




Office of
Population Affairs


Providing Teen Pregnancy Prevention (TPP) Programs in Select Settings 2015–2023

This snapshot summarizes performance measures data from Teen Pregnancy Prevention (TPP) grantees serving youth in three specific settings: juvenile justice settings, out-of-home care facilities (such as residential treatment or foster care group homes), and settings that serve youth experiencing homelessness (such as shelters or drop-in centers). The snapshot aims to highlight the unique characteristics of these settings in comparison with overall TPP implementation.

Juvenile Justice Settings (42 Grantees)




Out-of-Home Care Settings (33 Grantees)





Settings Serving Youth Experiencing Homelessness (10 Grantees)




Participant Reach

Between 2015 and 2023, TPP programs reached 21,279 youth in these three settings.

Program Models

The top program models replicated in these settings were Sexual Health and Adolescent Risk Prevention (SHARP) (5,665 youth), Making Proud Choices! (4,503 youth), and Love Notes (3,625 youth). SHARP was frequently implemented within these three settings but was only delivered to 1% of TPP participants overall. SHARP, designed for and tested in juvenile justice settings, was most frequently utilized in these settings among grants in the TPP2015 cohort, and Love Notes, designed and evaluated with a more general population, became the more popular option in the TPP2020 cohort. Across TPP overall, the most popular program models were Making Proud Choices! (144,471 youth, 12% of total), Reducing the Risk (128,293 youth, 11% of total), and Making a Difference! (83,434 youth, 7% of total).


Program Models by Setting (Program models serving at least 700 youth shown)



Age

Most youth served in out-of-home care and juvenile justice settings and in settings serving youth experiencing homelessness were older than 15 years old, in contrast with all TPP youth participants, more of whom were age 14 or younger.


Age by Setting



Gender

In juvenile justice settings, 75% of youth participants were male, while 25% were female. Out-of-home care settings served more female youth than male, averaging 54% female participants and 42% male participants over all eight years. In settings serving youth experiencing homelessness, gender is more balanced, averaging 52% female and 47% male across all years.


Gender by Setting



Race and Ethnicity

In juvenile justice settings, the majority of participants served were either Hispanic or Latinx (32%) or Black (31%), while 13% of youth were white. The youth served in out-of-home care settings were most frequently Hispanic or Latinx, followed closely by Black (27% and 24% respectively) across all eight years.¹ In settings that serve youth experiencing homelessness, the most frequently reported race was white (average 37%), followed by Black (25%), and Hispanic or Latinx (20%).


Race and Ethnicity by Setting



Dosage

Settings serving youth experiencing homelessness had the highest average dosage, with 91.9% of youth receiving 75% of programming or more across all years. Programs serving youth in juvenile justice settings followed at 76.5%, and programs serving youth in out-of-home care achieved an average dosage of 69.5%.

Percentage of Youth Receiving 75% of Programming by Setting



¹ Twenty-five percent of youth served in out-of-home care settings did not report race.

Appendix A

Grantee organizations that served at least 100 youth in any of the 3 select settings

Grantee Name	Juvenile Justice Settings	Out-of-Home Care Facilities	Settings Serving Youth Experiencing Homelessness
AccessMatters		✓	
Baltimore City Health Department	✓		
Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee	✓	✓	
Centerstone of Tennessee, Inc.	✓	✓	
Cicatelli Associates, Inc.		✓	
Fact Forward	✓	✓	
Fund for Public Health in New York, Inc.		✓	
Health Care Education and Training, Inc.		✓	
Indiana State Department of Health	✓		
Institute of Women and Ethnic Studies	✓		
Le Bonheur Community Health and Well-Being	✓		
Planned Parenthood Mar Monte	✓		
Planned Parenthood of Greater Washington and North Idaho	✓		
Planned Parenthood of the Heartland		✓	
PRO Youth and Families, Inc	✓	✓	
Public Health - Seattle & King County	✓		
San Diego Youth Services	✓		✓
Shift NC	✓	✓	
Southern Nevada Health District	✓	✓	
The Children's Aid Society		✓	
The Dallas Foundation	✓	✓	
The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio	✓	✓	
Urban Strategies LLC	✓		
Utah State University		✓	
WestEd	✓		
Youth Services of Tulsa, Inc.	✓		✓

Disclaimer: This publication was supported by Contract Number: HHSP23320150042I, Task Order: 75P00123F37015 from the Office of Population Affairs (OPA). Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of OPA or HHS.

More information about the TPP program and its grantees is available at <https://opa.hhs.gov/grant-programs/teen-pregnancy-prevention-program/about-tpp-program>.