

# Youth Development Behavioral Interventions Coordinated with Community Service to Reduce Sexual Risk Behaviors in Adolescents

## Summary Evidence Tables -- Economic Review

Study Monetary Conversions	Study Characteristics	Intervention Description	Pregnancies Averted	Program Costs (2007 US\$)	Economic Benefits (2007 US\$)	Economic Summary Measure (2007 US\$)
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Aos et al. (2004)</p> <p><b>Study Design:</b> Modeled based on Allen &amp; Philliber, 2001.</p> <p><b>Economic Method:</b> Modeled cost-benefit</p> <p>Estimates reported in 2004 US\$ and adjusted using general CPI</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Washington state</p> <p><b>Population:</b> Teen Outreach Program (TOP) modeled for Washington</p> <p><b>Population characteristics:</b> Ages 12 to 17; Female 25%; Minority 62-65%;</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Lifetime</p>	<p>Teen Outreach Program (TOP) with main objective of preventing teen pregnancies and academic failure.</p> <p>Multi-component intervention with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum-based learning</li> <li>• Minimum 20 hours of community service</li> <li>• Weekly group discussions about the volunteer experience and other topics relevant to youth</li> </ul>	<p>Standardized mean difference in number of pregnancies at age less than 18 years was -0.136</p>	<p>Intervention cost was \$699 per participant per year.</p> <p>Includes materials, facilitator and site-level coordinator time.</p>	<p>Benefit of \$903 per participant per year.</p> <p>Benefits based on pregnancies averted only and includes impact on high school graduation, income taxes, future delinquencies/legal issues, children/parents welfare costs. No STIs taken into account.</p>	<p>Net Benefit of \$204 per participant per year, calculated as benefits minus program cost.</p>
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Key et al. (2008)</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> South Carolina</p>	<p>Multi-component with:</p>	<p>Main effect size of intervention: 9 pregnancies averted</p>	<p>No itemized costs provided.</p>	<p>Based on estimated societal burden of South Carolina teen</p>	<p>Net benefit per year = \$37,596 x 3.17 annual births</p>

Study Monetary Conversions	Study Characteristics	Intervention Description	Pregnancies Averted	Program Costs (2007 US\$)	Economic Benefits (2007 US\$)	Economic Summary Measure (2007 US\$)
<p><b>Study Design:</b> Pre-post</p> <p><b>Economic Method:</b> Cost-benefit</p> <p>Estimates were reported in 2004 US\$ and adjusted using general CPI.</p>	<p><b>Sample:</b> Single school in urban location N=63</p> <p><b>Population Characteristics:</b> Participants were teen mothers who self-selected or were chosen by school authorities.</p> <p>Very poor; 99% African American; Mean age 16</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> 34 months</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly group meetings</li> <li>• Case management for pregnancy care and parenting skills with case worker</li> <li>• Learning projects based in community service</li> <li>• Comprehensive medical care for child and mother at home and at clinic</li> </ul> <p>Comparison: Comparison group (4 for each in intervention) randomly selected from data for all women in the state who matched by date of birth of mother, date of birth of the child, parity at the initial birth, and race/ethnicity.</p>	<p>among 63 participants over 34 months (3.17 annualized).</p> <p>Actual pregnancies were 11 (17%) and the rate of pregnancies among control was 33%.</p>	<p>Only cost of single social worker was reported for program cost.</p> <p>Program cost \$52,843 per year, or \$839 per person per year.</p>	<p>Pregnancy=\$3,300 per year</p> <p>Excess cost per pregnancy over 15 years discounted at 5%=\$37,596.</p> <p>Hence, total benefit per year = \$37,596 x 3.17 annual births averted=\$119,179 or \$1,891 per person per year.</p>	<p>averted - \$52,843 = \$66,336 (or \$1053 per person per year)</p>

## References

Allen JP, Philliber S. Who benefits most from a broadly targeted prevention program? Differential efficacy across populations in the Teen Outreach program. *Journal of Community Psychology* 2001;29(6):637-55.