) the Department of Corrections Field Services director and the director's leadership team; and

(4) labor organizations representing affected employees.

Subdivision 6. **Report.** By December 15, 2026, the working group shall submit a report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over public safety and judiciary policy and finance. The report must include recommended statutory changes to address the issues identified in subdivision 4. The report must also include recommendations to address any delivery system transitions that occurred after July 1, 2023, to ensure that they align with the proposed statutory changes, including whether the county or the Department of Corrections should be reimbursed for transition expenses by legislative appropriation.

Subdivision 7. **Expiration.** The working group expires upon submission of the report required under subdivision 6.

1.3 Purpose of the Report

This report summarizes the activities of the Community Supervision Working Group, presents findings developed during its review of community supervision system transitions, and provides recommendations for statutory changes intended to improve future transitions between county-operated and state-operated supervision systems.

Consistent with the legislative mandate, the report addresses each of the duties identified in subdivision 4 of the authorizing legislation and includes recommendations concerning statutory, fiscal, operational, and workforce issues associated with supervision system transitions. The report also examines transitions occurring after July 1, 2023, and provides recommendations regarding transition-related expenses and potential reimbursement considerations, as required by subdivision 6.

The recommendations contained in this report are intended to support consistent transition processes, clarify statutory responsibilities, and promote continuity of community supervision services throughout Minnesota.

2. Working Group Composition and Structure

2.1 Membership Requirements and Appointees

The legislation directs the Working Group consists of eight members representing both county and state perspectives on community supervision administration. Specifically, the Legislature required the appointment of four representatives by the Association of Minnesota Counties, including at least two county administrators from counties that have experienced a transition between community supervision

delivery systems, and four representatives appointed by the Commissioner of Corrections with expertise in human resources, finance, compensation plans, and agency administration.

This membership structure was designed to ensure that the Working Group included individuals with direct experience navigating the administrative, fiscal, workforce, and operational issues associated with community supervision system transitions. The Legislature recognized that transitions affect multiple aspects of government operations, including personnel management, employee compensation and benefits, budget development, labor relations, technology systems, and service delivery. As a result, the Working Group's membership brought together expertise from both county and state government to evaluate these issues from a variety of perspectives.

The county representatives contributed practical experience regarding local government administration and the challenges counties face when assuming or transferring supervision responsibilities. Department of Corrections representatives provided expertise related to state personnel systems, fiscal management, agency operations, and the administration of supervision services. Together, these perspectives enabled the Working Group to examine transition-related issues comprehensively and develop recommendations intended to be both practical and broadly applicable across Minnesota's community supervision systems.

Working Group Members

Member	Representing	Relevant Expertise
Bethany Cox	Association of Minnesota Counties	Washington County Commissioner
Neal Gaalswyk	Association of Minnesota Counties	Cass County Commissioner
Greg Kryzer (co-chair)	Association of Minnesota Counties	Wright County Administrator
Nicole Hansen	Association of Minnesota Counties	Otter Tail County Administrator/HR Director
Laurie Jandro	Minnesota Department of Corrections	Human Resources Director
Kwesi Pasley	Minnesota Department of Corrections	Chief Finance Officer
Kelly Mitchell (co-chair)	Minnesota Department of Corrections	Assistant Commissioner Community Services & Reentry
Safia Khan	Minnesota Department of Corrections	Deputy Commissioner & Chief of Staff

Members served without compensation as provided in Article 4, Section 7, subdivision 2(b).

2.2 Meetings and Process

Article 4, Section 7, subdivision 3 directs the Commissioner of Corrections to convene the first meeting of the Working Group no later than August 1, 2026, and to provide meeting space and administrative support necessary for the group to conduct its work. The legislation further requires the Working Group to meet as often as necessary to accomplish the duties assigned by the Legislature.

To support the completion of its statutory responsibilities, the Working Group met regularly between July and December 2026 to discuss issues associated with community supervision delivery system transitions. Meetings included presentations from subject matter experts, review of historical transition experiences, discussion of statutory and operational challenges, and evaluation of potential policy and legislative solutions. Staff from the Minnesota Department of Corrections coordinated meeting logistics, prepared meeting materials, maintained records, and provided administrative support throughout the process.

Consistent with statutory requirements, all meetings of the Working Group were conducted in accordance with Minnesota Statutes, chapter 13D, Minnesota's Open Meeting Law. Meeting notices, agendas, and other materials were made available as required to promote transparency and public access to the Working Group's activities.

Meeting agendas were developed collaboratively based on the Working Group's statutory duties and emerging issues identified through member discussions. Subject matter expertise was incorporated through presentations and discussions involving representatives from county government, Department of Corrections leadership, human resources professionals, finance and budget staff, labor representatives, and other stakeholders identified in the legislation. This approach ensured that recommendations were informed by operational experience, fiscal analysis, workforce considerations, and the perspectives of organizations directly affected by community supervision system transitions.

3. Background and Context

3.1 Overview of Minnesota's Community Supervision Delivery Systems

Minnesota's community supervision system plays a central role in public safety and rehabilitation efforts across the state. The vast majority of individuals involved in the correctional system are supervised in the community rather than incarcerated, making community supervision a critical component of Minnesota's approach to reducing recidivism, supporting behavior change, and maintaining public safety.

Minnesota is unique among states in that counties may receive community supervision services through one of three statutorily authorized delivery systems: the Community Corrections Act (CCA) model, the County Probation Officer (CPO) model, and the Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) model. Each system reflects a different approach to the administration, funding, and oversight of community supervision services. While all three systems share responsibility for supervising individuals in the community and supporting successful reentry outcomes, they differ in governance structure, staffing, funding mechanisms, and operational responsibilities.

Community Corrections Act (CCA)

The Community Corrections Act (CCA), enacted in 1973, allows eligible counties or groups of contiguous counties to assume responsibility for providing community supervision services locally. Under this model, participating counties are responsible for the supervision of juveniles and adults, including probation, supervised release, and in some jurisdictions, intensive supervised release services. Funding is provided through a combination of state subsidies and county tax revenue. CCA agencies are governed locally through a corrections advisory board and are required to submit comprehensive plans to the Minnesota Department of Corrections for approval. Currently, 34 counties representing 21 correctional jurisdictions participate in the CCA system.

County Probation Officer (CPO)

Under the County Probation Officer model, probation services are divided between county and state agencies. County Probation Officers serve at the pleasure of the chief judge and are supervised through local court services administration. In CPO counties, juveniles and most adult misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor cases are supervised by county probation staff, while adult felony cases are supervised by the Minnesota Department of Corrections. State law authorizes reimbursement of a portion of county probation officer salary and benefit costs through legislative appropriations. Currently, 24 counties utilize the CPO model for community supervision services.

Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC)

Under the DOC delivery model, the Minnesota Department of Corrections directly provides adult felony probation clients in 53 counties that are not part of the Community Corrections Act system. These services are administered through regional district offices under the direction of DOC supervisors and are funded entirely by the State of Minnesota.

In addition to felony supervision, the DOC provides juvenile and misdemeanor supervision services in certain counties through contractual agreements. These counties, commonly referred to as contract counties, reimburse the DOC for service costs, including employee salaries and fringe benefits, with a portion of those costs offset through state appropriations. The DOC also provides intensive supervised release services in most counties throughout the state.

Implications for Delivery System Transitions

Because each delivery system operates under different governance structures, funding arrangements, personnel systems, and administrative processes, transitions between systems can be complex. Changes in delivery systems may affect employee compensation and benefits, supervisory authority, budget responsibilities, staffing structures, labor agreements, data systems, training requirements, and service delivery operations.

Although delivery system transitions occur relatively infrequently, they often require substantial planning and coordination among counties, the Department of Corrections, employees, and other stakeholders. Understanding the distinctions among Minnesota's three supervision delivery models is essential to understanding the statutory and operational issues examined by the Community Supervision Working Group and the recommendations that follow.

History of Delivery System Transitions

Since the establishment of Minnesota's current community supervision delivery systems, a limited number of counties have elected to transition from one supervision model to another. While such transitions are relatively infrequent, they have occurred under a variety of circumstances, including changes in local governance priorities, financial consideration, service-delivery objectives, and organizational capacity.

Because transitions occur sporadically and often involve substantial planning and coordination, each has largely been managed as a unique event. This history has contributed to differing interpretations of statutory responsibilities and a lack of consistent statewide practices regarding transition implementation.

Rationale for Transitions

Counties have transitioned between community supervision delivery systems for a variety or reasons, often reflecting local circumstances, priorities, and operational needs. While no single factor explains all transitions, common considerations include:

- **Cost and funding considerations** – staffing, facilities, technology, employee benefits, and long-term fiscal obligations.
- **Administrative and governance considerations** – management structure, personnel authority, accountability, and coordination between supervision agencies and county leadership.
- **Service delivery goals** – alignment with local public safety priorities and integration with county-operated services such as behavioral health, housing, public health, and workforce development programs.
- **Workforce considerations** – recruitment, retention, training, supervisory capacity, and access to specialized expertise.
- **County-specific factors** – population trends, caseload characteristics, geographic considerations, fiscal capacity, available community resources, and changes in local leadership or strategic priorities.

Overall, transitions between supervision delivery systems have generally reflected counties' assessments of how best to organize and deliver community supervision services within their unique local contexts.

3.2 Changes to Community Supervision Funding

In 2023, the Minnesota Legislature enacted significant changes to the state's approach to funding community supervision as part of a broader package of justice reinvestment reforms[1]. Prior to these changes, community supervision funding was distributed through a variety of funding mechanisms that differed across supervision delivery systems. Stakeholders expressed concerns that the existing funding

[1] Lopez, E. "Explainer: Minnesota's Justice Reinvestment Legislation Results in $43.6 Million Annual Increase in Community Supervision System." *The Council of State Governments.* 2023. Explainer: Minnesota's Justice Reinvestment Legislation Results in $43.6 Million Annual Increase in Community Supervision System

structure did not consistently reflect supervision workloads, resulted in funding disparities among jurisdictions, and created uncertainty regarding long-term resource allocation.

The 2023 legislation established a statewide community supervision funding formula applicable to Community Corrections Act (CCA) jurisdictions, County Probation Officer (CPO) jurisdictions, Department of Corrections (DOC) supervised jurisdictions, and participating Tribal Nations. The formula was intended to create a more transparent, equitable, and predictable approach to distributing state supervision funding across Minnesota regardless of delivery system.

Under the revised formula, funding consists of two primary components:

- A base funding allocation of $150,000 per jurisdiction.
- Additional funding based on supervision populations using a per diem methodology that considers both felony and misdemeanor supervision workloads. Population calculations are based on a three-year average of supervision populations reported through the statewide probation survey.

The funding changes were informed by Minnesota's Justice Reinvestment Initiative and accompanied a substantial increase in state investment in community supervision. According to materials developed during the legislative process, the changes increased state funding for community supervision by approximately $43.6 million annually[2]. The reforms were intended to better align funding with supervision responsibilities and support more consistent implementation of community supervision practices across the state.

The legislation also included provisions intended to promote funding stability during implementation. Counties that would otherwise have received less funding under the new formula were provided transitional protections to reduce the impact of funding changes and allow jurisdictions time to adjust to the new funding structure.

Relevance to Delivery System Transitions

The 2023 funding reforms are relevant to discussions regarding delivery system transitions because they altered how supervision resources are allocated throughout Minnesota. Historically, differences among supervision delivery systems often resulted in different funding structures and reimbursement mechanisms. The statewide formula established a more uniform framework for allocating state supervision funding while preserving county choice regarding delivery system participation.

Although the funding formula provides greater consistency across jurisdictions, transitions between delivery systems may still raise questions regarding funding allocations, budget responsibilities, implementation timing, and the treatment of supervision resources during a transition year. As a result, the Working Group considered the 2023 funding reforms alongside existing transition statutes when evaluating areas where additional statutory clarity may be beneficial.

2

3.3 Existing Statutory Framework for Delivery System Transitions

Minnesota law contains multiple statutory provisions governing transitions between community supervision delivery systems. These statutes provide important employee protections and establish processes for transferring supervision responsibilities between agencies. However, because the provisions were enacted at different times and for different transition scenarios, they are not fully aligned and vary significantly in their level of detail.

Common Principles Across Transition Statutes

The statutes governing transitions between state, county probation officer, and Community Corrections Act delivery systems share several foundational principles. In each case, affected employees must be offered employment by the receiving agency, experience no loss of salary, and receive credit for prior years of service for future sick leave and vacation accrual purposes. These provisions reflect a consistent legislative intent to protect employees and maintain continuity of supervision services during organizational transitions.

Variations Among Transition Statutes

While the statutes share common objectives, they differ considerably in the specific protections and implementation requirements they establish. Some statutes address matters such as employee classification, accrued leave, seniority, probationary periods, fringe benefits, and layoff rights, while others are silent on those same issues. As a result, similarly situated employees may receive different treatment depending on the type and direction of the transition.

For example, statutes governing transitions to state operation include specific provisions regarding employee classification, probationary periods, and seniority negotiations, while the statute governing transitions to CCA include language addressing fringe benefits, transfers in grade, and layoff rights that are not consistently reflected elsewhere in statute.

These differences can create uncertainty regarding employee rights, agency responsibilities, and implementation expectations when a delivery system transition occurs.

3.4 Statutory Ambiguities and Implementation Challenges

While the authority to transition between delivery systems is clearly established in statute, questions often arise regarding how those transitions should be implemented in practice. Because county-operated and Department of Corrections-operated systems function under different employment, fiscal, and administrative frameworks, transitions can create uncertainty that is not fully addressed in current law.

Key areas of ambiguity include:

- **Employment matters** – employee transfer rights, seniority, accrued leave, collective bargaining agreements, and other personnel-related obligations.
- **Fiscal responsibilities** – funding allocations, personnel costs, budget obligations, and the timing of financial transfers during a transition.

- **Transition planning and implementation** – timelines, stakeholder notification requirements, coordination responsibilities, and dispute resolution processes.
- **Operational continuity** – transfer of caseloads, records, technology systems, facilities, equipment, contracts, and other resources necessary to maintain supervision services.

These challenges are compounded by the fact that delivery system transitions occur infrequently and have historically been managed on a case-by-case basis, resulting in limited statewide guidance and differing interpretations of statutory responsibilities.

Collectively, these ambiguities can create uncertainty for counties, the Department of Corrections, employees, and individuals under supervision. Clarifying these issues can help promote greater consistency, predictability, and transparency when future transition occur.

4. Working Group Duties and Methodology

4.1 Process

- How the working group did the work
    - Prior transitions
    - Case study of hypothetical transition
    - Statutory language
    - Developed recommendations for resolving them
    - Consultations

5. Consultation Summary

5.1 Consultation Participants

The Working Group consulted with representatives from:

- Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties **(MACCAC)**, representing counties operating community corrections system under the Community Corrections Act.
- Minnesota Association of Community Probation Officers **(MACPO)**, representing community supervision professionals throughout Minnesota.
- Labor organizations, including **AFSCME, MAPE, MMA, and Teamsters**, representing affected employees.
- **Department of Corrections Field Services leadership**, representing state-operated community supervision programs.

5.2 Themes Raised by Stakeholders

Several key themes emerged during stakeholder consultation:

- **Workforce Stability and Employee Transitions**
  Stakeholders emphasized the importance of minimizing disruption to supervision staff during agency transitions.

- **Clarity of Roles and Responsibilities**
  Stakeholders identified a need for clearer statutory direction regarding transition planning, implementation timelines, and responsibilities of transferring and receiving agencies.
- **Financial and Administrative Impacts**
  Stakeholders highlighted the need for clear expectations regarding funding responsibilities, budgeting, personnel administration, and technology-related costs associated with transitions.

Stakeholder Input and Recommendation Development

Stakeholders broadly agreed on the need for greater statutory clarity, advance planning requirements, and measures to support continuity of services during supervision transitions. Perspectives varied regarding specific implementation approaches, particularly in areas affecting employment practices and administrative responsibilities. The Working Group considered this feedback in developing the recommendations contained in this report, with particular emphasis on reducing uncertainty, supporting affected staff, and ensuring continuity of supervision services.

6. Key Findings and Justifications

6.1 Finding: Existing Transition Statutes Lack Consistency and Create Uncertainty

Finding

The Working Group found that statutory provisions governing transitions between community supervision delivery systems contain inconsistent requirements and varying levels of detail. While all existing transition statutes contain certain common employee protections, significant differences exist regarding position placement, probationary periods, seniority recognition, transfer-in-grade provisions, and employee rights during workforce transitions. These differences have contributed to uncertainty regarding legislative intent and inconsistent implementation across transitions.

Justification

The Working Group's review of existing transition statutes identified several areas where similar transitions are governed by different statutory expectations. Members noted that some statutes require placement into similar positions while others are silent, some explicitly address probationary periods while others do not, and some provide guidance regarding seniority or layoff protections while others leave these issues unresolved. Stakeholders consistently indicated that a more uniform statutory framework would reduce confusion and improve predictability for counties, the Department of Corrections, and affected employees.

6.2 Finding: Employee-Related Issues Are the Most Significant Source of Transition Challenges

Finding

The Working Group found that employee compensation, benefits, leave balances, seniority, classification, and employment status represent the most significant and complex issues associated with delivery

systems transitions. These concerns were consistently identified across past transition experiences and stakeholder consultations.

Justification

Members repeatedly identified employee benefits and compensation as the primary source of uncertainty during transitions. Discussions focused on leave accruals, sick leave and vacation balances, salary protection, probationary periods, retirement systems, seniority calculations, and placements into comparable positions. Stakeholders emphasized that employees do not choose delivery system transitions and should be protected from unintended financial or professional harm resulting from organizational changes beyond their control. Labor organizations also emphasized the importance of respecting collective bargaining agreements and clearly defining how employee protections interact with existing labor contracts.

6.3 Finding: Effective Transitions Require Earlier Planning and More Structured Information Sharing

Finding

The Working Group found that counties and the Department of Corrections need access to timely and reliable information throughout the transition process. Existing statutes do not establish expectations regarding information sharing, data availability, transition planning, or notice requirements.

Justification

Members identified multiple situations where counties needed access to staffing, caseload, budget, and workload information in order to evaluate a potential transition. Stakeholders noted that counties require accurate data to make informed decisions regarding staffing levels, fiscal impacts, and service delivery needs. The Working Group also discussed the need for formal mechanisms requiring the exchange of key transition information and establishing timelines that account for state and county budget cycles.

6.4 Finding: Operational Transitions Extend Beyond Staffing and Funding Issues

Finding

The Working Group found that successful delivery system transitions require significant coordination of operational, technology, training, facility, and case-management activities that are not addressed in current statutes.

Justification

The Working Group's case study analysis identified numerous operational tasks that must be completed during a transition, including data migration, records management, office space planning, training coordination, credentialing, case transfers, vendor management, and continuity of treatment programming. Members noted that many of these activities occur under compressed timelines and involve multiple agencies and technology systems. While the Working Group generally supported maintaining

flexibility through operational guidance rather than detailed statutory requirements, members agreed that statute should recognize the need for planning and operational coordination.

6.5 Finding: A Standardized Transition Framework Would Improve Predictability and Accountability

Finding

The Working Group found that transitions have historically been managed through local planning and informal collaboration rather than a standardized statewide process. While this flexibility has allowed transitions to adapt to local circumstances, it has also resulted in inconsistent approaches and uncertainty regarding responsibilities.

Justification

Members expressed support for creating a statutory framework that establishes minimum expectations regarding notice, timelines, employee protections, information sharing, and transition planning while still allowing counties and the Department of Corrections flexibility to address local operational needs. Stakeholders consistently emphasized the importance of clear communication, coordinated planning, and predictable processes.

7. Recommended Statutory Changes

For each recommendation:

- **6.X Recommendation Title**
- **Statutory Sections Affected**
- **Problem Statement**
- **Justification (Evidence, Analysis, Stakeholder Input)**
- **Proposed Statutory Fix**
- **Expected Outcomes**
- **Implementation Considerations** (timing, resource needs, training, coordination)

Recommendation 1

Establish a single, uniform statutory framework governing all community supervision delivery system transitions.

Recommendation 2

Establish statutory notice requirements and transition timelines, including a formal notice of intent process and target transition completion dates.

Recommendation 3

Require information sharing between counties and the Department of Corrections, including staffing, caseload, budget, and service-delivery information necessary for transition planning.

Recommendation 4

Create consistent employee protections related to:

- Salary placement
- Comparable position placement
- Recognition of years of service
- Leave accrual treatment
- Seniority considerations
- Probationary status
- Layoff protections

Recommendation 5

Require development of operational transition guidelines that address:

- HR functions
- Data transfers
- Technology systems
- Training
- Caseload transitions
- Continuity of services

Recommendation 6

Direct future examination of retirement and pension issues associated with transitions, including interactions between PERA, MSRS, and other retirement systems.

8. Review of Transitions Occurring Since July 1, 2023

(Required by Subdivision 6.)

8.1 Overview of Relevant Transitions

- Counties impacted
- Timeline and circumstances
- Nature of disputes or challenges encountered

8.2 Alignment with Proposed Statutory Changes

- How recommended updates would have prevented or mitigated issues
- Identification of gaps remaining even with proposed changes

8.3 Recommendations for Legislative Appropriations (if applicable)

- Whether counties or DOC should be reimbursed for transition expenses
- Justification and cost categories potentially subject to reimbursement

9. Implementation Considerations

9.1 Transition Planning Templates or Frameworks

9.2 Timeline Expectations for Future Transitions

9.3 Risks and Mitigation Strategies

9.4 Resource Needs (IT, HR, Legal, Operational)

10. Conclusion

- Overall significance of clarifying transition statutes
- Expected benefits for counties, DOC, and public safety
- Next steps for legislative action

Appendices (as needed)

- Appendix A: Full statutory language establishing the Working Group
- Appendix B: Meeting agendas, attendance, and materials
- Appendix C: Transition case examples (historical or recent)
- Appendix D: Comparative summaries of county vs DOC employment systems
- Appendix E: Fiscal impact modeling assumptions
- Appendix F: Full stakeholder feedback summaries