


Recent Study of Community Based Correctional Facilities


by

Chris Lowenkamp & Edward Latessa
Center for Criminal Justice Research
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0389
www.uc.edu/criminaljustice


Relationship Between Successful Termination Rate and Treatment Effect




Relationship Between Mixed Facilities and Treatment Effect




Relationship Between Years in Operation and Treatment Effect




Relationship between Treatment Model and Treatment Effect




Relationship Between Proportion of Criminogenic Programming and Treatment Effect




Relationship Between Male (or Mixed) and All Female Programs and Treatment Effect




Relationship Between Role Playing and Treatment Effect



Relationship Between Treatment and Supervision Intensity and Treatment Effect



Relationship Between Programmatic Factors and Treatment Effects



TR = Termination Rate in Acceptable Range; 3Y = Program in Operation for 3 or more years; CB = Cognitive Behavioral Program; CT = 25% or more of service have Criminogenic Targets; RP = Program reports Role Playing almost every session; RISK = Program varies intensity by RISK.


Treatment Effects Overall

- Average Treatment Effect is 4% Reduction in Recidivism
- Lowest is a 41% Increase in Recidivism
- Highest is a 43% Reduction in Recidivism




- Programs that have acceptable termination rates, have been in operation for 3 years or more, have a cognitive behavioral program, target criminogenic needs, use role playing in almost every session, and vary treatment and length of supervision by risk have a 39% reduction in recidivism


Relationship Between Program Manager Qualifications and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Program Manager Involvement and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Program Value and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Program Value and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Staff and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Evaluation and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Evaluation and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Evaluation and Treatment Effect*




Relationship Between Ethical Guidelines and Treatment Effect*



Relationship Between Significant Factors and Treatment Effect*



Relationship Between Significant Factors and Treatment Effect for HWHs*



Relationship Between Significant Factors and Treatment Effect for CBCFs*

