

Miami-Dade County Integrated HIV/AIDS Prevention and Care Plan

CY 2019-2020 Integrated Plan Progress

Prepared for

Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership's
Joint Integrated Plan Review Team Meeting
November 8, 2021

Presented by

Robert Ladner, Ph.D., President
Jimmy Hernandez, M.S., Clinical Quality Management Data Analyst

aidsnet.org

Information and Disclaimers

- Discussions concerning subrecipient-specific results will focus on program planning and quality improvement initiatives, not the performance of the subrecipients. Subrecipient performance discussions are the sole responsibility of the Recipient (i.e., Miami-Dade County).
- Discussions not adhering to this requirement will be redirected by staff.

Acronyms and Terminology Used in this Report

ACA	Affordable Care Act	PrEP/nPEP	Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis/non-occupational Post-Exposure Prophylaxis
Acuity	Any of a number of co-occurring conditions or adherence issues contributing to an increased need for MCM attention	PrEP WG	FDOH-MDC PrEP Work Group
ADAP	AIDS Drug Assistance Program	PRIM	Pre-Natal Immunology Clinic, w/in the University of Miami
AETC	AIDS Education and Training Center; or South Florida Southeast (SF-SE) AETC	QI	Quality Improvement
ART	Antiretroviral Therapy	RiC	Retention in Care
BSR	Behavioral Science Research Corp., (Admin/CQM Subrecipient)	Risk Factor	Self-reported mode of initial HIV/AIDS diagnosis
C&T	Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership's Care & Treatment Committee	RWP	Miami-Dade County Ryan White Program Part A/MAI
CQM	Clinical Quality Management Program at BSR, including CQMC and MAI CQM Team	STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
CQMC	Ryan White Program CQM Committee	Subrecipients	See below
CY	Calendar Year	TA	Technical Assistance
DIS	Disease Intervention Specialist at FDOH-MDC	TTRA	Test and Treat / Rapid Access
DTC	Data To Care	VL	Viral Load
FDOH-MDC	Florida Dept. of Health in Miami-Dade County		
FPL	Federal Poverty Level		
IDU	Injection Drug Use / Injection Drug User		
MAI	Minority AIDS Initiative, part of the RWP		
MAI CQM Team	Minority AIDS Initiative Clinical Quality Management Team; see CQM		
MCM	RWP Medical Case Management or Medical Case Managers		
MMSC	Male-to-Male Sexual Contact (formerly Men Who Have Sex With Men/MSM)		
NHAS	National HIV/AIDS Strategy		
OAHS	Outpatient/Ambulatory Health Services, provided by the RWP		
Part A/MAI	Part A and the Minority AIDS Initiative of the RWP		
PE	Provide Enterprise (RWP client database)		

Ryan White Program Part A Subrecipients (*MAI Subrecipients)

- AIDS Healthcare Foundation (AHF)
- Better Way of Miami
- Borinquen Health Care Center*
- CAN Community Health
- Care 4 U Community Health Center*
- Care Resource*
- Citrus Health Network
- Community Health of South FL (CHI)
- Empower U Community Health Center*
- Food for Life Network
- Jessie Trice Community Health System
- Latinos Salud
- Legal Services of Greater Miami
- MBCHC/St. Luke's Addiction Recovery Center
- Miami Beach Community Health Center*
- New Hope C.O.R.P.S.
- Public Health Trust/Jackson Health System (all clinics)
- University of Miami*

RETENTION IN CARE

OBJECTIVE R1.

Increase the percentage of MCM and OAHS clients served by the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program (RWP) who had at least two (2) instances of either (a) RWP OAHS visits; (b) CD4/VL lab tests (as proxy for medical care outside the RWP); or (3) a payment made by the RWP for co-pays or deductible expenses for medical care visits covered by ACA Insurance supported by the RWP at least 90 days apart within a 12-month period, from the baseline 60% in 2015 to at least 90% by 2021.

NB: in CY 2020, the RiC rate for MCM clients was 76%.

RETENTION IN CARE: MCM

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1a

Identify RWP subrecipients with highest and lowest Retention in Care (RiC) rates, identify potential Quality Improvement (QI) problem areas to remediate and QI best practices to replicate.

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETENTION IN CARE (RiC) BY SUBRECIPIENT SERVICE SITE (DESCENDING ORDER BY % RiC)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
ALL MCM	6879	86.0%	7,199	75.7%
AHF LC	103	95.1%	162	87.7%
PHT PET	211	87.7%	200	86.5%
CR CHC MB	92	95.8%	103	84.5%
AHF CG	409	95.1%	448	83.9%
CR CHC LH	161	91.9%	159	81.1%
JTCCH	147	91.2%	154	79.9%
AHF HS	58	81.0%	102	79.4%
PHT SFAN	1575	79.7%	1043	79.0%
AHF JN	267	87.3%	333	76.9%
AHF MB	337	91.1%	359	74.7%
CR CHC MT	1376	84.5%	1431	74.6%
MBCHC	808	89.6%	1289	74.1%
BHCC	450	85.8%	633	73.6%
Citrus	111	93.7%	104	73.1%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	26	73.1%
Empower U CHC	188	92.6%	219	71.2%
PHT ND	155	88.4%	116	70.7%
UM CAP	98	90.8%	110	69.1%
CHI CH	328	76.2%	115	44.3%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	43	44.2%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	14	14.3%

RETENTION IN CARE: OAHS

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1a

Identify RWP subrecipients with highest and lowest Retention in Care (RiC) rates, identify potential Quality Improvement (QI) problem areas to remediate and QI best practices to replicate.

***In CY 2019 Care Resource OAHS clients were evaluated as a whole, instead of by each CR service site. For 702 CR OAHS clients, the RiC was 91.3%.**

RWP OAHS CLIENTS RETENTION IN CARE BY SUBRECIPIENT SERVICE SITE (DESCENDING ORDER BY % RiC)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
ALL OAHS	3,853	91.8%	4,840	86.30%
CR CHC MB*			44	95.5%
CR CHC LH*			137	94.2%
PHT PET	102	96.1%	87	92.0%
MBCHC Co-Pay	N/A	N/A	981	91.9%
CR CHC MT*			344	89.8%
JTCCH	64	98.4%	67	89.6%
Citrus	53	96.2%	42	88.1%
MBCHC	646	94.7%	608	87.8%
AHF LC	79	96.2%	105	86.7%
PHT SFAN	449	93.3%	161	86.3%
AHF CG	219	95.0%	232	86.2%
UM CAP	671	89.0%	893	86.1%
AHF HS	43	83.7%	60	83.3%
BHCC	204	91.7%	277	83.0%
Empower U CHC	0		134	82.8%
PHT ND	79	93.7%	62	82.3%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	22	81.8%
AHF MB	209	90.9%	193	79.3%
AHF JN	125	88.0%	146	76.7%
CHI CH	208	84.6%	176	68.8%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	9	11.1%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY ETHNICITY GROUP TOTALS (DESCENDING ORDER BY % RiC)

Ethnicity	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%	7,199	75.7%
Hispanic	4,058	88.9%	4,492	78.6%
Haitian	823	86.0%	721	76.8%
White, non-Hispanic	460	82.4%	521	71.0%
African American/Black	1,503	79.3%	1,425	68.2%
Other	35	88.6%	40	64.5%

RETENTION IN CARE of PRIORITY POPULATION

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

aidsnet.org

CY 2020 RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY RACE-GENDER-RISK FACTOR (DESCENDING ORDER BY % RiC)

Ethnicity	CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%
Hispanic Female	446	80.7%
Hispanic MMSC	3316	78.9%
Haitian Male	358	77.1%
Haitian Female	362	76.5%
Hispanic Male Hetero	585	76.1%
White Female	44	75.0%
White Male	474	70.7%
Black/African American Female	490	69.8%
Black/African American Male Hetero	408	69.6%
Black/African American MMSC	452	65.9%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY GENDER (ACROSS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS)

Gender	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%	7,199	75.7%
Male	5,344	86.7%	4,382	75.8%
Female	1,483	83.7%	1,016	75.4%
Transgender	52	82.7%	70	78.6%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY AGE (ACROSS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS)

Age	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%	7,199	76.0%
13-24	161	82.0%	132	71.2%
25-34	1,267	81.5%	1,305	68.8%
35-44	1,493	86.4%	1,684	75.1%
45-54	2,026	88.7%	1,880	78.4%
55-64	1,599	87.7%	1,786	80.2%
65+	333	78.4%	412	70.4%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY RISK FACTOR (COMBINING MALES AND FEMALES)

Risk Factor	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%	7,199	75.7%
Male-to-Male Sexual Contact (MMSC)	3,750	87.9%	4,327	76.5%
Heterosexual contact w/female	1,462	84.2%	1,342	74.7%
Heterosexual contact w/male	1,401	84.8%	1,263	75.9%
Injection Drug User (IDU)	56	71.4%	44	63.6%
MMSC/IDU	27	77.8%	28	75.0%
Mother	53	64.2%	48	64.6%
Hemophilia	0	0.0%	7	71.4%
Unknown	91	82.4%	114	67.5%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

aidsnet.org

CY 2020 RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY RISK FACTOR AMONG MALES AND FEMALES (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

Risk Factor	MCM Client	
	Total N	% RiC
Males	5,782	76.7%
MMSC	4,252	76.4%
Heterosexual contact	1,342	74.7%
Unknown	86	68.6%
Injection Drug User (IDU)	33	63.6%
MMSC/IDU	27	74.1%
Mother	25	72.0%
Blood disorder/transfusion	13	69.2%
Hemophilia	4	75.0%
Females	1,347	75.4%
Heterosexual contact	1,263	75.9%
Unknown	28	64.3%
Mother	23	56.5%
Injection Drug User (IDU)	11	63.0%
Blood disorder/transfusion	10	90.0%
Hemophilia	3	66.7%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY INCOME (ACROSS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS)

Income - Based on % of Federal Poverty Level (FPL)	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%	7,199	75.7%
0-100% FPL	2,338	81.5%	2,601	74.2%
101-138% FPL	1,048	88.4%	1,130	77.1%
139-250% FPL	2,339	87.7%	2,067	75.8%
251-400%+ FPL	1,034	89.7%	1,388	78.2%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1b

Identify RWP client demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age) and risk factor(s) associated with low RiC rates and track RiC rates by demographic and risk factor groups across and within subrecipients.

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY INSURANCE STATUS (DESCENDING ORDER BY % RiC) (Multiple Responses Possible)

Insurance Status	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%	7,199	75.7%
ACA	1,875	91.5%	2,611	82.5%
No non-RWP insurance	4,203	85.9%	3,642	74.2%
Medicare	442	74.7%	359	65.2%
Medicaid	423	69.7%	217	64.5%
Private	97	75.3%	560	62.7%
VA	8	100.0%	8	25.0%
Other	75	76.0%	48	66.7%

RETENTION IN CARE

Strategy R1.1 Identify RWP client target populations who are at greatest risk for dropping out of care.

ACTIVITY R1.1c

Develop assessments of acuties (e.g. substance use, mental illness, incidence of missed appointments or other non-adherence) associated with RiC; track and refine measurements in subsequent years.

aidsnet.org

RWP MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY CO-OCCURRING CONDITIONS (“ACUITIES”) (DESCENDING ORDER BY % RiC) (multiple responses possible)

Co-Occurring Conditions	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,879	86.0%	7,199	75.7%
STI positive test	1,296	86.0%	298	86.6%
Mental health needs	1,501	84.1%	781	80.4%
Hepatitis B or C	1,018	88.7%	234	79.9%
AIDS diagnosis	2,666	84.5%	2,273	76.5%
Substance abuse	980	80.7%	1,143	75.9%
Income <136% FPL	3,329	83.5%	3,662	74.9%
No health insurance	4,203	85.9%	3,642	74.2%
Housing instability	374	76.5%	373	65.6%

RETENTION IN CARE

ACTIVITY R1.2c

Conduct targeted QI record reviews of RWP OAHS and/or MCM subrecipients with below-standard scores to ensure adherence to Public Health Standards and RWP Service Delivery Guidelines, and lay groundwork for QI interventions.

A medical record review was conducted in 2020-2021 at an OAHS subrecipient, resulting in corrective action plans for Recipient review (to address compliance issues) and involvement by Behavioral Science Research (to focus attention on specific QI opportunities at the subrecipient agency). Data will be provided to the Recipient and the Clinical Quality Improvement Committee as they become available.

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE

OBJECTIVE DR1.

By 2021, increase the percentage of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS clients in key disparate minority health groups who had at least two (2) instances of either (a) RWP OAHS visits; (b) CD4/VL lab tests (as proxy for medical care outside the RWP); or (3) a payment made by the RWP for co-pays or deductible expenses for medical care visits covered by ACA Insurance supported by the RWP at least 90 days apart within a 12-month period, from the baseline 60% in 2015 to at least 90% by 2021, to match overall RWP MCM and OAHS retention levels.

NB: in CY 2020, the RiC rate for MCM clients was 76%.

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITIES DR1.1a and DR1.2a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for Black/African American Male clients.

aidsnet.org

B/AA MALES RETAINED IN CARE, TOTAL (DESCENDING ORDER BY # OF CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
B/AA Males	941	78.7%	914	67.3%
CR CHC MT	181	80.7%	191	67.5%
PHT SFAN	264	72.0%	156	70.5%
AHF JN	77	80.5%	90	67.8%
MBCHC	29	65.5%	73	68.5%
Empower U CHC	62	91.9%	70	65.7%
BHCC	52	78.8%	69	62.3%
JTCHS	41	90.2%	49	73.5%
AHF MB	30	80.0%	30	60.0%
UM CAP	22	86.4%	29	72.4%
AHF LC	20	85.0%	27	81.5%
PHT ND	35	91.4%	24	58.3%
CHI CH	63	65.1%	21	47.6%
PHT PET	20	85.0%	20	70.0%
AHF CG	24	100.0%	18	66.7%
AHF HS	11	63.6%	17	76.5%
Care 4 U CHC	n/a	n/a	13	76.9%
Citrus	5	80.0%	5	40.0%
CR CHC MB	3	100.0%	4	75.0%
Latinos Salud	n/a	n/a	2	0.0%
CAN CH	n/a	n/a	1	0.0%
CR CHC LH	1	0.0%	1	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE – MCM CLIENTS

B/AA HETERO MALES RETAINED IN CARE (DESCENDING ORDER BY # OF CLIENTS)

ACTIVITY DR1.2a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for Black/African American male heterosexual clients.

aidsnet.org

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
B/AA Hetero Males	503	77.5%	408	69.6%
PHT SFAN	185	70.3%	93	71.0%
CR CHC MT	81	77.8%	78	71.8%
JTCHS	31	90.3%	31	74.2%
Empower U CHC	31	93.5%	31	67.7%
AHF JN	30	93.3%	30	73.3%
BHCC	24	75.0%	30	53.3%
MBCHC	10	60.0%	25	80.0%
PHT ND	26	96.2%	19	63.2%
UM CAP	13	84.6%	18	72.2%
PHT PET	11	81.8%	11	72.7%
CHI CH	37	59.5%	10	60.0%
AHF LC	9	88.9%	9	77.8%
AHF HS	4	50.0%	8	50.0%
Care 4 U CHC	n/a	n/a	6	83.3%
AHF CG	6	100.0%	4	50.0%
AHF MB	3	100.0%	2	100.0%
Citrus	2	100.0%	2	50.0%
CR CHC LH	n/a	n/a	1	0.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CR CHC LH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE – MCM CLIENTS

B/AA MMSC RETAINED IN CARE (DESCENDING ORDER BY # OF CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
B/AA MMSC	438	80.1%	452	65.9%
CR CHC MT	100	83.0%	102	65.7%
AHF JN	47	72.3%	56	64.3%
PHT SFAN	79	75.9%	48	70.8%
MBCHC	19	68.4%	41	61.0%
BHCC	28	82.1%	39	69.2%
Empower U CHC	31	90.3%	35	68.6%
AHF MB	27	77.8%	24	58.3%
AHF LC	11	81.8%	18	83.3%
AHF CG	18	100.0%	14	71.4%
JTCCH	10	90.0%	14	64.3%
CHI CH	26	73.1%	10	40.0%
AHF HS	7	71.4%	9	100.0%
UM CAP	9	88.9%	9	77.8%
PHT PET	9	88.9%	9	66.7%
Care 4 U	N/A	N/A	7	71.4%
PHT ND	9	77.8%	4	50.0%
CR CHC MB	3	100.0%	3	66.7%
Citrus	3	66.7%	3	33.3%
Latinos Salud	N/A	N/A	2	0.0%
CAN CH	N/A	N/A	1	0.0%
CR CHC LH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

ACTIVITY DR1.1a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHs subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for Black/African American MMSC clients.

aidsnet.org

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DR1.3a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for Black/African American Female clients.

aidsnet.org

B/AA FEMALES RETAINED IN CARE (DESCENDING ORDER BY # OF CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
B/AA Female	544	80.1%	490	69.8%
PHT SFAN	166	72.3%	106	70.8%
CR CHC MT	77	87.0%	68	66.2%
MBCHC	25	84.0%	52	73.1%
Empower U CHC	50	90.0%	52	71.2%
JTCHS	54	90.7%	49	79.6%
AHF JN	31	83.9%	37	73.0%
PHT ND	34	79.4%	28	75.0%
BHCC	18	77.8%	27	70.4%
AHF CG	7	100.0%	11	72.7%
AHF HS	8	75.0%	11	72.7%
CHI CH	39	61.5%	10	30.0%
UM CAP	11	81.8%	9	33.3%
PHT PET	10	80.0%	7	85.7%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	7	57.1%
Citrus	5	100.0%	5	60.0%
AHF MB	2	50.0%	3	66.7%
CR CHC MB	1	100.0%	2	100.0%
AHF LC	6	100.0%	2	50.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
CR CHC LH	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	1	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DR1.4a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for Hispanic MMSC clients.

aidsnet.org

HISPANIC MMSC RETAINED IN CARE (DESCENDING ORDER BY # OF CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
Hispanic MMSC	2,918	89.3%	3,316	78.9%
CR CHC MT	769	85.7%	790	78.0%
MBCHC	408	90.2%	659	73.7%
AHF CG	306	94.1%	327	85.6%
BHCC	193	89.6%	285	78.2%
PHT SFAN	350	86.3%	257	85.6%
AHF MB	217	94.0%	223	79.4%
CR CHC LH	138	92.0%	129	83.7%
AHF JN	80	95.0%	102	85.3%
PHT PET	99	85.9%	93	86.0%
AHF LC	54	98.1%	92	88.0%
CR CHC MB	67	94.0%	71	85.9%
Citrus	65	95.4%	57	70.2%
AHF HS	20	95.0%	51	90.2%
UM CAP	36	94.4%	42	66.7%
CHI CH	89	77.5%	38	44.7%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	34	55.9%
Empower U CHC	16	93.8%	25	72.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	8	12.5%
JTCHS	7	71.4%	7	71.4%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
PHT ND	4	100.0%	1	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DR1.4a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for Disparity populations (Haitian Males).

Note: Haitian males and females are not included in the IP disparity groups for RiC but are included in the IP disparity group for VL Suppression. They are cited here for reference.

aidsnet.org

HAITIAN MALES RETAINED IN CARE (DESCENDING ORDER BY # OF CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
Haitian Males			358	77.1%
PHT SFAN			96	79.2%
MBCHC			59	79.7%
BHCC			51	56.9%
CR CHC MT			33	72.7%
AHF JN			31	90.3%
JTCCH			23	82.6%
PHT ND			20	90.0%
Empower U CHC			16	87.5%
PHT PET			11	90.9%
AHF MB			4	75.0%
UM CAP			4	75.0%
AHF LC			3	100.0%
CHI CH			3	0.0%
AHF CG			2	50.0%
CAN CH			1	100.0%
Latinos Salud			1	0.0%
AHF HS			0	0.0%
Care 4 U CHC			0	0.0%
Citrus			0	0.0%
CR CHC LH			0	0.0%
CR CHC MB			0	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DR1.4a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for Disparity populations (Haitian Females).

Note: Haitian males and females are not included in the IP disparity groups for RiC but are included in the IP disparity group for VL Suppression. They are cited here for reference.

aidsnet.org

HAITIAN FEMALES RETAINED IN CARE (DESCENDING ORDER BY # OF CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
Haitian Females			362	76.5%
PHT SFAN			93	75.3%
MBCHC			78	78.2%
BHCC			57	75.4%
CR CHC MT			36	80.6%
PHT ND			27	74.1%
Empower U CHC			23	73.9%
AHF JN			18	83.3%
JTCCH			13	84.6%
PHT PET			6	83.3%
CHI CH			5	60.0%
AHF LC			2	50.0%
AHF CG			1	100.0%
AHF MB			1	0.0%
Care 4 U CHC			1	100.0%
UM CAP			1	0.0%
AHF HS			0	0.0%
CAN CH			0	0.0%
Citrus			0	0.0%
CR CHC LH			0	0.0%
CR CHC MB			0	0.0%
Latinos Salud			0	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION OBJECTIVE DV1.

By 2021, increase the percentage of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS clients in key disparate minority health groups who have suppressed viral loads to 80%, to match overall RWP MCM and OAHS VL suppression rates.

NB: In CY 2020, the RWP overall VL Suppression rate was 85.0%.

aidsnet.org

DISPARITIES IN SUPPRESSED VL LEVELS – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DV1.1a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM with higher than average VL suppression rates for Black/African American MMSC clients.

aidsnet.org

B/AA MMSC VL SUPPRESSION (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% VL Supp	Total N	% VL Supp
B/AA MMSC	438	71.9%	452	78.8%
CR CHC MT	100	74.0%	102	83.3%
AHF JN	47	66.0%	56	83.9%
PHT SFAN	79	67.1%	48	81.3%
MBCHC	19	68.4%	41	75.6%
BHCC	28	78.6%	39	71.8%
Empower U CHC	31	87.1%	35	77.1%
AHF MB	27	77.8%	24	83.3%
AHF LC	11	81.8%	18	77.8%
AHF CG	18	77.8%	14	78.6%
JTCCH	10	70.0%	14	78.6%
CHI CH	26	50.0%	10	50.0%
AHF HS	7	57.1%	9	88.9%
PHT PET	9	77.8%	9	66.7%
UM CAP	9	88.9%	9	88.9%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	7	71.4%
PHT ND	9	66.7%	4	75.0%
Citrus	3	66.7%	3	66.7%
CR CHC MB	3	100.0%	3	100.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	2	0.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
CR CHC LH	1	0.0%	0	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN SUPPRESSED VL LEVELS -- MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DV1.2a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for Black/African American male heterosexual clients.

aidsnet.org

B/AA HETERO MALES VL SUPPRESSION (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% VL Supp	Total N	% VL Supp
BAA Hetero Males	503	69.6%	408	75.7%
PHT SFAN	185	60.5%	93	72.0%
CR CHC MT	81	69.1%	78	75.6%
Empower U CHC	31	80.6%	31	61.3%
JTCCH	31	87.1%	31	83.9%
AHF JN	30	86.7%	30	83.3%
BHCC	24	62.5%	30	70.0%
MBCHC	10	60.0%	25	88.0%
PHT ND	26	92.3%	19	84.2%
UM CAP	13	92.3%	18	83.3%
PHT PET	11	72.7%	11	81.8%
CHI CH	37	45.9%	10	70.0%
AHF LC	9	100.0%	9	88.9%
AHF HS	4	50.0%	8	50.0%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	6	50.0%
AHF CG	6	100.0%	4	75.0%
AHF MB	3	100.0%	2	100.0%
Citrus	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
CR CHC LH	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CR CHC MB	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN SUPPRESSED VL LEVELS – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITIES DV1.1a & DV1.2a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for Black/African American male clients.

aidsnet.org

B/AA MALES (TOTAL) VL SUPPRESSION (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% VL Supp	Total N	% VL Supp
B/AA Males	941	70.7%	914	77.1%
CR CHC MT	181	71.8%	191	80.1%
PHT SFAN	264	62.5%	156	73.7%
AHF JN	77	74.0%	90	83.3%
MBCHC	29	65.5%	73	82.2%
Empower U CHC	62	83.9%	70	68.6%
BHCC	52	71.2%	69	71.0%
JTCCH	41	82.9%	49	81.6%
AHF MB	30	80.0%	30	83.3%
UM CAP	22	90.9%	29	82.8%
AHF LC	20	90.0%	27	81.5%
PHT ND	35	85.7%	24	83.3%
CHI CH	63	47.6%	21	61.9%
PHT PET	20	75.0%	20	75.0%
AHF CG	24	83.3%	18	77.8%
AHF HS	11	54.5%	17	70.6%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	13	61.5%
Citrus	5	80.0%	5	80.0%
CR CHC MB	3	100.0%	4	100.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	2	0.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
CR CHC LH	1	0.0%	1	100.0%

DISPARITIES IN SUPPRESSED VL LEVELS – MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DV1.3a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for Black/African American Female clients.

aidsnet.org

B/AA FEMALES VL SUPPRESSION (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% VL Supp	Total N	% VL Supp
B/AA Female	544	71.7%	490	79.2%
PHT SFAN	166	62.0%	106	77.4%
CR CHC MT	77	80.5%	68	80.9%
Empower U CHC	50	72.0%	52	84.6%
MBCHC	25	76.0%	52	76.9%
JTCCH	54	85.2%	49	89.8%
AHF JN	31	83.9%	37	89.2%
PHT ND	34	73.5%	28	78.6%
BHCC	18	83.3%	27	77.8%
AHF CG	7	100.0%	11	72.7%
AHF HS	8	62.5%	11	72.7%
CHI CH	39	46.2%	10	40.0%
UM CAP	11	81.8%	9	77.8%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	7	28.6%
PHT PET	10	80.0%	7	71.4%
Citrus	5	100.0%	5	80.0%
AHF MB	2	50.0%	3	66.7%
AHF LC	6	66.7%	2	100.0%
CR CHC MB	1	100.0%	2	100.0%
CAN CHC	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
CR CHC LH	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	1	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN SUPPRESSED VL LEVELS -- MCM CLIENTS

HISPANIC MMSC VL SUPPRESSION (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% VL Supp	Total N	% VL Supp
Hispanic MMSC			3,316	88.2%
CR CHC MT			790	90.8%
MBCHC			659	86.0%
AHF CG			327	88.7%
BHCC			285	87.0%
PHT SFAN			257	84.8%
AHF MB			223	87.9%
CR CHC LH			129	90.7%
AHF JN			102	97.1%
PHT PET			93	92.5%
AHF LC			92	93.5%
CR CHC MB			71	94.4%
Citrus			57	94.7%
AHF HS			51	90.2%
UM CAP			42	88.1%
CHI CH			38	55.3%
Latinos Salud			34	70.6%
Empower U CHC			25	76.0%
CAN CHC			8	62.5%
JTCCH			7	71.4%
Care 4 U CHC			2	100.0%
PHT ND			1	100.0%

ACTIVITY DV1.5a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for RWP Disparity Group clients.

Note: Hispanic MMSC are not included in the IP disparity groups for VL Suppression, but are included in the IP disparity group for RiC. They are cited here for reference.

aidsnet.org

DISPARITIES IN SUPPRESSED VL LEVELS -- MCM CLIENTS

HAITIAN MALES VL SUPPRESSION (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

ACTIVITY DV1.4a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for Haitian Male clients.

aidsnet.org

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% VL Supp	Total N	% VL Supp
Haitian Males	396	77.0%	358	83.8%
PHT SFAN	137	64.2%	96	82.3%
MBCHC	56	80.4%	59	86.4%
BHCC	42	83.3%	51	82.4%
CR CHC MT	35	94.3%	33	81.8%
AHF JN	21	100.0%	31	90.3%
JTCCH	22	81.8%	23	82.6%
PHT ND	25	72.0%	20	80.0%
Empower U CHC	15	93.3%	16	100.0%
PHT PET	12	75.0%	11	90.9%
AHF MB	4	100.0%	4	100.0%
UM CAP	5	80.0%	4	50.0%
AHF LC	1	100.0%	3	100.0%
CHI CH	17	70.6%	3	66.7%
AHF CG	2	100.0%	2	0.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
AHF HS	1	0.0%	0	0.0%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Citrus	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CR CHC LH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CR CHC MB	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

DISPARITIES IN SUPPRESSED VL LEVELS -- MCM CLIENTS

ACTIVITY DV1.5a

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for HF clients.

aidsnet.org

HAITIAN FEMALES VL SUPPRESSION (DESCENDING ORDER BY # CLIENTS)

MCM Site	CY 2019		CY 2020	
	Total N	% VL Supp	Total N	% VL Supp
Haitian Females	426	75.8%	362	81.2%
PHT SFAN	165	66.1%	93	77.4%
MBCHC	60	86.7%	78	87.2%
BHCC	50	82.0%	57	78.9%
CR CHC MT	35	88.6%	36	86.1%
PHT ND	34	64.7%	27	70.4%
Empower U CHC	18	94.4%	23	87.0%
AHF JN	18	94.4%	18	77.8%
JTCCH	11	81.8%	13	92.3%
PHT PET	7	100.0%	6	100.0%
CHI CH	18	72.2%	5	60.0%
AHF LC	3	66.7%	2	50.0%
AHF CG	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
AHF MB	2	0.0%	1	100.0%
Care 4 U CHC	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
UM CAP	3	33.3%	1	100.0%
AHF HS	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CAN CH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Citrus	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CR CHC LH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CR CHC MB	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Latinos Salud	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Thank you!
Any questions?

Contact Us

Robert Ladner, Ph.D., President

rladner@behavioralscience.com

305-443-2000 ext 110

Jimmy Hernandez, M.S., CQM Data Analyst

jhernandez@behavioralscience.com

305-443-2000 ext 113

Behavioral Science Research Corporation

2121 Ponce de Leon Blvd, Suite 240

Coral Gables, FL 33134

aidsnet.org