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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 prison admissions are due to supervision failures. 25 percent of the standing population is admitted to prison with a release revocation.
2. Black and Native American people are overrepresented in Minnesota’s criminal justice system.

Black and Native American people are overrepresented 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 serve 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.
4. Statewide core standards must include effective supervision practices and shared service delivery definitions.

All agree that practice standards for reducing recidivism should target the right people for the right interventions.

<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>

Prioritizing supervision conditions, programming, and treatment that focus on behavioral health, education, and relationships may support better supervision outcomes.
5. While defining core services, Minnesota has choices to make for reinventing equitable state support for local supervision.

States use funding formulas for supervision and incentive funding to target and maintain diversions.

Oregon’s systematic workload analysis provides strong logic for each county’s slice of the budget pie.
Today’s analysis tests community supervision in Minnesota against three principles.

1. **Effectiveness**
   Is the Minnesota approach working? Are people succeeding?

2. **Equity**
   Is the Minnesota approach fair? Does every person get equal opportunities to succeed?

3. **Resources**
   Is Minnesota supervision funded in a way to ensure it is effective and equitable?
This analysis examines three recidivism outcomes within three years of people starting probation.

**Incarceration**
Matched people on probation to prison admissions occurring within three years of starting probation using Minnesota Department of Corrections data.

**Felony Conviction**
Matched people on probation to felony sentences in which the offense was committed within three years of starting probation using Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission data.

**New Probation Term**
Matched people on probation to new probation terms for felonies or misdemeanors starting within three years of starting probation using Minnesota Department of Corrections S$^3$ data.
Fifteen percent of people starting felony probation were incarcerated within three years, but twice that proportion got a new probation term.

Recidivism Outcomes within Three Years of People Starting Probation by Offense Level
Probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017

- Incarceration
- New felony conviction
- New probation term

Felony:
- 15% Incarceration
- 25% New felony conviction
- 31% New probation term

Misdemeanor:
- 3% Incarceration
- 8% New felony conviction
- 18% New probation term

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
Incarceration is less common after 18 months of starting felony probation.

Time to Incarceration from Probation Start
Felony probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
People starting felony probation for family and safety offenses—frequently domestic assault or harassment—had the highest rates of subsequent incarceration.

**Incarceration within Three Years of Starting Probation by Offense Type**

Felony probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017

- **Family/Safety**: 26%
- **Other**: 17%
- **Property**: 17%
- **Public Order**: 14%
- **Drugs**: 13%
- **Person**: 13%
- **Sex**: 11%
- **DUI/Traffic**: 9%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
All three measures of recidivism were higher for people on felony probation supervised by CCA agencies.

**Recidivism Outcomes within Three Years of People Starting Probation by Delivery System**
Felony probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017

- **Incarceration:**
  - CCA: 17%
  - DOC: 9%
- **New felony conviction:**
  - CCA: 27%
  - DOC: 18%
- **New probation term:**
  - CCA: 32%
  - DOC: 27%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
There is wide variation in rates of incarceration for people on felony probation by supervision agency.

Incarceration within Three Years of Probation Start by Agency
Felony probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017
Size of points are proportionate to total number of probation starts per agency

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
Regression analysis makes it possible to compare outcomes between two groups, after accounting for group differences.

By using regression, we can account for key differences in the composition of a delivery system’s probation population—such as type of offense and age—to make an “apples to apples” comparison between delivery systems.

Results expressed as an adjusted relative rate index.
People starting felony probation with CCA agencies were...

- 2.5x more likely to be incarcerated within three years
- 1.5x more likely to be convicted of a felony within three years
- 1.2x more likely to start a new probation term within three years

Adjusted relative rate index of predicted probability of incarceration, conviction, or probation calculated using a logistic regression model, controlling for age, gender, race, offense type, and county size. N = 22,900, N = 14,870, N = 19,078; Felony probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017. CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
Strengthening services for people on probation for drug offenses could reduce recidivism.

New Probation Term within Three Years of Starting Probation by Offense Type
Misdemeanor probation terms starting July 1, 2015–June 30, 2017

- Drugs: 36%
- Family/Safety: 30%
- Property: 28%
- Other: 22%
- Person: 22%
- Public Order: 21%
- Sex: 15%
- DWI/Traffic: 13%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
The recidivism outcomes for people starting misdemeanor probation were similar across the three delivery systems.

Recidivism Outcomes within Three Years of People Starting Probation by Delivery System
Misdemeanor probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CCA</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>CPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New felony conviction</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New probation term</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
Compared to people on misdemeanor probation and supervised by DOC...

- people supervised by CCA agencies were **1.3x** less likely to be incarcerated within three years.
- people supervised by CPO agencies were **1.6x** less likely to be incarcerated within three years.
- people supervised by CPO agencies were **1.6x** less likely to be convicted of a felony within three years.

Adjusted relative rate index of predicted probability of incarceration or felony conviction calculated using a logistic regression model, controlling for age, gender, race, offense type, offense level, and county size. N = 60,018, N = 60,018, N = 49,247; Misdemeanor probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017.

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
There was less variation in rates of new probation terms by agency.

New Probation Term within Three Years of Probation Start by Agency
Misdemeanor probation terms starting July 1, 2015–June 30, 2017
Size of points are proportionate to total number of probation starts per agency

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
Native American people on felony probation were incarcerated at higher rates than people of other races.

Incarceration within Three Years of Starting Probation by Race and Delivery System
Felony probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017

- Native American: CCA 23%, DOC 15%
- Asian: CCA 17%, DOC 14%
- Hispanic: CCA 20%, DOC 11%
- Black: CCA 19%, DOC 11%
- White: CCA 15%, DOC 8%

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
Native American and Black people on misdemeanor probation had higher rates of subsequent probation than people of other races.

New Probation Term within Three Years of Starting Probation by Race and Delivery System
Misdemeanor probation terms starting July 1, 2015–June 30, 2017

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
Compared to White people...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Felony Probation</th>
<th>Misdemeanor Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.7x more likely</td>
<td>1.5x more likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people on felony</td>
<td>to be incarcerated</td>
<td>to have a new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probation were</td>
<td>within three years</td>
<td>probation term within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people on</td>
<td>1.2x more likely</td>
<td>1.3x more likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felony probation</td>
<td>to be incarcerated</td>
<td>to have a new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were</td>
<td>within three years</td>
<td>probation term within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>three years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted relative rate index of predicted probability of incarceration or new probation term calculated using a logistic regression model, controlling for age, gender, race, offense type, offense level, and county size. N = 22,900, N = 22,900, N = 49,247; Probation terms starting July 1, 2015–Dec 31, 2017. CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC probation data.
From 2016 to 2020, there was an increase in the average number of violations heard in a supervised release revocation hearing.

Average Number of Violations Heard, 2016–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violations at Hearings, 2016–2020

- 2–5 violations: 11,992 (70%)
- 6–10 violations: 1,442 (8%)
- 11 or more violations: 144 (1%)

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
The most prevalent supervised release violations were for drugs, programming failure, failure to maintain an appropriate residence, and law violations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation Type</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug violation</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>6,396</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence violation</td>
<td>5,732</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law violation</td>
<td>5,431</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to maintain contact</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to follow agent instructions</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special supervision phases violation</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to comply with restructure</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assultive behavior</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation Type</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet violation</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to comply with drug testing</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contact order violation</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons possession</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to notify agent of law enforcement interaction</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left state</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle violation</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes the failure to refrain from purchase of sexually explicit materials, failure to refrain from entering any establishment where the sale of alcohol is the primary business, failure to respond promptly, failure to submit to unannounced visit.
Supervised release revocations account for more than one-third of all prison admissions, and...

44 percent of people starting intensive supervised release were reincarcerated within one year

23 percent of people starting standard supervised release were reincarcerated within one year

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
Supervised release failures most commonly occurred in the first six months of supervision.

**Time to Reincarceration from Supervised Release Start**
Supervised release terms starting Jan 1, 2016–Dec 31, 2017

- **Intensive**
- **Standard**

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
Native American and Black people on supervised release are reincarcerated more often than people of other races.

Reincarceration within One Year of Starting Supervised Release by Race
Supervised release terms starting Jan 1, 2016–Dec 31, 2019

- Native American: 53% Intensive, 29% Standard
- Black: 54% Intensive, 25% Standard
- White: 34% Intensive, 20% Standard
- Hispanic: 34% Intensive, 19% Standard
- Asian: 20% Intensive, 25% Standard

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
Compared to White people...

Native American people on standard SR were 1.5x more likely to be incarcerated within one year.

Native American people on intensive SR were 1.3x more likely to be incarcerated within one year.

Black people on standard SR were 1.2x more likely to be incarcerated within one year.

Black people on intensive SR were 1.1x more likely to be incarcerated within one year.

Adjusted relative rate index of predicted probability of reincarceration using a logistic regression model, controlling for age, gender, offense type, supervision delivery system, prison term prior to release, and county size. N = 16,802; Supervised release terms starting Jan 1, 2016–Dec 31, 2019. CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
People on supervised release by CCA agencies were more likely to be reincarcerated than people supervised by DOC.

After controlling for case and individual factors, people supervised by CCA agencies were 1.2x more likely to be incarcerated within one year compared to people supervised by DOC.

Adjusted relative rate index of predicted probability of reincarceration using a logistic regression model, controlling for age, gender, race, offense type, prison term prior to release, and county size. N = 16,802; Supervised release terms starting Jan 1, 2016–Dec 31, 2019. CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
Reincarceration rates varied by agency from less than 10 percent to nearly 35 percent for people on supervised release.

Reincarceration within One Year of Starting Standard Supervised Release by Agency

Standard supervised release terms starting Jan 1, 2016–Dec 31, 2019
Size of points are proportionate to total number of SR starts per agency

CCA  DOC

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
Across most agencies, between 40 and 45 percent of people on intensive supervised release were reincarcerated.

Reincarceration within One Year of Starting Standard Supervised Release by Agency

Intensive supervised release terms starting Jan 1, 2016–Dec 31, 2019
Size of points are proportionate to total number of SR starts per agency

CCA  DOC

CSG Justice Center analysis of MN DOC supervised release data.
Key Takeaways

1. Fifteen percent of people starting felony probation were incarcerated within three years, but twice that proportion got a new probation term.

2. Native American and Black people on felony probation and supervised release were incarcerated within three years of starting supervision more often than White people.

3. Recidivism rates were higher for CCA agencies than for DOC for felony probation and supervised release.
This analysis does not explain why there are different outcomes by delivery system.

• What do you think contributes to the different outcomes by delivery system?

Reincarceration is just one measure of failure (and the inverse, success).

• How does your agency currently measure success?

• What outcomes are most important to your agency? How do you measure those outcomes?
Supervision Assessment

3
CSG Justice Center staff assessed various supervision systems in Minnesota.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>DOC Assessment</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beltrami</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSG Justice Center staff conducted over 80 meetings with staff from, and people supervised by, each supervision delivery system.

- 60-minute meeting with the director of each county/region
- 60-minute interviews with community agencies providing programming, if available
- 60-minute focus group with female clients
- 60-minute focus group with male clients
- 60-minute focus group with the supervision agency’s administration
- 90-minute focus group with supervision officers
Each system was assessed against nine strategies of supervision based on the principles of effective intervention discussed in the November presentation.

<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>

Focus on Change

There were many strengths found across the systems, which are discussed along with challenges in the soon-to-follow written reports. However, given that our focus is on creating the change needed to meet the above nine principles, this brief overview will focus on the common challenges and priorities that must be met to ensure continuity in evidence-based practices and the experience of people under supervision across systems.
1. Assess risk, needs, and responsivity.

Findings

- **Inconsistent use of risk and needs assessment.** Different sites use different parts of the tools.
- **Different tools used across the state.**
- **Most tools have not been validated on the MN population.**
- **Most tools have not been validated to ensure accuracy and minimize bias across race, ethnicity, and gender.**
- **Responsivity issues are often overlooked.**
- **Assessment results are not used in supervision case planning and management.**
1. Assess risk, needs, and responsivity.

- **Validate the LS/CMI** or develop and validate one criminogenic risk screener and one risk assessment tool for use across the systems.

  *If the state is unable to agree to one screener and one risk assessment tool, adopt a five-level risk and needs system and map (and validate) the tools in use.*

- Develop **consistent policy on the use** of risk and needs tools.

**Recommendations**
2. Enhance intrinsic motivation.

- There is inconsistency within and between systems regarding what agents see as their role; some see themselves as *change agents* and others as *law enforcement*.

- The *lack of diversity* in the workforce (workforce does not match clients) impairs enhancing motivation.

- There is a lack of ongoing *coaching and quality assurance* across all the systems.
2. **Enhance intrinsic motivation.**

- Codify among all three systems that community supervisors are **change agents**.
- Help agents **disaggregate motivation and accountability**.
- All delivery systems need to intentionally plan to develop a workforce that better mirrors clients served.
- Develop a **training and quality improvement process**.
Target interventions based on assessments and appropriate dosage.

Findings

- There are no consistent formalized case plans or formal collaborative case plans completed, though one is in development.
- The use of Smart Chronos absent a case plan does not effectively drive the agent’s supervision process and limits the ability to measure what works.
- Some agents see return to prison as the best intervention for sanctions and stability even absent public safety risk.
- Community programs vary greatly in quality, including mental health, substance use, batterer’s intervention, and problem sexual behavior treatment programs.
3. Target interventions based on assessments and appropriate dosage.

- Complete the development of a **formalized case planning** process across the three systems.

- Integrate the **Smart Chrono** reporting with the case plan.

- **Determine evidence-based treatment approaches** for clients in the criminal justice system and require providers serving criminal justice clients to adhere to those practices.

**Recommendations**
4. Frontload interventions during a person’s supervision term.

Findings

- Supervision intensity is frontloaded, but there are delays in treatment access.
- Delays may be based on availability, client ability to pay, and/or transportation issues.
- Risk and need assessment results do not always drive referrals to programs.
- There is no quality control over community programs.
- Some agents do not see it as their responsibility to shepherd clients to the right program or to programs that are evidence based.
- Providers are inconsistent in what, how, and when they report information back to community supervisors.
4. Frontload interventions during a person’s supervision term.

- Develop one statewide standard and format for provider reports to agents.
- Assess people prior to release from incarceration or at the pre-sentence level. If not, assess within 14 days of release or placement on probation.
- Refer to programs based on risk and needs, including mental health and substance use needs.
- Determine where the gaps in insurance coverage exist and adjust the state’s eligibility guidelines to ensure that clients can access needed treatment.
- Increase who can access medical transportation for clients who have transportation difficulties.
- Maximize use of telehealth for people in the criminal justice system.

Recommendations
Ensure adequate investment in and access to proven programs (e.g., cognitive behavioral treatment).

All three systems have agents trained in motivational interviewing and cognitive programming, including the Carey Guides, Decision Points, and others.

There is little to no ongoing coaching or quality control in any of the systems.

There is no requirement for gender-specific or culturally specific training or program provision.

There is limited gender-informed supervision, and many community providers do not offer gender-informed programming.
5. Ensure adequate investment in and access to proven programs (e.g., cognitive behavioral treatment).

- Develop a **statewide evidence-based practice coordinator** to ensure that evidence-based practices are consistently utilized across the systems.

- Fund specific training, coaching, and quality assurance **positions** for DOC, CPO, and CCA. Do not require these positions to carry a caseload.
6. Use assessment-driven case planning to facilitate behavior change.

Findings

- No consistent formal case planning is utilized.
- The **limited training, coaching, and QI** impede ensuring that agents are change agents and not acting as law enforcement.
- **Personnel evaluations**, if they exist formally at all, do not adequately focus on the skills and behaviors needed for community supervisors to be change agents.
6. Use assessment-driven case planning to facilitate behavior change.

**Complete development of a formalized case planning process across the three systems.**

**Evaluate agent performance** with relevant personnel evaluations at least twice yearly. The part of the personnel evaluation related to skills and behaviors for behavior change should be the same across the three systems.
7. Respond effectively to negative behavior and increase positive reinforcement.

Findings

- There is no structured incentives and sanctions matrix in use.
- There is limited use of informal incentives.
- While informal sanctions are used, there is no way to adequately measure their relevance or impact.
- Some agents see return to incarceration as the favored sanction.
- Sanctions are not associated with assessed risk level.
- Policies on sanctions vary within and between systems.
7. Respond effectively to negative behavior and increase positive reinforcement.

**Develop incentives** and use them four times more than sanctions to achieve behavior change.

**Develop an incentives and sanctions grid** to provide officers with multiple options and associate those options with level of assessed risk.

**Develop a consistent policy** across the delivery systems on the use of incentives and sanctions.

Provide **ongoing coaching** on the appropriate use of incentives and sanctions.

Include an evaluation of each agent’s use of incentives and sanctions as part of the uniform personnel evaluations.

**Recommendations**
8. Engage with supports in the community.

Findings

Agents maintain **good contact** with family members, providers, and in some areas, employers.

There is **informal collaborative case planning** with community providers, but it is inconsistent within and between systems.

Some areas engage heavily with **employers and landlords**, but others do not.

There is a general hesitancy among many employers and landlords to **employ or house people with a felony conviction**.
Engage with supports in the community.

Complete development of a **formalized, collaborative case plan process** with integrated Smart Chrono, including the development of access for providers to enter progress data on clients.

Develop **statewide incentives and protection** through legislation for employers and landlords working with people in the criminal justice system.
Measure outcomes and provide feedback.

Findings

- Everything that goes into CSTS does not get **uploaded** to S3.
- Though much data are collected, **definitions for this data vary** across the systems.
- This results in **limited data feedback loops** to help staff improve their day-to-day work.
- Many agents see the **Smart Chrono as a burden** and not something that helps direct their work.
9. Measure outcomes and provide feedback.

- Develop **shared definitions** of what matters in program provision, supervision stipulations, and supervision processes.

- **Assess the current capacity for data collection**, including how data are collected and what is needed to meet a statewide standard of data collection, and provide the needed support to counties with capacity gaps.

- **Track consistent information** in all three systems and ultimately upload to S3 to allow for a statewide quality assurance process.
Begin with these four recommendations to improve supervision practices across all three delivery systems.

1. Use one set of tools validated on the MN population. Tools must be validated across gender, race, and ethnicity.

2. Develop a formalized case planning process across the three systems.

3. Create a statewide EBP coordinator, enhance statewide training, and support coaching and quality assurance staff in each system.

4. Require evidence-based treatment approaches for clients in the criminal justice system being served by community providers.
Many of these recommendations are low-cost, cost-neutral, or require administrative changes only.

• How could your agency operationalize some of those recommendations?
• Do any require legislation or new appropriations?
• What is holding your agency back from implementing evidence-based practices?
Budget
Public Safety & Judiciary (PSJ) receives about $3.2 billion, or 3 percent of the state’s budget, and Corrections is 42 percent of PSJ.

Minnesota State Budget FY2022–2023

- Public Safety & Judiciary $3,190,000,000 (3%)
- Corrections $1,314,000,000 (42%)
- Other $137,780,000 (4%)
- Supreme Court $137,780,000 (5%)
- Board of Public Defense $137,780,000 (7%)
- District Courts $137,780,000 (22%)
- Public Safety $137,780,000 (20%)

Public Safety & Judiciary Budget FY2022–2023

- Department of Corrections $1,314,000,000 (42%)
- District Courts $137,780,000 (22%)
- Public Safety $137,780,000 (20%)
- Other $137,780,000 (4%)
- Supreme Court $137,780,000 (5%)
- Board of Public Defense $137,780,000 (7%)

Corrections Budget FY2022–2023

- Incarceration and Pre-Release Services $137,780,000 (22%)
- Organizational, Regulatory and Administrative Services $137,780,000 (5%)

State auditor reports on county expenditures for public safety in 2019 totaled $1.3 billion, or 16.6 percent of total county expenditures.

Summary of County Expenditures, 2019

- 83% Public Safety
  - $1,341,661,606
  - 16.6%

Public Safety Expenditures, 2019

- Corrections 42%
- Sheriff 47%
- All Other 7%
- Capital Outlay 4%

Minnesota’s total adult probation population remained consistent between 2015 and 2019.


- Adult Felony: +5%
- Adult Gross Misd: +8%
- Adult Misd: -18%
- Juvenile: -23%

Between 2015 and 2019, state funding for CCA counties increased 10 percent while the probation population decreased 2 percent and the post-release population increased 6 percent.

Supervision Funding and Populations for CCA Agencies, 2015–2019

**MN DOC Probation Survey 2015-2019; CCA email to CSG Justice Center staff.**
Between 2015 and 2019, funding for DOC field services increased 10 percent while the probation population increased 2 percent and the post-release population increased 6 percent.
Between 2015 and 2019, state funding for CPO counties remained steady while the CPO probation population decreased by 1 percent.

Supervision Funding and Populations for CPO Agencies, 2015–2019

MN DOC Probation Survey 2015-2019; CPO email to CSG Justice Center staff.
Three questions were discussed at the December 10 meeting on budget approaches used in Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

1. Should one funding formula approach for all counties be adopted?
2. If yes, on what would the funding be based?
3. Could there be two funding approaches, such as a basic formula and an incentive approach?
How does community supervision in Minnesota currently hold up against these three principles?

1. **Effectiveness**
   Is the Minnesota approach working? Are people succeeding?

2. **Equity**
   Is the Minnesota approach fair? Does every person get equal opportunities to succeed?

3. **Resources**
   Is Minnesota supervision funded in a way to ensure it is effective and equitable?
## Calendar of meetings and deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 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. 16</td>
<td>Fourth Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td>Juvenile Data Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 11-12</td>
<td>Virtual Behavioral Health Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td>Final Delivery System Working Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1</td>
<td>Report Due to Legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Governor’s Council on Justice Reinvestment will soon launch.

Co-Chairs

- Kevin Reese
  Founder & Executive Director, Until We Are All Free
- Paul Schnell
  DOC Commissioner
- Jack Swanson
  AMC Public Safety Chair, Roseau County Commissioner
- Sen. Julie Rosen
  Chair, Finance Committee
- Catherine Johnson
  MACCAC President, Hennepin County
- Dr. Yohuru Williams
  Founding Director, Racial Justice Initiative, UST
- Sen. John Marty
  District 66
- Jason Anderson
  CPO President, Itasca County
- Judge Jennifer Frisch
  MN Court of Appeals
- Rep. Rena Moran
  District 65A
- John Choi
  Board Member, MN County Attorneys Association, Ramsey County Attorney
- Rep. Paul Novotny
  District 30A
- Kelly Mitchell
  Chair, MN Sentencing Guidelines Commission
- Chairman Kevin DuPuis
  Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa
- Tim Leslie
  Dakota County Sheriff

The Council of State Governments Justice Center | 73
Minnesota’s Justice Reinvestment Initiative will run through 2022.

- **Project Launch**: September 2021
- **CSG Justice Center staff conduct independent data analysis and extensive stakeholder engagement, facilitate working group meetings, and develop policy recommendations.**
- **2021**
  - September 2021
  - Project Launch
  - September–December 2021
  - Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy recommendations are introduced
- **2022**
  - January 2022
  - Summary report of Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy recommendations released
  - February 2022
  - Justice Reinvestment Initiative implementation can begin
  - Ongoing technical assistance and data monitoring to ensure the policy recommendations are successfully implemented
  - March 2022
  - Legislative session begins
  - Summary report of Justice Reinvestment Initiative policy recommendations released
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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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