Overview

1. Project Recap
2. Supervision Fundamentals
3. Probation and Supervised Release
4. Data by Delivery System
5. People on Supervision
6. Judicial Perspectives
7. Next Steps
Project Recap
1. Minnesota relies heavily on community supervision, but there is concern about consistency and effectiveness across supervision systems.

Minnesota’s rate of people under correctional control is 11th highest among states, driven by its high probation rate.

About three-quarters of all felony sentences are to probation.

More than 60 percent of admissions to prison are due to supervision failures.
2. Black and Native American people are over-represented in Minnesota’s criminal justice system.

Black and Native American people are over-represented in probation, supervised release, and prison populations.

Native Americans in the state have their probation revoked at a higher rate than any other racial or ethnic group.
3. The methods for determining the state’s financial investments in community supervision no longer serves Minnesota's larger criminal justice goals.

The state has a long history of tinkering with supervision systems in statute.

Minnesota spends the lowest proportion of state general funds on corrections.
This presentation sets the stage for the core standards of supervision to be developed over the course of this project.

These core standards must include shared service delivery definitions and standards but also important details about supervision practices and processes including:

- Officer safety and training in evidence-based practices
- Consistent data collection
- Coaching and quality assurance
- Coordination with other supervision systems
- Collaboration across the service delivery systems including programs, housing, and employment
State statute outlines the state’s obligation to support supervision.

...the Department of Corrections shall have exclusive responsibility for providing probation services for adult felons in counties that do not take part in the Community Corrections Act. In counties that do not take part in the Community Corrections Act, the responsibility for providing probation services for individuals convicted of gross misdemeanor offenses shall be discharged according to local judicial policy.

§ 244.20

The commissioner of corrections... shall exercise supervision over persons released on parole or probation,... over probationers, and over persons conditionally released. The commissioner shall appoint state agents... The commissioner may also... enter into agreements with individuals and public or private agencies, for the same purposes, and pay the costs incurred under the agreements.

§ 243.05

The court may order the supervision to be under the probation officer of the court, or, if there is none and the conviction is for a felony or gross misdemeanor, by the commissioner of corrections... Unless the court directs otherwise, state parole and probation agents and probation officers may impose community work service or probation violation sanctions.

§ 609.135
The goal is consistent, quality supervision across counties that are extremely different.

What is the fairest and most effective approach to funding and setting policy for supervision that addresses this reality?

Poverty

US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2015–2019 5-Year Estimates, Table C17002, B03002, and B15002.
Minnesota has templates to build upon for “core services,” such as the treatment court standards.

Judicial Council Policy 511.1 outlines standards for DWI, adult drug, mental health, juvenile, hybrid, and veterans treatment courts. Those standards set requirements for:

1. Treatment court teams
2. Target population, eligibility, referrals, and orientation
3. Program structure
4. Judicial monitoring/court hearings
5. Drug and alcohol testing
6. Treatment services
7. Complementary treatment and social services
8. Sanctions and incentives
9. Program evaluation

“While these standards seek to create a minimum level of uniform practices for treatment courts there is much room for innovation and for local treatment courts to tailor their courts to meet their needs.”
The CCAs’ comprehensive plans provide another template to build upon for “core services.”

Annually, each CCA publishes a comprehensive plan, utilizing the format provided by the Minnesota Department of Corrections, which provides general descriptions and summary information on defined service areas, including:

1. Caseload Sizes
2. Risk/Needs Assessments
3. Diversion/Prevention
4. Field Services
   - Probation Services by Risk Level
   - Programming
5. Institutions
6. Out-of-Home Placements

Other states with county probation define core services.

Texas Community Justice Assistance Division Rules

37 Texas Admin. Code §163.31
- Court Services
- Basic Supervision
- Administrative Services
- Continuum of Sanctions
- Planning
- Restitution
- Education

Pennsylvania Operating Standards

Based on American Correctional Association 4th Edition Standards, “these standards are focused on . . . effective, evidence-based practices in offender supervision, personnel management, probation/parole officer safety, and operational and organizational management. . . .”

- Community (§ 1–5)
- Offender (§ 6–29)
- Agency (§ 30–81)

Tex. Admin. Code §163.31,
Minnesota’s supervision delivery systems agree on paper about several core services, if not exactly what they look like.

| thumbs_up | Sorting clients through assessment with validated tools |
| thumbs_up | Using assessment to drive supervision, treatment, and case management |
| thumbs_up | Collaboration with community supports |
| thumbs_up | Using CBI, motivational interviewing, and evidence-based practices (EBP) |
| thumbs_up | Pretrial support/supervision to limit incarceration but ensure appearance |
| thumbs_up | Early diversion and early discharge |

Delivery system “white papers” provided to the CSG Justice Center in 2021.
Supervision Fundamentals
The Risk, Need, and Responsivity (RNR) model provides the core concepts of effective intervention for people who engage in criminal behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Responsivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A person’s likelihood of reoffending</td>
<td>Criminogenic factors related to a person’s behavior</td>
<td>Tailoring interventions in a way to mitigate barriers for a given individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static and dynamic factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>General and specific responsivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong adherence to core RNR principles increases the effectiveness of recidivism-reducing programming. Reductions in recidivism are seen when the RNR model is implemented with fidelity and consistently used across correctional settings. Maximum recidivism reduction is achieved when RNR programs are delivered in the community.

Reducing recidivism is about targeting the right people, using the right programs and practices, and ensuring program quality and effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine Strategies of Supervision Based on the Principles of Effective Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assess risk, needs, and responsivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhance intrinsic motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Target interventions based on assessments and appropriate dosage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frontload interventions during a person’s supervision term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensure adequate investment in and access to proven programs (e.g., CBT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use assessment-driven case planning to facilitate behavior change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respond effectively to negative behavior and increase positive reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Engage with supports in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Measure outcomes and provide feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRINCIPLE 1: Assess risk, needs, and responsivity.

Risk assessment tool: an instrument used to estimate the likelihood of future criminal behavior and to inform decision-making following convictions. Additionally, specialized risk tools are used for specific types of offending.

Risk and need assessments (RNA) sort people into categories based on likelihood of future criminal behavior.

Without Risk Assessment...

Risk level is not an indicator of:
≠ Dangerousness
≠ Severity of offense
≠ Guarantee of reoffending or non-offending
≠ Offense-specific reoffending
≠ Level of need for services

With Risk Assessment...

Focus resources according to risk so that people at higher risk of future criminal behavior receive higher-intensity interventions.

Supervision Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of Reoffending</th>
<th>Supervision Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Risk of Reoffending</td>
<td>Very Low Supervision/Program Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk of Reoffending</td>
<td>Low Supervision/Program Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk of Reoffending</td>
<td>Medium Supervision/Program Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk of Reoffending</td>
<td>High Supervision/Program Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Risk of Reoffending</td>
<td>Very High Supervision/Program Intensity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy may dictate more intensive supervision, but this does not change a person’s risk or need score.

Supervision by Risk with Overrides

Overrides to risk and need assessment results may occur as a matter of policy but should be used sparingly and be carefully monitored.

Across Minnesota, different risk assessment tools are used. The use of LS/CMI results also differs between supervision agencies.

Most supervision agencies utilize the LS/CMI as their main risk assessment tool.

- The LS/CMI is a case management tool designed to measure risk and needs factors.
- Together, all the “domains” examined by the LS/CMI assist with case planning and help supervision officers prioritize areas for programming and levels of service.

Minnesota Screening Tool Assessing Recidivism Risk (MnSTARR)

The DOC utilizes the MnSTARR as its main risk assessment tool.

- The MnSTARR is not a needs assessment; it is designed to predict recidivism but contains both static and dynamic factors.
  - Felony recidivism
  - Nonviolent recidivism
  - Violent recidivism
  - Repeat sexual offending (for men)
The percentage of felony probation starts with completed LS/CMIs varies by agency from more than 80 percent to below 40 percent.

*Felony Probation Starts with Completed LS/CMIs by Agency, 2018–2020*

The alternative assessments used by these agencies are not included in these rates. CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms beginning between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
PRINCIPLE 2: Motivational interviewing, rather than persuasion tactics, is a more effective strategy for initiating and maintaining behavior change.

- Motivation predicts action.
- Motivation is behavior specific.
- Motivation is changeable.
- Motivation is interactive.
- Motivation can be affected by both internal and external factors, but internally motivated change usually lasts longer.

Using an RNR approach with motivational interviewing is different from how community supervision was typically run in the past.

**Traditional Approach**
- Supervise everyone the same way.
- Assign programs that feel or seem effective.
- Deliver programs the same way to everyone.

**Evidence-Based Practices**
- **Risk**: Assess risk of recidivism and focus supervision on the highest-risk people.
- **Need**: Prioritize programs addressing the needs most associated with recidivism.
- **Responsivity**: Deliver programs based on learning style, motivation, and/or circumstances.
PRINCIPLE 3: Target the right people and focus the highest-intensity resources on people at the highest risk of recidivating.

People who are assessed as low risk:

- Can stop committing crime with minimal intervention in many cases.
- Have positive patterns of behavior that can be disrupted by intensive services and supervision.
- Have been shown through research to learn more ingrained criminal behaviors when put with higher-risk individuals.

Average Difference in Recidivism by Risk for Individuals in Ohio Halfway Houses, 2006–2007

- Low Risk + 5%
- Moderate Risk - 6%
- High Risk - 15%

Increased Recidivism
Decreased Recidivism

Intervention dosage provided should match the level of the person’s assessed risk to recidivate and their assessed needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dosage</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Hours</td>
<td>3–6 Months</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 hours</td>
<td>6–9 Months</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 hours</td>
<td>9–18 Months</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x week or Residential</td>
<td>2x week</td>
<td>Mod/High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the limited research on dosage and recidivism to date, this chart presents a theoretical model to guide interventions for people assessed as being at a higher risk of recidivism.

People on felony probation fail at higher rates than those on probation for gross misdemeanor and misdemeanor offenses.

Probation Discharges by Outcome and Offense Level

- Discharged
- Discharged with Ongoing Supervision
- Revoked
- Other

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between July 2015 and June 2020.
Reducing probation revocations could lead to a significant reduction in prison admissions.

### Prison Admissions by Commitment Type and Gender, 2018–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Revocation</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commitment</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Revocation - No New Offense</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Revocation - New Offense</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women**

- Probation Revocation: 44%
- New Commitment: 29%
- Release Revocation - No New Offense: 25%
- Release Revocation - New Offense: 2%

**Men**

- Probation Revocation: 19%
- New Commitment: 40%
- Release Revocation - No New Offense: 36%
- Release Revocation - New Offense: 6%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC prison admissions data.
**PRINCIPLE 4:** Frontload supervision and treatment to address criminogenic needs that drive behavior.

**RESEARCH**
Supervision and supports should be focused on the period when people are most likely to reoffend.

Most recidivism events occur within the first year following release from prison.

By combining valid risk and needs assessment information with individually tailored frontloaded supervision and treatment, including referrals and connections to community supports, justice systems can impact recidivism the most.

---

*Based on the first arrest after release from prison, for people serving sentences in 30 states.*

PRINCIPLE 5: Ensure adequate investment in access to proven programs.

RESEARCH

Programs, treatment, and services should meet the unique needs of people in the criminal justice system.

Changes in Recidivism by Program Type

- Decreases Recidivism
  - Cognitive behavioral (-26%)
  - Academic training (-10%)
  - Individual counseling (-5%)
- Increases Recidivism
  - Deterrence/scared straight (2%)
  - Discipline/boot camp (8%)

Programs should utilize cognitive behavioral approaches regardless of area of focus (e.g., criminal thinking, substance use, sex offender).

Skill building with structured skills practice is an essential component of effective programs.

Systems should prioritize gender-responsive services and trauma-informed approaches.

All programming should be provided with attention to responsivity factors.

Effective behavioral health treatment for people in the criminal justice system addresses both criminogenic and behavioral health needs.

Addressed individually, these categories of care have minimal impact on recidivism reduction.

Addressed together, these categories of care improve behavioral health and reduce criminal behavior.
LS/CMI assessments in Minnesota indicate that nearly half of those assessed have high substance use disorder needs.

Only includes clients with completed LS/CMIs during probation term.
CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Financial problems, family violence, homelessness, and mental illness are other issues experienced by people on probation.

![Percentage of LS/CMI Assessments by Client Issues Identified, 2018–2020](chart)

Only includes clients with completed LS/CMIs during probation term.

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Staff selection, training, and ongoing staff development improve outcomes.

A meta-analysis of 58 studies of CBT showed that high-quality treatment implementation was associated with larger recidivism reductions.

Corrections and supervision agencies should conduct initial **staff training** on curricula by appropriately **trained or licensed individuals** as recommended by the program developer.

Agencies should also conduct annual staff training on **evidence-based practices and service delivery** for participants in a correctional setting.

New staff should be required to **attend and complete** all necessary training **prior to facilitating** services.

Personnel evaluations should reflect the skills of the agents related to each area above.

PRINCIPLE 6: Use assessment-driven case planning to facilitate behavior change.

**RESEARCH**
Focus case-planning goals on identified criminogenic need areas to facilitate positive behavior change.

- Antisocial Personality Pattern
- Antisocial Attitudes
- Antisocial Associates
- Substance Use Disorder
- Family/Marital Stressors
- Poor School/Work Performance
- Few Leisure or Recreation Activities


**Condition Setting**
Tailor special conditions to need areas identified as “high risk” or as a “significant problem.”

**Case Planning**
Focus case planning goals on identified criminogenic need areas to proactively address needs prior to violation behavior.

**Programming/Referrals**
Ensure that programming addresses criminogenic needs.

There are many services that are not designed as evidence-based programs but are still important components of a comprehensive treatment plan.
PRINCIPLE 7: Increase positive reinforcement and respond effectively to negative behaviors.

RESEARCH

Punishment alone is not an effective way to bring about long-term behavior change, partly because the negative behavior tends to return when the punishment is discontinued.

- Rewards and sanctions must be meaningful to the person receiving them.
- Punishment can STOP behavior but doesn’t replace it with appropriate behavior.
- It is important to reinforce desired behaviors so those continue after punishment discourages undesired behavior.
- All staff should be trained in the use of the behavioral management system so that skills and strategies learned in treatment are consistently reinforced.
- Formal menus of incentives and sanctions should be developed statewide.

Incentives should be used 4x more often than sanctions to promote and sustain behavior change.

Eric J. Wodahl, “Utilizing Behavioral Interventions to Improve Supervision Outcomes in Community-Based Corrections,” Criminal Justice and Behavior 38, no. 4, 2011.
PRINCIPLE 8: Engage with supports in the community.

RESEARCH
Prosocial support for individuals in their communities upon reentry or while on supervision can provide positive reinforcement of desired new behaviors.

Examples of prosocial supports include:
- Collaborative comprehensive case plan for reentry
- In-reach by community-based treatment providers to establish relationships
- Relapse prevention plan, use of peer recovery support if applicable
- Engagement with supportive family friends, community resources (including education, employment, housing, treatment providers)

PRINCIPLE 9: Measure outcomes, provide feedback, and use data to inform actions.

RESEARCH
Data should be the driver for change at multiple levels of supervision delivery.

Correctional leadership, management, supervisors, and officers all need access to timely data showing how actions impact outcomes.

What gets measured, gets managed.

- Trainings should be followed by staff coaching.
- Institute quality assurance and continuous quality improvement processes.
- Knowledge and performance expectations should be tied to job description and performance evaluations.
- Program evaluations should be conducted on a regular basis to ensure quality and effectiveness.
- Evaluate how data is used to improve outcomes.

Use data to drive agency decisions, including enacting policies that incentivize agency staff to use effective strategies and practices that improve outcomes for people on community supervision.

- Adopt a data system that tracks day-to-day practices and outcomes and that transforms data from stale reporting into a real-time catalyst for measuring and managing change.
- Monitor staff proficiency in use of evidence-based practices and create feedback loops to staff about what is working well to improve outcomes.
- Use data to inform decision-making related to training, programming, and implementing new practices and to assess and address areas of agency culture that prevent progress.
- Use data to measure the implementation, fidelity, and impact of evidence-based practices and agency policies in affecting behavior and reducing revocations.
Probation and Supervised Release
Minnesota’s total probation population has declined in the past decade.

Minnesota Probation Population, 2011–2020

- **Adult Felony**: +1%
- **Adult Gross Misd**: -17%
- **Adult Misd**: -53%
- **Juvenile**: -51%

Each year there are around 45,000 adult admissions to probation in Minnesota. In 2020, there were 21 percent fewer people on probation than in 2011.

Entries and Exits to and from Probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Entries</th>
<th>Exits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>107,786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>153,561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>124,236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>118,912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>118,741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>114,763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>115,515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>115,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>84,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>85,254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2019, more than 36,000 people started pretrial supervision; 43 percent were for non-felony offenses.

Includes only “Pretrial” case type and “Investigation” case service from CSTS; CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC pretrial supervision data.
The number of people on probation for offenses related to drugs and driving while intoxicated (DWI) speaks to the need for behavioral health services for people on supervision.

Top Offense Categories of People on Probation by Level, 2018–2020

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Black and Native American people are over-represented in probation, supervised release, and prison populations.

![Racial Composition of Justice-Involved Populations Compared to Total Adult Population](chart)

LS/CMI assessments are completed for nearly 70 percent of people on felony probation. Fewer than 20 percent of people on misdemeanor probation have completed LS/CMI assessments. The alternative assessments used by these agencies are not included in these numbers; CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Intensive Supervised Release (ISR) has a distinct target population that is supervised either by DOC or by CCAs.

- ISR was created in response to a particular crime in 1990 as a highly structured and defined program. It has been amended substantively only once (2015) since the 1990s.

- ISR program requirements include 24-hour supervision, which requires a minimum of three full-time agents. Per statute, an ISR agent can supervise a maximum of 15 cases, or no more than 45 cases supervised by three agents.

- By law at least half of the money appropriated for the ISR programs each year is to be used for programs in Community Corrections Act counties.

M.C.A. §§ 244.12-15
The standard supervised release population has increased by 46 percent since 2011, while the ISR population has decreased by 11 percent.

The Challenge Incarceration Program and Work Release Program provide an alternative to traditional incarceration.

**Challenge Incarceration Program (CIP)**
- CIP is an intervention that provides individuals who are good candidates for early release from prison with a combination of boot camp and intensive aftercare rehabilitation.
- It combines a traditional military institutional program for six months with two six-month phases of intensive, supervised release aftercare.

**Work Release Program**
- The Work Release Program connects incarcerated people to paid employment or approved vocational programming in the community.
- People are eligible for work release during the last 12 months prior to their supervised release date; the program provides a structured transition period for people returning to the community with the intent of better preparing them for a successful, crime-free life.

Source:
Since 2016, the proportion of releases to ISR has increased. People released to ISR accounted for 25 percent of all community supervision starts in 2019 and 2020.

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC community supervision data.
A higher proportion of White people start the Challenge Incarceration Program and Work Release than people of other races and ethnicities.
Of the people released to ISR, 90 percent have very high MnSTARR risk levels.

Supervised Release Starts by MnSTARR Risk Level, 2019–2020

- **Very High**: 90%
- **High**: 7%
- **Medium**: 2%
- **Low**: 2%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC community supervision data.
Nearly 40 percent of people on supervised release return to prison before completing their sentence.

Supervised Release Discharges by Outcome, 2018–2020

- Discharge: 59%
- Revoked - No New Sentence: 34%
- Revoked - New Sentence: 5%
- Death: 0%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC community supervision data.
Data by Delivery System
The average length of pretrial supervision by CPO agencies is longer than CCA or DOC pretrial supervision.

Median Length (Days) of Pretrial Supervision by Offense Level and Delivery System, 2018–2020

Includes pretrial supervision terms that started between Jan 2018 and Dec 202 and ended by Nov 17, 2021.

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC pretrial supervision data.
Community Corrections Act agencies supervise more than 70 percent of all people starting probation and pretrial supervision.

**Supervision Starts by Supervision Delivery System, 2018–2020**

### Probation

- **CCA**: 71%
- **DOC**: 17%
- **CPO**: 12%

### Pretrial

- **CCA**: 71%
- **DOC**: 23%
- **CPO**: 6%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
The per capita crime rate across all offense types is higher in CCA counties than in DOC and CPO counties.

Part II crimes include simple assault, DUI, drug offenses, fraud, and other crimes not defined as Part I violent or property crimes by the FBI UCR.
Adults on probation are distributed most evenly by offense class in CCA agencies.

Probation Starts by Supervision Delivery System and Offense Level, 2018–2020

- CCA:
  - Misdemeanor: 36%
  - Gross Misdemeanor: 32%
  - Felony: 32%

- DOC:
  - Misdemeanor: 28%
  - Gross Misdemeanor: 28%
  - Felony: 44%

- CPO:
  - Misdemeanor: 56%
  - Gross Misdemeanor: 44%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
The racial makeup of the three delivery systems differs, and they may need different cultural competencies to deliver appropriate services.

Probation Starts by Delivery System and Race, 2018–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery System</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
DOC field offices and CPO agencies complete LS/CMIs for people admitted to probation more often than CCA agencies.

The alternative assessments used by these agencies are not included in these rates;
CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
CCA agencies supervise more people on supervised release than DOC, but DOC’s supervised release population has a higher proportion of people on ISR.

Supervised Release Starts by Delivery System and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CCA (Standard)</th>
<th>CCA (Intensive)</th>
<th>DOC (Standard)</th>
<th>DOC (Intensive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC community supervision data.
Throughout our assessment work, people shared very compelling experiences on supervision.

The agents want to be helpful, not to take you down. He provides me with resources and solutions.

It is hard being on probation in different counties with different expectations from the agents.

My (ISR) agent holds me accountable and gives me the structure I need to succeed.

My agent is available 24/7 and always returns my calls no matter what the time.

The last county I was in wanted you to fail, but here they want you to succeed.

I couldn't afford the programs [required as conditions].
One person’s path through the supervision system touched five agencies and all three delivery systems.

**Supervision Terms and Sentences to Probation**

- **Anoka (CCA)**
- **Wright (CPO)**
- **Isanti (CPO)**
- **Center City (DOC)**
- **Ramsey (CCA)**

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
People on supervision in multiple systems must overcome additional hurdles to successfully discharge from supervision.

- **82,056**
  - Adult probation windows started between Jan 2018 and June 2020

- **11,179**
  - 14%
  - More than one sentence date

- **5,048**
  - 6%
  - More than one supervising agency

- **2,399**
  - 3%
  - More than one delivery system

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Thousands of people on probation are supervised by two or more agencies, and thousands receive new probation sentences while on supervision.

---

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Supervision resources should be targeted to the people who are assessed as high and very high risk, regardless of offense type or supervision system.

The alternative assessments are not included in these numbers; CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Prioritizing supervision conditions, programming, and treatment that focus on behavioral health, education, and relationships may support better supervision outcomes.

Percentage of LS/CMI Assessments with High or Very High Score by Domain and Offense Level, 2018–2020

Only includes clients with completed LS/CMIs during probation term.
CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
Individuals on supervision identified needs associated with finances, housing, and mental health.

Percentage of LS/CMI Assessments by Client Issues Identified and Offense Level, 2018–2020

Only includes clients with completed LS/CMIs during probation term.
CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data with terms starting between Jan 2018 and June 2020.
296 district court judges were surveyed in October and nearly half responded; response rates varied by district.

![Judicial Survey Response Rates by Judicial District](chart)

Nearly half of judges said that treatment and programming are inadequate or barely adequate, and almost two-thirds of judges in DOC counties said so.

Most judges (66 percent) work with only one delivery system, and most (60 percent) indicated their preference was “not applicable.”
Judges with a preference for a delivery system provided explanations.

**CPO**
- More answerable to the judge. DOC is a separate agency and there can be some push and pull.
- Our CPO office is responsive, proportional, and consistent.

**CCA**
- Is more responsive to local needs and more cooperative with the bench. The limitation seems to be funding.
- I find DOC very inflexible and not particularly invested in the community.

**DOC**
- I very much prefer DOC, with statewide policies and standardized practices.

**Other**
- Not sure what the difference is between CCA and CPO.

Three-quarters of judges are satisfied or very satisfied with their relationship with supervision officers.

![Bar Chart: Judges’ Relationships with Supervision Officers]

- Very satisfied: 36%
- Satisfied: 39%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 18%
- Dissatisfied: 6%
- Very dissatisfied: 0%

Overall, most judges (73 percent) permitted sanctions conferences at least half the time for responding to violations, but permission was lower in DOC counties.

How Often Judges Allow Sanctions Conferences for Violations

- **CCA only**
  - Always: 50%
  - Most of the time: 21%
  - About half the time: 12%
  - Infrequently: 10%
  - Never: 7%

- **CPO only**
  - Always: 50%
  - Most of the time: 14%
  - About half the time: 11%
  - Infrequently: 4%
  - Never: 21%

- **DOC only**
  - Always: 38%
  - Most of the time: 12%
  - About half the time: 12%
  - Infrequently: 25%
  - Never: 12%

- **More than one delivery system**
  - Always: 8%
  - Most of the time: 8%
  - About half the time: 25%
  - Infrequently: 21%
  - Never: 33%

Next Steps 7
Staff from the CSG Justice Center are assessing Minnesota’s supervision system.

Counties were selected to reflect the diversity of the state.

- 4–5 agencies from each delivery system—13 total
- Counties both large and small, by geography and population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPO Assessment</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itasca</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCA Assessment</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFO</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead Regional</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherburne</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOC Assessment</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beltrami</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Governor’s Council on Justice Reinvestment will soon launch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Chairs</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founder &amp; Executive Director, Until We Are All Free</td>
<td>Chair, Finance Committee</td>
<td>District 66</td>
<td>District 65A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Schnell</td>
<td>Catherine Johnson</td>
<td>Jason Anderson</td>
<td>John Choi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Commissioner</td>
<td>MACCAC President, Hennepin County</td>
<td>CPO President, Itasca County</td>
<td>Board Member, MN County Attorneys Association, Ramsey County Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Swanson</td>
<td>Dr. Yohuru Williams</td>
<td>Judge Jennifer Frisch</td>
<td>Chairman Kevin DuPuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC Public Safety Chair, Roseau County Commissioner</td>
<td>Founding Director, Racial Justice Initiative, UST</td>
<td>MN Court of Appeals</td>
<td>Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Calendar of meetings and deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 28</td>
<td>First Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>Second Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>Third Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 10</td>
<td>State of Oregon Peer Sharing on Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 14</td>
<td>Fourth Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td>Final Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(week of) Jan. 10</td>
<td>Behavioral Health Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1</td>
<td>Report Due to Legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minnesota’s Justice Reinvestment Initiative will run through 2022.

- **Project Launch**
  - September 2021
  - September–December 2021

- **2021**
  - CSG Justice Center staff conduct independent data analysis and extensive stakeholder engagement, facilitate working group meetings, and develop policy recommendations.

- **2022**
  - January 2022
    - Summary report of Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy recommendations released
  - February 2022
    - Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy recommendations are introduced
  - Spring 2022
  - Ongoing technical assistance and data monitoring to ensure the policy recommendations are successfully implemented
  - Minnesota’s 2022 legislative session begins
  - April 2022
  - Summary

- **2023**
  - Ongoing technical assistance and data monitoring to ensure the policy recommendations are successfully implemented
Thank You!

Join our distribution list to receive updates and announcements:

https://csgjusticecenter.org/resources/newsletters/

For more information, please contact Michelle Rodriguez at mrodriguez@csg.org
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