DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Meeting Minutes: Community Supervision Advisory Committee

Meeting Date: November 9, 2023
Hybrid Meeting: Minnesota Department of Corrections Central Office, Afton Room and via Webex

Members present in person were: Carter Diers, Jake McLellan, Jonathan Schiro, Kelly Mitchell, and Kurt Mortenson

Members attending online were: Barb Weckmann Brekke, Tami Jo Lieberg, Tierre Caldwell, Julie Atella, Wally Kostich and Rebecca Muskat

Absent: Ron Antony, Jenna Kavanagh, Morgan Ironheart, Michael Schommer and Nick Henderson

Also present were Carli Stark, Mike Cook and Danelle Gorra, as well as additional members of the public. Meeting was recorded.

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Assistant Commissioner Kelly Mitchell called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm. There was a late start due to technical difficulties. AC Mitchell explained that the goal of the meeting was to educate committee about the concept and general purpose of a workload study. Because this is one of the first deliverables for the committee, the issue is time sensitive.

2. Approval of Draft Meeting Agenda (Action) and Approval of Draft meeting Minutes from September 29, 2023 (Action)

Upon update of minutes to reflect that Ron Antony was present at the September 29th meeting the minutes were approved

Motion to approve 1st: Jake McLellan
Motion 2nd: Carter Diers
Approved by: Carter Diers, Jake McLellan, Jonathan Schiro, Kelly Mitchell, Kurt Mortenson, Barb Weckmann Brekke, Tami Jo Lieberg, Tierre Caldwell, Julie Atella, Wally Kostich and Rebecca Muskat

3. Workload Study

a) Review Legislative Directive Regarding Workload Study
AC Mitchell reviewed with the committee the legislative directive to complete a workload study by October 2024. She noted that no funding was provided for the workload study.

b) What is a workload study?
Jennifer Johnson explained how DOC uses and implements workload studies. DOC studies are aimed at determining how much time it takes to supervise a specific type of client using a random sample of an agents' clients. Eight different work studies have been conducted since 2006. The information is utilized

as management tool for supervisors to adjust agent workloads, move positions, move office locations, or determine where new positions are needed. Trends are looked at but also outside of the study, considerations need to be made for geographic areas and constraints faced by the clientele, i.e., transportation, etc.

c) 2022 Workload Study. How does it relate to the funding formula?
Carli Stark from the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties explained how the new funding formula had been developed, and what role the work study played in the development of the formula.

Agents spend about 2/3 of their time on client-based activities. Chronos take up most of the time of the administrative work. Funding principles apply to all 3 delivery systems.

Each county receives base funding of $150,000. The capitated rate (Per Diem) is designed to provide additional funding based on client populations and risk levels. The goal is to make sure the same resources are available from county to county. The capitative rate consists of the administrative rate of $2.00 to cover costs of IT, Equipment, etc., plus $3.62 to cover the costs of supervision thus, the capitated rate in the statute is $5.62. The workload study informed the caseload sizes used to develop the capitated rate.

CSAC role is to update capitated rate every biennium, review and reassess the current workload study and make recommendations to the commissioner based on the committee's review. Committee members asked several questions regarding the capitated rate adjustment and workload study parameters. Committee members also noted that it will be important to look at the time it takes for evidence-based practices (EBP). How do we measure data with the goal to encourage EBP? Culture shift is needed to focus on impactful work of EBP. Looking for what is ideal while keeping quality assurance across the state.

d) Oregon Workload/Financial Study Approach
Denise Sitler from the Oregon Department of Corrections described the workload and financial study approach developed in that state.

Oregon's approach includes two components: a Time Study and a Financial Study. The time study establishes the daily rate per offender cost of supervision by risk level. The daily rate is used to calculate community corrections statewide funding for three biennial budget cycles – increasing only by the rate of inflation – before it is updated with the daily rate from a new study. The financial study captures the total cost to manage the statewide population. Counties submit annual costs broken out by: Supervision, Sanctions, Services, Treatment. Final summary is grouped by Supervision and sanctions/services/treatment.

The Oregon workload study took about 22 months, with a year of that spent in work study prep including training. The Minnesota work study took 5 months. Both states analyzed only current open cases. Oregon uses an average population from three snapshot dates. Cases that were discharged early are included in the snapshots. Minnesota uses a population from one snapshot date and early discharges are not included. In Oregon, every case is assessed with a risk assessment screener called the Public Safety Checklist. Thus, all cases have an assigned risk level. In Minnesota, many cases are never assessed for risk level.

Following this presentation, the committee discussed several variables that were present in both the Minnesota and Oregon approaches to translating the workload study into a funding formula:

(a) Both states had to look at financial base to use as a starting point but there are differences in approaches. Minnesota used average PO salary and a survey of administrative costs whereas Oregon conducted a financial survey taking into account all of the costs of supervision.
(b) Minnesota's formula was based on caseload sizes; Oregon's formula was based on time time necessary to supervise a case.
(c) Minnesota used national average risk levels to differentiate caseload types; Oregon used actual risk assessment levels from their risk screener.
(d) Minnesota's population snapshot was one day; Oregon looks at three different days throughout the study.

4. Next Steps?

a. Based on fact of trying to move forward with reporting back to legislators should there be a sub-committee to determine needs, formula, etc. Members noted that time is short to report by October. Additionally, there is no funding for a workload study so there is a logistical issue there. Committee members discussed that it might be better to take the time to determine what a good workload study is prior to reacting and jumping in to do one. Subcommittee could write an RFI after determining what type of study is desired, and this would provide the committee with information about how a study might be conducted and what it would cost. The following members volunteered to serve on the subcommittee: Tami Jo Lieberg, Jake McLellan, Jon Shiro, Julie Atella. In addition, committee members asked Carli Stark to serve on the subcommittee. Members noted that the subcommittee can include members outside of the CSAC committee who have relevant expertise.

   Need to consider if subcommittee should focus only on RFI for work study or should they also review the capitated rate – question was tabled for another meeting.

Meeting adjourned 3:34pm

Next Meeting Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023, 9 am to 3 pm

See Committee Webpage for instructions for viewing online: https://mn.gov/doc/about/legislative-info/community-supervision-advisory-committee/