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Relationship Between Successful Termination Rate and Treatment Effect

![Graph showing the relationship between successful termination rate and change in recidivism rate. The x-axis represents the termination rate, and the y-axis represents the change in recidivism rate. The graph shows a positive correlation, indicating that as the termination rate increases, the change in recidivism rate also increases.]
Relationship Between Mixed Facilities and Treatment Effect

![Graph showing % Change in Recidivism between Mixed Sex and Single Sex facilities.](image-url)
Relationship Between Years in Operation and Treatment Effect
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Relationship between Treatment Model and Treatment Effect

![Bar Chart]

- Cognitive Behavioral: 8% change in recidivism
- Other: 0% change in recidivism
Relationship Between Proportion of Criminogenic Programming and Treatment Effect

![Bar Chart]

- More than 25% Criminogenic
  - % Change in Recidivism: 5

- Less than 25% Criminogenic
  - % Change in Recidivism: -16
Relationship Between Male (or Mixed) and All Female Programs and Treatment Effect
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Relationship Between Role Playing and Treatment Effect

![Bar chart showing the percentage change in recidivism for role playing]

- Almost Always to Every Session: 9%
- Occasionally to Never: 2%
Relationship Between Treatment and Supervision Intensity and Treatment Effect

![Bar chart showing the relationship between change in recidivism and treatment supervision intensity.]

- Some Variation -- High Risk Received More Services and/or Longer Stay: 7
- No Variation or Lower Risk Got More Services and/or Longer Stay: 1
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*

![Graph showing the relationship between program manager qualifications and treatment effect. The graph indicates that relevant qualifications lead to an 8% change in recidivism, while lacking qualifications lead to a 2% change.](image-url)
Relationship Between Program Manager Involvement and Treatment Effect*

% Change in Recidivism

- Trains Staff: 7
- Doesn't Train Staff: 1
Relationship Between Program Value and Treatment Effect

![Bar graph showing % change in recidivism. Valued by CJ Community shows a % change of 7, while Not Valued by CJ Community shows a % change of 1.](image-url)
Relationship Between Program Value and Treatment Effect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Change in Recidivism</th>
<th>Valued by Community</th>
<th>Not Valued by Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*

![Bar graph showing the relationship between assessment practices and treatment effect. The graph indicates that receiving appropriate clients results in a 7% change in recidivism, while receiving inappropriate clients results in a 0% change.](image-url)
Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*

% Change in Recidivism

- Need Factors Assessed: 6
- Need Factors Not Assessed: 0
Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*

% Change in Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Level Defined</th>
<th>Need Level Not Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The graph represents the change in recidivism rates with and without defined need levels. The data shows a significant decrease in recidivism when need levels are defined, indicating a positive relationship between assessment practices and treatment effect.
Relationship Between Assessment Practices and Treatment Effect*
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Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*

- Effective TX Type: 10% change in recidivism
- Ineffective TX Type: 5% change in recidivism
Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*

![Bar chart showing % change in recidivism](chart)

- **Location Monitored**: 7
- **Not Monitored**: 1
Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*

Involvement 40-70%       Involvement Outside of Range

% Change in Recidivism
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Relationship Between Program Characteristics and Treatment Effect*

% Change in Recidivism

Match Staff and Program: 9
Don't Match Staff and Program: 5
Relationship Between Staff and Treatment Effect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Change in Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Graph showing a significant difference in % change in recidivism between Area of Study and Unrelated Area of Study.)
Relationship Between Evaluation and Treatment Effect*

![Bar chart showing % Change in Recidivism]

- **Internal QA**: 6
- **No Internal QA**: 1
Relationship Between Evaluation and Treatment Effect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Change in Recidivism</th>
<th>External QA</th>
<th>No External QA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship Between Evaluation and Treatment Effect*

% Change in Recidivism

Recidivism Follow Up  |  No Follow Up
9                      |  4
Relationship Between Ethical Guidelines and Treatment Effect*
Relationship Between Significant Factors and Treatment Effect*
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Relationship Between Significant Factors and Treatment Effect for HWHs*
Relationship Between Significant Factors and Treatment Effect for CBCFs*

- **9-15 Factors Present**: 5
- **16-19 Factors Present**: 9