# 2017-2021 Miami-Dade County Integrated HIV/AIDS Prevention and Care Plan

# Calendar Year 2019 Integrated Plan Progress

Prepared for
Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership's
Joint Integrated Plan Review Team Meeting
October 30, 2020

by
Behavioral Science Research Corporation

Presented by

Robert Ladner, Ph.D., President
Petra Brock, M.S., Director of Research
Clarice Evans, M.A., Quality Management Research Associate







# **Information and Disclaimers**

Discussions concerning subrecipient-specific results are to focus on program planning and quality improvement initiatives, not the performance of the subrecipients.

- All discussions concerning the subrecipient-specific results are to focus on program planning and quality improvement initiatives, not the performance of the subrecipients.
- Discussions concerning subrecipient deficiencies and related corrective actions 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

Acuity Any of a number of co-occurring conditions or

adherence issues contributing to an increased need

for MCM attention

ADAP AIDS Drug Assistance Program

AETC AIDS Education and Training Center; or South

Florida Southeast (SF-SE) AETC

ART Antiretroviral Therapy

Behavioral Science Research Corp., (Admin/CQM) BSR

Subrecipient)

C&T Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership's Care &

Treatment Committee

CQM Clinical Quality Management Program at BSR,

including CQMC and MAI CQM Team

CQMC Ryan White Program CQM Committee

CY Calendar Year

DIS Disease Intervention Specialist at FDOH-MDC

DTC Data To Care

Florida Dept. of Health in Miami-Dade County FDOH-MDC

FPL Federal Poverty Level

IDU Injection Drug Use / Injection Drug User Minority AIDS Initiative, part of the RWP MAI MAI CQM Team Minority AIDS Initiative Clinical Quality

Management Team; see CQM

MCM RWP Medical Case Management or Medical Case

Managers

Male-to-Male Sexual Contact (formerly Men Who MMSC

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)

Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis/non-occupational Post-PrEP/nPEP

Exposure Prophylaxis

FDOH-MDC PrEP Work Group PrEP WG

PRIM Pre-Natal Immunology Clinic, w/in the University of

Miami

QI Quality Improvement RiC Retention in Care

Risk Factor Self-reported mode of initial HIV/AIDS diagnosis Miami-Dade County Ryan White Program Part A/MAI RWP

STD Sexually Transmitted Disease

Subrecipients See below

TΑ Technical Assistance

Test and Treat / Rapid Access TTRA

VL Viral Load

#### Ryan White Program Part A Subrecipients (\*MAI Subrecipients)

AIDS Healthcare Foundation (AHF)

Better Way of Miami

Boringuen 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\*







#### **OBJECTIVE R1.**

Increase the percentage of RWP MCM and OAHS clients who had at least two (2) instances of either (a) RWP OAHS visits, or (b) CD4/VL lab tests (as proxy for medical care outside the RWP), at least 90 days apart within a 12-month period, from 60% in 2015 to at least 90% by 2021.







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY OAHS SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2	CY 2018		2019
OAHS E/M Site	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP OAHS Clients	4,278	85.3%	3,853	91.8%
Jessie Trice	60	90.9%	64	98.4%
AHF Liberty City			79	96.2%
Citrus	63	94.0%	53	96.2%
PHT/PET Center	116	93.5%	102	96.1%
AHF Coconut Grove	246	86.3%	219	95.0%
MBCHC	681	87.2%	646	94.7%
PHT/North Dade	66	90.4%	79	93.7%
PHT/SFAN	185	86.9%	449	93.3%
Borinquen	230	87.8%	204	91.7%
Care Resource	750	85.3%	702	91.3%
AHF Miami Beach	250	88.0%	209	90.9%
UM-CAP	1,140	82.8%	671	89.0%
AHF Jackson North	146	86.4%	125	88.0%
CHI	210	83.7%	208	84.6%
AHF Homestead	36	69.2%	43	83.7%







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2	2018	CY 2	2019
MCM Site	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
Care Resource Miami Beach	70	94.3%	92	95.8%
AHF Coconut Grove	380	88.6%	409	95.1%
AHF Liberty City	20	85.0%	103	95.1%
Citrus	91	94.5%	111	93.7%
Empower U	213	86.4%	188	92.6%
Care Resource Little Havana	140	87.1%	161	91.9%
Jessie Trice	113	77.9%	147	91.2%
AHF Miami Beach	294	87.4%	337	91.1%
UM-CAP	105	87.6%	98	90.8%
МВСНС	811	89.6%	808	89.6%
PHT/North Dade	189	84.7%	155	88.4%
PHT/PET Center	236	83.2%	211	87.7%
AHF Jackson North	210	85.2%	267	87.3%
Borinquen	420	86.2%	450	85.8%
Care Resource Midtown	1,337	83.4%	1,376	84.5%
AHF Homestead	22	90.9%	58	81.0%
PHT/SFAN	1,481	83.1%	1,575	79.7%
СНІ	295	83.4%	328	76.2%







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY ETHNICITY

	CY 2018		CY 2019	
Ethnicity	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
Hispanic	3,793	88.2%	4,058	88.9%
Haitian	760	87.2%	823	86.0%
White, non-Hispanic	406	85.5%	460	82.4%
African American/Black	1,462	77.8%	1,503	79.3%
Other	33	81.8%	35	88.6%







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY GENDER

	CY 2018		CY 2019	
Gender	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
Male	4,922	86.2%	5,344	86.7%
Female	1,496	83.4%	1,483	83.7%
Transgender	36	83.3%	52	82.7%







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY AGE

	CY 2018		CY 2019	
Age	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
<13	1	0.0%		
13-24	122	77.0%	161	82.0%
25-34	1,118	82.6%	1,267	81.5%
35-44	1,352	87.4%	1,493	86.4%
45-54	2,000	87.6%	2,026	88.7%
55-64	1,501	85.6%	1,599	87.7%
65+	360	78.9%	333	78.4%







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY RISK FACTOR

	CY 2	CY 2018		2019
Risk Factor	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
Male-to-Male Sexual Contact (MMSC)	3,384	87.3%	3,750	87.9%
Heterosexual contact w/male	1,425	83.9%	1,401	84.8%
Heterosexual contact w/female	1,406	84.2%	1,462	84.2%
Blood disorder/transfusion	34	76.5%	39	82.1%
MMSC & IDU	15	40.0%	27	77.8%
Injection Drug User (IDU)	50	78.0%	56	71.4%
Mother	39	71.8%	53	64.2%
Other	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
Unknown	96	80.2%	91	82.4%







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY INCOME

Income - Based on % of Federal	CY 2	CY 2018		019
Poverty Level (FPL)	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
0-100% FPL	2,678	83.6%	2,338	81.5%
101-138% FPL	946	86.5%	1,048	88.4%
139-250% FPL	1,987	87.3%	2,339	87.7%
251-400% FPL	840	86.3%	1,031	89.6%
401%+ FPL	3	100.0%	3	33.3%







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.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY INSURANCE STATUS

(Multiple Responses Possible)

	CY 2	CY 2018		CY 2019	
Insurance Status	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC	
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%	
None (RWP only)	4,223	88.9%	4,203	85.9%	
ACA	1,851	89.5%	1,875	91.5%	
Private	731	81.1%	97	75.3%	
Medicare	557	76.3%	442	74.7%	
Medicaid	987	67.8%	423	69.7%	
VA	13	69.2%	8	100.0%	
Other	84	84.5%	75	76.0%	







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

#### **ACTIVITY R1.1c**

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

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY CO-OCCURRING CONDITIONS ("ACUITIES")

	CY 2018		CY 2	019
Co-Occurring Conditions	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
Hepatitis B or C	1,482	88.9%	1,018	88.7%
STI positive test	1,008	91.1%	1,296	86.0%
No health insurance	4,223	88.9%	4,203	85.9%
AIDS diagnosis in CY	2,535	84.1%	2,666	84.5%
Mental health needs	1,147	86.3%	1,501	84.1%
Income <136% FPL	3,571	84.4%	3,329	83.5%
Substance abuse	1,268	81.2%	980	80.7%
Housing instability	287	73.9%	374	76.5%







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

#### **ACTIVITY R1.1c**

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

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM MCM CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY HOUSING STATUS

	CY 2018		CY 2019	
Housing Status	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP MCM Clients	6,454	85.5%	6,879	86.0%
Stable/Permanent	6,110	86.2%	6,458	86.7%
Unstable (homeless)	287	73.9%	374	76.5%
Institutional	55	69.1%	41	70.7%
Other	2	100.0%	1	100.0%







Strategy R1.2 Provide continuous improvements in MCM and OAHS that meet the needs and identified vulnerabilities of people with HIV in care.

#### **ACTIVITY R1.2a**

Evaluate quality and appropriateness of MCM and OAHS clinical care through client satisfaction surveys and targeted reviews of PE data, and provide technical assistance to assist subrecipients in self-correction (e.g., on site QI technical assistance (TA), AIDS Education and Training Center (AETC), etc.). Provide subrecipient-based data to the Recipient and CQMC to make recommendations in service delivery processes.

# AVERAGE LEVEL OF SATISFACTION AMONG RWP CLIENTS BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	2019 Client	Satisfaction Survey
MCM Site	N	Avg. Satisfaction
All RWP Clients	507	4.72
PHT/PET Center	10	5.00
Jessie Trice	13	4.92
AHF Miami Beach	27	4.89
Citrus	19	4.89
AHF Coconut Grove	29	4.86
AHF Homestead	6	4.83
Care Resource Miami Beach	6	4.83
Borinquen	34	4.82
AHF Liberty City	10	4.80
AHF Jackson North	19	4.79
СНІ	19	4.79
Care Resource Midtown	108	4.72
PHT/North Dade	17	4.71
UM-CAP	7	4.71
MBCHC	60	4.70
Care Resource Little Havana	10	4.60
PHT/SFAN	94	4.50
Empower U	14	4.50







Strategy R1.2 Provide continuous improvements in MCM and OAHS that meet the needs and identified vulnerabilities of people with HIV in care.

#### **ACTIVITY R1.2a**

Evaluate quality and appropriateness of MCM and OAHS clinical care through client satisfaction surveys and targeted reviews of PE data, and provide technical assistance to assist subrecipients in self-correction (e.g., on site QI technical assistance (TA), AIDS Education and Training Center (AETC), etc.). Provide subrecipient-based data to the Recipient and CQMC to make recommendations in service delivery processes.

# AVERAGE LEVEL OF SATISFACTION AMONG RWP CLIENTS BY OAHS SUBRECIPIENT

	2019 Client	Satisfaction Survey
OAHS Site	N	Avg. Satisfaction
All RWP Clients	466	4.65
Citrus	6	5.00
AHF Homestead	5	5.00
AHF Liberty City	7	4.86
AHF Coconut Grove	18	4.83
CR Miami Beach	12	4.83
UM-CAP	16	4.81
Jessie Trice	9	4.78
CR Midtown	83	4.75
MBCHC	43	4.74
Borinquen	30	4.73
PHT/PET Center	10	4.70
AHF Jackson North	16	4.69
CR Little Havana	18	4.56
PHT/North Dade	16	4.56
AHF Miami Beach	24	4.46
СНІ	18	4.44
PHT/SFAN	76	4.41
Empower U	13	4.23







Strategy R1.2 Provide continuous improvements in MCM and OAHS that meet the needs and identified vulnerabilities of people with HIV in care

#### **ACTIVITY R1.2b**

Review and update RWP Service Delivery Guidelines for RWP OAHS and MCM services annually. This activity is in process by the Partnership's and Care and Treatment Committee and Medical Care Subcommittee.







Strategy R1.2 Provide continuous improvements in MCM and OAHS that meet the needs and identified vulnerabilities of people with HIV in care

#### **ACTIVITY R1.2c**

Conduct targeted QI record reviews of RWP OAHS and MCM subrecipients with belowstandard scores to ensure adherence to Public Health Standards and RWP Service Delivery Guidelines and lay groundwork for QI interventions.

A CQM record review is currently underway at an OAHS subrecipient, to lead to a QI opportunity at the provider agency. Data will be provided once they become available.







Strategy R1.3 Track and assess the quality of OAHS care provided to RWP clients who transition to Affordable Care Act (ACA)-provided outpatient medical care.

#### **ACTIVITY R1.3a**

Revise and streamline ACA enrollment and re-enrollment processes to increase the number of ACA-eligible RWP clients transitioned to ACA from 50% (2015 baseline) to 70%.

#### RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS TRANSITIONED TO ACA

	CY 2	018	CY 2019		
RWP Clients	Total N	%	Total N	%	
Not eligible for ACA	3,330	50.5%	2,769	43.5%	
Eligible for ACA	3,261	49.5%	3,602	56.6%	
Enrolled in ACA	1,817	55.7%	2,018	56.0%	







Strategy R1.3 Track and assess the quality of OAHS care provided to RWP clients who transition to Affordable Care Act (ACA)-provided outpatient medical care.

#### **ACTIVITY R1.3b**

Require all RWP clients enrolled in ACA and receiving RWP MCM to report VL levels at a minimum once every six (6) months, in order to assess and track clinical health outcomes of RWP clients receiving OAHS through an ACA Marketplace insurance plan.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS REPORTING VL LEVELS AT A MINIMUM EVERY SIX MONTHS

		CY 2018 Clients CY 2019 Outcomes					
RWP Clients	N	n	%				
Not eligible for ACA	2,953*	2,346	79.4%				
ACA eligible but NOT enrolled	1,270*	1,002	78.9%				
ACA eligible AND enrolled	1,761*	1,571	89.2%				

<sup>\*</sup> Removed from the CY 2018 counts are clients whose status changed between CY 2018 and CY 2019 becoming either out-of-network referrals or whose case was closed in CY 2019.







Strategy R1.3 Track and assess the quality of OAHS care provided to RWP clients who transition to Affordable Care Act (ACA)-provided outpatient medical care.

#### **ACTIVITY R1.3c**

Compare rates of missing VL data and VL suppression rates among people with HIV treated through the ACA with missing VL data and VL suppression rates among people with HIV receiving OAHS through the RWP to identify disparities.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS MISSING VL RATE

	CY 2018 Clients							
	CY 20	19 Outc	omes	CY 2020 Outcomes**				
RWP Clients	N	n	%	N	n	%		
ACA eligible AND enrolled	1,761*	15	0.9%	1,689*	215	12.7%		
Rec. RWP OAHS	3,468*	272	7.8%	3,207*	694	21.6%		

- \* Removed from the CY 2018 counts are clients whose status changed in subsequent calendar years becoming either out-of-network referrals or whose case was closed in the calendar year.
- \*\* CY 2020 outcomes are based on data through 10/27/2020







Strategy R1.3 Track and assess the quality of OAHS care provided to RWP clients who transition to Affordable Care Act (ACA)-provided outpatient medical care.

#### **ACTIVITY R1.3c**

Compare rates of missing VL data and VL suppression rates among people with HIV treated through the ACA with missing VL data and VL suppression rates among people with HIV receiving OAHS through the RWP to identify disparities.

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS VL SUPPRESSION RATE

	CY 2018 Clients							
CY 2019 Outcomes CY 202			0 Outco	mes**				
RWP Clients	N	n	%	N	n	%		
ACA eligible AND enrolled	1,761*	1,703	96.7%	1,689*	1,439	85.2%		
Rec. RWP OAHS	3,468*	2,868	82.7%	3,207*	2,248	70.1%		

- \* Removed from the CY2018 counts are clients whose status changed in subsequent calendar years becoming either out-of-network referrals or whose case was closed in the calendar year.
- \*\* CY 2020 outcomes are based on data through 10/27/2020







Strategy R1.3 Track and assess the quality of OAHS care provided to RWP clients who transition to Affordable Care Act (ACA)-provided outpatient medical care.

#### **ACTIVITY R1.3d**

Increase the percentage of clients transitioned from RWP-funded OAHS to ACA medical care who are retained in ACA-provided medical care for two (2) years after enrollment from 60% enrolled in 2015 and continuously enrolled in 2017 to 75% enrolled in 2019 and continuously enrolled in 2021. (Using VL data as proxy for ACA OAHS)

**B/AA** = Black/African American **FPL** = Federal Poverty Level

ACA NE = Not eligible for ACA

**ACA EN** = ACA eligible but NOT enrolled **ACA EE** = ACA eligible AND enrolled

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	CY 2018				CY 2019	
Demographics	ACA NE	ACA EN	ACA EE	ACA NE	ACA EN	ACA EE
Income (Based on %FPL)						
<101% FPL	65.9%	0.0%	0.0%%	70.7%	0.0%	0.0%
101-200% FPL	21.1%	57.4%	50.2%	19.0%	58.1%	51.2%
201-300% FPL	9.7%	31.4%	34.0%	7.6%	29.4%	35.2%
301-400% FPL	3.2%	11.2%	15.7%	2.5%	12.5%	13.6%
Gender/Ethnicity						
Hispanic Male	53.1%	49.4%	68.5%	50.8%	53.7%	68.3%
Hispanic Female	7.6%	6.0%	4.8%	8.4%	6.0%	4.8%
B/AA Male	13.7%	18.5%	6.7%	15.7%	15.1%	6.7%
B/AA Female	6.5%	8.9%	4.1%	7.5%	7.6%	4.1%
Haitian Male	5.8%	5.2%	4.2%	5.9%	5.4%	4.0%
Haitian Female	7.1%	4.0%	4.2%	6.4%	5.1%	4.4%
White Male	5.3%	7.6%	6.7%	4.6%	6.3%	7.1%
White Female	0.9%	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%







#### **OBJECTIVE R2.**

Increase the proportion of "lost to care" RWP MCM clients who are relinked to care, from 40% in 2017 to 60% by 2021.







Strategy R2.1 RWP MCM subrecipients will partner with FDOH-MDC to detect clients in danger of being lost to care, update contact information on vulnerable RWP clients, and use both FDOH and RWP outreach specialists to relink clients in care.

#### **ACTIVITY R2.1b**

Identify RWP MCM subrecipients with lowest and highest relinkage rates and determine QI interventions and best practices.

**Q1** = March 1, 2019 – May 31, 2019

**Q2** = June 1, 2019 - Aug 31, 2019

**Q3 =** Sept. 1, 2019 – Nov. 30, 2019

# RYAN WHITE PROGRAM CLIENTS 90 DAYS RE-LINKAGE RATE

	2	Q1 2019-2020			Q2 2019-2020			Q3 2019-2020		
MCM Subracipiont	A.	N Link	% Link	A/	N Link	% Link	M	N Link	% Link	
Subrecipient  Total RWP	73	52	71%	<b>N</b> 82	49	60%	76	38	50%	
AHF	1	0	0%	4	2	50%	1	1	100%	
Borinquen	4	4	100%	6	4	67%	2	2	100%	
Care Resource	36	28	78%	38	19	50%	29	7	24%	
Empower U	20	11	55%	17	10	59%	12	6	50%	
PHT/SFAN	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	10	8	80%	
UM - CAP	10	8	80%	14	11	79%	12	9	75%	







Strategy R2.1 RWP MCM subrecipients will partner with FDOH-MDC to detect clients in danger of being lost to care, update contact information on vulnerable RWP clients, and use both FDOH and RWP outreach specialists to relink clients in care.

#### **ACTIVITY R2.1c**

Develop 6-month RiC measurements and protocols for new-in care clients based on the RiC Report Card data prioritized by the CQMC.

The CQMC Committee has recently approved a 3-month and 6-month engagement measure for new-in-care clients.

- The 3-month engagement measure will be based on specific billing codes for MCM and Peer services provided around the 90-day-in-care date (+/- 30 days).
- The 6-month engagement measure will be based on the completion of the client assessment by the medical case manager at the 6-month-incare date (+/- 30 days).







# VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION

#### **OBJECTIVE V1.**

Increase the percentage of people with HIV in the EMA who are virally suppressed (<200 copies/mL) from 67% in 2015 to at least 80% by 2021.

In FY2020, the percent of RWP clients with suppressed VL was 82% (89% among MCM clients, 86% among OAHS clients)







### VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION

Strategy V1.1 Expand role of RWP MCM and OAHS subrecipients in detecting persistent unsuppressed viral loads (VL) and initiate appropriate responses.

#### **ACTIVITY V1.1a**

On a monthly basis, detect RWP clients with persistent unsuppressed VL over two semiannual measurements ("virologic failure") and notify RWP MCM and OAHS subrecipients to enable their targeted response. Monitor improvement in VL suppression levels to ensure efficacy of subrecipient response.

**Note:** OAHS data will be limited to RWP OAHS subrecipients only.

# PERCENT OF RWP CLIENTS WITH PERSISTENT UNSUPPRESSED VL BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

(Aggregated Across Sites)

	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
MCM Site	2019	2019	2019	2019	2019
All RWP MCM Clients	6.8%	8.1%	7.4%	6.7%	7.4%
AHF	3.2%	3.7%	5.9%	0.6%	3.8%
Borinquen	4.1%	4.8%	8.2%	10.3%	1.7%
Care Resource	4.2%	5.1%	4.9%	7.1%	6.0%
СНІ	30.8%	27.9%	19.5%	7.4%	10.8%
Citrus Health	0.0%	12.5%	3.8%	9.1%	0.0%
Empower U	16.2%	17.3%	9.7%	17.4%	16.7%
Jessie Trice	6.3%	7.7%	13.6%	9.5%	0.0%
MBCHC	6.0%	6.9%	4.4%	2.5%	8.0%
PHT/North Dade	9.7%	8.0%	13.8%	6.7%	4.8%
PHT/PET Center	2.0%	0.0%	2.9%	5.7%	10.3%
PHT/SFAN	10.5%	15.7%	12.7%	15.0%	15.6%
UM – CAP	8.3%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	10.0%







### VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION

Strategy V1.1 Expand role of RWP MCM and OAHS subrecipients in detecting persistent unsuppressed viral loads (VL) and initiate appropriate responses.

#### **ACTIVITY V1.1a**

On a monthly basis, detect RWP clients with persistent unsuppressed VL over two semi-annual measurements ("virologic failure") and notify RWP MCM and OAHS subrecipients to enable their targeted response. Monitor improvement in VL suppression levels to ensure efficacy of subrecipient response.

**Note:** OAHS data will be limited to RWP OAHS subrecipients only.

# PERCENT OF RWP CLIENTS WITH PERSISTENT UNSUPPRESSED VL BY OAHS SUBRECIPIENT

(Aggregated Across Sites)

OAHS Site	Sep. 2019	Oct. 2019	Nov. 2019	Dec. 2019
All RWP OAHS E/M clients	9.7%	8.9%	9.4%	9.6%
AHF	4.5%	7.4%	2.4%	4.9%
Borinquen	3.3%	16.2%	12.1%	5.0%
Care Resource	7.1%	6.5%	11.9%	6.7%
CHI	26.5%	22.2%	4.5%	17.2%
Citrus Health	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jessie Trice	20.0%	8.3%	18.2%	0.0%
MBCHC	13.8%	6.8%	7.1%	11.2%
PHT/North Dade	9.1%	7.1%	8.3%	8.3%
PHT/PET Center	0.0%	7.1%	9.1%	16.7%
PHT/SFAN	9.1%	10.5%	9.1%	11.5%
UM - CAP	13.3%	11.4%	14.6%	19.0%







#### **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, or (b) CD4/VL lab tests (as proxy for medical care outside the RWP), at least 90 days apart within a 12-month period, from 60% in 2015 to at least 90% by 2021, to match overall RWP MCM and OAHS retention levels.







Strategy DR1.1 Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American Male-to-Male Sexual Contact (B/AA MMSC)

MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions:

Increase RiC among B/AA MMSC RWP MCM and OAHS clients to 90% in CY 2021.

#### **ACTIVITY DR1.1a**

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

# BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MMSC RETAINED IN CARE BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2	2019
MCM Site	Total N	% RiC
All RWP B/AA MMSC Clients	438	80.1%
AHF Coconut Grove	18	100.0%
CR Miami Beach	3	100.0%
Empower U	31	90.3%
Jessie Trice	10	90.0%
PHT/PET Center	9	88.9%
UM-CAP	9	88.9%
CR Midtown	100	83.0%
Borinquen	28	82.1%
AHF Liberty City	11	81.8%
AHF Miami Beach	27	77.8%
PHT/North Dade	9	77.8%
PHT/SFAN	79	75.9%
CHI	26	73.1%
AHF Jackson North	47	72.3%
AHF Homestead	7	71.4%
МВСНС	19	68.4%
Citrus	3	66.7%
CR Little Havana	1	0.0%







Strategy DR1.2 Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI **Black/African American male (B/AAM) heterosexual**MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions:

Increase RiC among B/AAM heterosexual RWP MCM and OAHS clients to 90% by CY 2021.

#### **ACTIVITY DR1.2a**

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for B/AA male heterosexual clients.

# BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MALE HETEROSEXUAL CLIENTS RETAINED IN CARE BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2019		
MCM Site	Total N	% RiC	
All RWP B/AA Heterosexual Clients	503	77.5%	
AHF Coconut Grove	6	100.0%	
AHF Miami Beach	3	100.0%	
Citrus	2	100.0%	
PHT/North Dade	26	96.2%	
Empower U	31	93.5%	
AHF Jackson North	30	93.3%	
Jessie Trice	31	90.3%	
AHF Liberty City	9	88.9%	
UM-CAP	13	84.6%	
PHT/PET Center	11	81.8%	
CR Midtown	81	77.8%	
Borinquen	24	75.0%	
PHT/SFAN	185	70.3%	
МВСНС	10	60.0%	
СНІ	37	59.5%	
AHF Homestead	4	50.0%	







Strategies DR1.1 and DR1.2

#### **ACTIVITIES DR1.1a and DR1.2a**

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average RiC rates for B/AA MMSC (DR1.1) and B/AA male heterosexual (DR1.2) clients.

# BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MALES RETAINED IN CARE BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2018		CY 2019		
MCM Site	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC	
All RWP B/AAM Clients	897	80.7%	941	78.7%	
AHF Coconut Grove	18	83.3%	24	100.0%	
CR Miami Beach	1	100.0%	3	100.0%	
Empower U	87	85.1%	62	91.9%	
PHT/North Dade	50	78.0%	35	91.4%	
Jessie Trice	30	86.7%	41	90.2%	
UM-CAP	32	78.1%	22	86.4%	
PHT/PET Center	19	84.2%	20	85.0%	
AHF Liberty City	5	60.0%	20	85.0%	
CR Midtown	163	77.9%	181	80.7%	
AHF Jackson North	61	80.3%	77	80.5%	
AHF Miami Beach	31	87.1%	30	80.0%	
Citrus	2	100.0%	5	80.0%	
Borinquen	54	81.5%	52	78.8%	
PHT/SFAN	242	76.4%	264	72.0%	
МВСНС	26	76.9%	29	65.5%	
СНІ	61	70.5%	63	65.1%	
AHF Homestead	5	60.0%	11	63.6%	
CR Little Havana	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	







### NHAS 2020 Goal #3: Reduce HIV-Related Health Disparities and Health Inequities

# **DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE**

Strategy DR1.3 Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI **Black/African American female (B/AAF)** MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: *Increase RiC rates for B/AAF to 90% by CY 2021*.

#### **ACTIVITY DR1.3a**

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

# BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN FEMALES RETAINED IN CARE BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2	CY 2018		2019
MCM Site	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP B/AAF Clients	551	81.1%	544	80.1%
AHF Coconut Grove	3	100.0%	7	100.0%
AHF Liberty City	1	100.0%	6	100.0%
Citrus	1	100.0%	5	100.0%
CR Miami Beach	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Jessie Trice	51	64.7%	54	90.7%
Empower U	58	82.8%	50	90.0%
CR Midtown	81	84.0%	77	87.0%
MBCHC	23	82.6%	25	84.0%
AHF Jackson North	23	82.6%	31	83.9%
UM-CAP	12	91.7%	11	81.8%
PHT/PET Center	11	63.6%	10	80.0%
PHT/North Dade	50	82.0%	34	79.4%
Borinquen	20	70.0%	18	77.8%
AHF Homestead	3	100.0%	8	75.0%
PHT/SFAN	168	73.2%	166	72.3%
СНІ	38	71.1%	39	61.5%
AHF Miami Beach	3	66.7%	2	50.0%







Strategy DR1.4 Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI **Hispanic MMSC (HMMSC)** MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: *Increase RiC rates among HMMSC to 90% in CY 2021.* 

#### **ACTIVITY DR1.4a**

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

# HISPANIC MMSC RETAINED IN CARE BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

MCM Site	CY 2018		CY 2019	
	Total N	% RiC	Total N	% RiC
All RWP HMMSC Clients	2,613	88.5%	2,918	89.3%
PHT/North Dade	4	75.0%	4	100.0%
AHF Liberty City	9	88.9%	54	98.1%
Citrus	56	94.6%	65	95.4%
AHF Jackson North	65	87.7%	80	95.0%
AHF Homestead	7	100.0%	20	95.0%
UM-CAP	34	91.2%	36	94.4%
AHF Coconut Grove	280	90.4%	306	94.1%
AHF Miami Beach	189	88.9%	217	94.0%
CR Miami Beach	48	91.7%	67	94.0%
Empower U	14	85.7%	16	93.8%
CR Little Havana	112	89.3%	138	92.0%
MBCHC	412	89.6%	408	90.2%
Borinquen	161	88.2%	193	89.6%
PHT/SFAN	294	87.4%	350	86.3%
PHT/PET Center	116	94.8%	99	85.9%
CR Midtown	730	85.6%	769	85.7%
СНІ	76	89.5%	89	77.5%
Jessie Trice	4	100.0%	7	71.4%







# **DISPARITIES IN TREATMENT OUTCOMES**

(SUPPRESSED/UNDETECTABLE VL LEVELS)

#### **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% by 2021, to match overall RWP MCM and OAHS VL suppression rates.







Strategy DV1.1 Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI **Black/African American MMSC (B/AA MMSC)**MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions:

Increase VL suppression levels among B/AAM MMSC to 80% by CY 2021.

#### **ACTIVITY DV1.1a**

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for B/AA MMSC clients.

## B/AA MMSC CONTACT VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2019		
MCM Site	Total N	% Suppressed	
All RWP B/AAM MMSC Clients	438	71.9%	
CR Miami Beach	3	100.0%	
UM-CAP	9	88.9%	
Empower U	31	87.1%	
AHF Liberty City	11	81.8%	
Borinquen	28	78.6%	
AHF Miami Beach	27	77.8%	
AHF Coconut Grove	18	77.8%	
PHT/PET Center	9	77.8%	
CR Midtown	100	74.0%	
Jessie Trice	10	70.0%	
MBCHC	19	68.4%	
PHT/SFAN	79	67.1%	
PHT/North Dade	9	66.7%	
Citrus	3	66.7%	
AHF Jackson North	47	66.0%	
AHF Homestead	7	57.1%	
CHI	26	50.0%	
CR Little Havana	1	0.0%	







Strategy DV1.2 Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI **Black/African American male (B/AAM) heterosexual** MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions:

Increase VL suppression levels among B/AAM heterosexuals to 80% by CY 2021.

#### **ACTIVITY DV1.2a**

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for B/AAM male heterosexual clients.

## BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MALE HETEROSEXUALS VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY 2019		
MCM Site	Total N	% Suppressed	
All RWP B/AAM Heterosexual Clients	503	69.6%	
AHF Liberty City	9	100.0%	
AHF Coconut Grove	6	100.0%	
AHF Miami Beach	3	100.0%	
Citrus	2	100.0%	
PHT/North Dade	26	92.3%	
UM-CAP	13	92.3%	
Jessie Trice	31	87.1%	
AHF Jackson North	30	86.7%	
Empower U	31	80.6%	
PHT/PET Center	11	72.7%	
CR Midtown	81	69.1%	
Borinquen	24	62.5%	
PHT/SFAN	185	60.5%	
MBCHC	10	60.0%	
AHF Homestead	4	50.0%	
CHI	37	45.9%	







Strategies DV1.1 and DV1.2

#### **ACTIVITIES DV1.1a & DV1.2a**

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for B/AA MMSC (DV1.1) and B/AA male heterosexual (DV1.2) clients.

## BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MALES VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	C	Y 2018	CY 2019	
MCM Site	Total N	% Suppressed	Total N	% Suppressed
All RWP B/AAM Clients	881	79.5%	941	70.7%
CR Miami Beach	1	100.0%	3	100.0%
UM-CAP	31	83.9%	22	90.9%
AHF Liberty City	5	60.0%	20	90.0%
PHT/North Dade	49	95.9%	35	85.7%
Empower U	87	81.6%	62	83.9%
AHF Coconut Grove	18	72.2%	24	83.3%
Jessie Trice	29	89.7%	41	82.9%
AHF Miami Beach	31	93.5%	30	80.0%
Citrus	2	100.0%	5	80.0%
PHT/PET Center	19	89.5%	20	75.0%
AHF Jackson North	61	91.8%	77	74.0%
CR Midtown	161	79.5%	181	71.8%
Borinquen	54	81.5%	52	71.2%
MBCHC	26	96.2%	29	65.5%
PHT/SFAN	232	81.9%	264	62.5%
AHF Homestead	5	100.0%	11	54.5%
CHI	60	68.3%	63	47.6%
CR Little Havana	0	0.0%	1	0.0%







Strategy DV1.3 Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American female (B/AAF) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: *Increase B/AAF VL suppression levels to 80% by CY 2021*.

#### **ACTIVITY DV1.3a**

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

## BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN FEMALES VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	c	CY 2018		CY 2019		
MCM Site	Total N	% Suppressed	Total N	% Suppressed		
All RWP B/AAF Clients	539	89.6%	544	71.7%		
AHF Coconut Grove	3	100.0%	7	100.0%		
Citrus	1	100.0%	5	100.0%		
CR Miami Beach	1	100.0%	1	100.0%		
Jessie Trice	50	94.0%	54	85.2%		
AHF Jackson North	23	87.0%	31	83.9%		
Borinquen	20	85.0% 18		83.3%		
UM-CAP	12	83.3% 11		81.8%		
CR Midtown	79	89.9%	77	80.5%		
PHT/PET Center	11	90.9%	10	80.0%		
МВСНС	23	91.3%	25	76.0%		
PHT/North Dade	50	88.0%	34	73.5%		
Empower U	57	86.0%	50	72.0%		
AHF Liberty City	1	100.0%	6	66.7%		
AHF Homestead	3	100.0%	8	62.5%		
PHT/SFAN	163	89.6%	166	62.0%		
AHF Miami Beach	3	66.7%	2	50.0%		
CHI	36	83.3%	39	46.2%		







#### NHAS 2020 Goal #3: Reduce HIV-Related Health Disparities and Health Inequities

#### **DISPARITIES IN TREATMENT OUTCOMES** (SUPPRESSED/UNDETECTABLE VL LEVELS)

Strategy DV1.4 Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI **Haitian Male (HM)** MCM & OAHS clients and address them w/ specific interventions: *Increase HM VL suppression levels to 80% in CY 2021*.

#### **ACTIVITY DV1.4a**

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

## HAITIAN MALE CLIENTS VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY	2019
MCM Site	Total N	% Suppressed
All RWP Haitian Male Clients	396	77.0%
AHF Jackson North	21	100.0%
AHF Miami Beach	4	100.0%
AHF Coconut Grove	2	100.0%
AHF Liberty City	1	100.0%
CR Little Havana	1	100.0%
CR Midtown	35	94.3%
Empower U	15	93.3%
Borinquen	42	83.3%
Jessie Trice	22	81.8%
МВСНС	56	80.4%
UM-CAP	5	80.0%
PHT/PET Center	12	75.0%
PHT/North Dade	25	72.0%
СНІ	17	70.6%
PHT/SFAN	137	64.2%
AHF Homestead	1	0.0%







Strategy DV1.3 Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI **Haitian Female (HF)** MCM and OAHS clients and address them w/ specific interventions: *Increase HF VL suppression levels to 80% in CY 2021*.

#### **ACTIVITY DV1.5a**

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

## HAITIAN FEMALE CLIENTS VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY	2019
MCM Site	Total N	% Suppressed
All RWP Haitian Female Clients	426	75.8%
PHT/PET Center	7	100.0%
AHF Coconut Grove	1	100.0%
CR Little Havana	1	100.0%
AHF Jackson North	18	94.4%
Empower U	18	94.4%
CR Midtown	35	88.6%
MBCHC	60	86.7%
Borinquen	50	82.0%
Jessie Trice	11	81.8%
CHI	18	72.2%
AHF Liberty City	3	66.7%
PHT/SFAN	165	66.1%
PHT/North Dade	34	64.7%
UM-CAP	3	33.3%
AHF Miami Beach	2	0.0%







Strategies DV1.4 and DV1.5

#### **ACTIVITIES DV1.4a and DV1.5a**

Determine best practices of RWP Part A/MAI MCM and OAHS subrecipients with higher than average VL suppression rates for Haitian Male (DV1.4) and Haitian Female (DV1.5) clients.

## HAITIAN MALE AND FEMALE CLIENTS VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT

	CY	2018	CY 2	019	
		%		%	
MCM Site	Total N	Suppressed	Total N	Suppressed	
All RWP Haitian Clients	756	89.4%	823	76.4%	
AHF Coconut Grove	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	
AHF Jackson North	28	96.4%	39	97.4%	
Empower U	25	96.0%	33	93.9%	
CR Midtown	61	91.8%	70	91.4%	
PHT/PET Center	20	85.0%	19	84.2%	
MBCHC	118	94.9%	116	83.6%	
Borinquen	78	89.7%	93	82.8%	
Jessie Trice	18	66.7%	33	81.8%	
AHF Liberty City	2	100.0%	4	75.0%	
CHI	28	85.7%	35	71.4%	
PHT/North Dade	62	90.3%	59	67.8%	
AHF Miami Beach	4	100.0%	6	66.7%	
PHT/SFAN	297	82.2%	302	65.2%	
UM-CAP	8	87.5%	8	62.5%	
AHF Homestead			1	0.0%	







CV 2040

# RETENTION IN CARE and VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION Summary Tables







#### **Information and Disclaimers**

Data are based on RWP clients who received at least one RWP service between 3/01/2019 and 2/29/2020 and who were assigned to a medical case management site.

- The FY 2019 VL suppression rate is based on VL lab results conducted between 3/01/2019 and 2/29/2020. Clients with no VL lab on file are excluded from this analysis as the percent with no VL lab during this time.
- Clients whose case management is paid for by General Revenue monies and whose medical case management site is PHT/South Florida AIDS Network are included in these tables.
- Excluded from the analyses are clients who are out-of-network, case managed under Medicaid, clients with an unassigned case management site, or whose cases were closed during the reporting period.







#### **RETENTION IN CARE & VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSSION**

Objectives R1. and V1

#### **OBJECTIVE R1 (RiC)**

Increase the percentage of RWP Medical Case Management (MCM) clients and Outpatient Ambulatory Health Service (OAHS) clients who had at least two (2) instances of either (a) Miami-Dade County Ryan White Program (RWP) OAHS visits, or (b) CD4/Viral Load (VL) lab tests (as proxy for medical care outside the RWP), at least 90 days apart within a 12-month period, from 60% in 2015 to at least 90% by 2021.

#### **OBJECTIVE V1 (VL Suppression)**

Increase the percentage of people with HIV in the EMA who are virally suppressed (<200 copies/mL) from 67% in 2015 to at least 80% by 2021.

## ALL MCM CLIENTS BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP MCM Clients	6,681	74.0%	89.0%	98.6%	88.8%
AHF Coconut Grove	443	80.5%	93.2%	99.8%	96.4%
AHF Homestead	75	74.3%	85.3%	100.0%	82.7%
AHF Jackson North	304	78.1%	88.5%	99.0%	93.4%
AHF Liberty City	139	76.0%	92.8%	100.0%	89.2%
AHF Miami Beach	376	77.5%	89.6%	98.9%	94.7%
Borinquen	511	71.4%	83.2%	98.2%	87.1%
CR Little Havana	160	87.9%	92.5%	98.1%	94.4%
CR Miami Beach	92	82.1%	89.1%	97.8%	95.7%
CR Midtown	1,297	78.1%	86.5%	98.6%	91.8%
Citrus	112	82.4%	92.9%	100.0%	90.2%
CHI	325	74.9%	74.8%	93.2%	73.8%
Empower U	221	77.3%	91.0%	98.6%	80.1%
Jessie Trice	144	79.1%	96.5%	98.6%	90.3%
МВСНС	754	73.6%	91.5%	99.2%	92.3%
PHT/North Dade	133	88.7%	95.5%	100.0%	85.7%
PHT/PET Center	180	81.8%	95.6%	100.0%	92.2%
PHT/SFAN	1,316	76.9%	90.8%	98.4%	83.2%
UM-CAP	99	36.3%	86.9%	98.0%	88.9%







## DISPARITIES IN RETENTION IN CARE and DISPARITIES IN TREATMENT OUTCOMES CARE CONTINUUM DATA, FY 2019 – 20







Strategies DR1.1 and DR1.2; Strategies DV1.1 and DV1.2

Includes Black African American Male-to-Male Sexual Contact (DR1.1 and DV1.1) and Black/ African American Heterosexuals Male (DR1.2 and DV1.2).

#### BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MALES BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP B/AAM Clients	851	12.7%	86.0%	97.5%	82.0%
AHF Coconut Grove	22	5.0%	95.5%	100.0%	90.9%
AHF Homestead	12	16.0%	66.7%	100.0%	66.7%
AHF Jackson North	72	23.7%	86.1%	100.0%	93.1%
AHF Liberty City	23	16.5%	95.7%	100.0%	73.9%
AHF Miami Beach	30	8.0%	90.0%	100.0%	83.3%
Borinquen	58	11.4%	82.8%	98.3%	77.6%
CR Little Havana	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CR Miami Beach	3	3.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CR Midtown	178	13.7%	80.3%	97.8%	81.5%
Citrus	4	3.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CHI	55	16.9%	70.9%	89.1%	70.9%
Empower U	69	31.2%	85.5%	98.6%	82.6%
Jessie Trice	41	28.5%	97.6%	97.6%	95.1%
MBCHC	24	3.2%	95.8%	100.0%	87.5%
PHT/North Dade	31	23.3%	100.0%	100.0%	90.3%
PHT/PET Center	16	8.9%	93.8%	100.0%	81.3%
PHT/SFAN	189	14.4%	87.8%	96.3%	78.3%
UM-CAP	24	24.2%	87.5%	95.8%	79.2%







#### **STRATEGY DR1.1 (RiC)**

Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American Male-to-Male Sexual Contact (B/AA MMSC) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase RiC among B/AA MMSC RWP MCM to 90% in CY 2021.

#### **STRATEGY DV1.1 (Tx Outcomes)**

Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American MMSC (B/AA MMSC) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase VL suppression levels among B/AAM MMSC to 80% by CY 2021.

#### BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MMSC BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP B/AAM MMSC					
Clients	413	48.5%	86.4%	98.3%	81.8%
AHF Coconut Grove	16	72.7%	93.8%	100.0%	87.5%
AHF Homestead	7	58.3%	57.1%	100.0%	71.4%
AHF Jackson North	45	62.5%	80.0%	100.0%	93.3%
AHF Liberty City	11	47.8%	90.9%	100.0%	63.6%
AHF Miami Beach	27	90.0%	88.9%	100.0%	81.5%
Borinquen	32	55.2%	84.4%	96.9%	75.0%
CR Little Havana	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CR Miami Beach	3	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CR Midtown	92	51.7%	85.9%	98.9%	82.6%
Citrus	2	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CHI	26	47.3%	76.9%	84.6%	69.2%
Empower U	36	52.2%	83.3%	97.2%	86.1%
Jessie Trice	12	29.3%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%
MBCHC	16	66.7%	93.8%	100.0%	81.3%
PHT/North Dade	6	19.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PHT/PET Center	8	50.0%	87.5%	100.0%	75.0%
PHT/SFAN	63	33.3%	90.5%	100.0%	79.4%
UM-CAP	11	45.8%	90.9%	100.0%	72.7%







#### **STRATEGY DR1.2 (RiC)**

Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American male (B/AAM) heterosexual MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase RiC among B/AAM heterosexual RWP MCM and OAHS clients to 90% by CY 2021.

#### **STRATEGY DV1.1 (Tx Outcomes)**

Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American male (B/AAM) heterosexual MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase B/AAM heterosexual VL suppression levels to 80% by CY 2021.

## BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN MALE HETEROSEXUALS BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP B/AAM Clients	438	51.5%	85.6%	96.8%	82.2%
AHF Coconut Grove	6	27.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AHF Homestead	5	41.7%	80.0%	100.0%	60.0%
AHF Jackson North	27	37.5%	96.3%	100.0%	92.6%
AHF Liberty City	12	52.2%	100.0%	100.0%	83.3%
AHF Miami Beach	3	10.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Borinquen	26	44.8%	80.8%	100.0%	80.8%
CR Little Havana	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CR Miami Beach	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CR Midtown	86	48.3%	74.4%	96.5%	80.2%
Citrus	2	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CHI	29	52.7%	65.5%	93.1%	72.4%
Empower U	33	47.8%	87.9%	100.0%	78.8%
Jessie Trice	29	70.7%	96.6%	96.6%	96.6%
MBCHC	8	33.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PHT/North Dade	25	80.6%	100.0%	100.0%	88.0%
PHT/PET Center	8	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%
PHT/SFAN	126	66.7%	86.5%	94.4%	77.8%
UM-CAP	13	54.2%	84.6%	92.3%	84.6%







#### **STRATEGY DR1.3 (RiC)**

Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American female (B/AAF) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase RiC rates for B/AAF to 90% by CY 2021.

#### **STRATEGY DV1.3 (Tx Outcomes)**

Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Black/African American female (B/AAF) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions:
Increase B/AAF VL suppression levels to 80% by CY 2021.

#### BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN FEMALES BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	%On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP B/AAF Clients	480	7.2%	85.4%	97.3%	78.8%
AHF Coconut Grove	6	1.4%	83.3%	83.3%	100.0%
AHF Homestead	12	16.0%	66.7%	100.0%	58.3%
AHF Jackson North	33	10.9%	93.9%	100.0%	84.8%
AHF Liberty City	4	2.9%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%
AHF Miami Beach	1	0.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Borinquen	23	4.5%	78.3%	95.7%	78.3%
CR Little Havana	1	0.6%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CR Miami Beach	1	1.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CR Midtown	70	5.4%	82.9%	95.7%	90.0%
Citrus	5	4.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CHI	35	10.8%	68.6%	94.3%	57.1%
Empower U	60	27.1%	91.7%	98.3%	65.0%
Jessie Trice	50	34.7%	94.0%	98.0%	88.0%
MBCHC	20	2.7%	95.0%	100.0%	85.0%
PHT/North Dade	27	20.3%	92.6%	100.0%	85.2%
PHT/PET Center	8	4.4%	87.5%	100.0%	87.5%
PHT/SFAN	114	8.7%	81.6%	96.5%	76.3%
UM-CAP	10	10.1%	90.0%	100.0%	80.0%







#### **STRATEGY DR1.4 (RiC)**

Identify RiC vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Hispanic MMSC (HMMSC) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase RiC rates among HMMSC to 90% by CY 2021.

#### **Tx Outcomes**

ARV and VLS data included for continuity.

## HISPANIC MMSC BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP Hispanic MMSC					
Clients	3,001	44.9%	89.1%	98.8%	93.1%
AHF Coconut Grove	332	74.9%	94.3%	100.0%	97.3%
AHF Homestead	32	42.7%	93.8%	100.0%	90.6%
AHF Jackson North	98	32.2%	92.9%	99.0%	96.9%
AHF Liberty City	82	59.0%	91.5%	100.0%	93.9%
AHF Miami Beach	243	64.6%	92.6%	99.2%	96.3%
Borinquen	224	43.8%	81.7%	98.2%	90.2%
CR Little Havana	128	80.0%	92.2%	98.4%	95.3%
CR Miami Beach	64	69.6%	89.1%	98.4%	95.3%
CR Midtown	716	55.2%	88.8%	99.2%	95.7%
Citrus	63	56.3%	90.5%	100.0%	93.7%
CHI	102	31.4%	69.6%	92.2%	76.5%
Empower U	23	10.4%	82.6%	100.0%	82.6%
Jessie Trice	8	5.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MBCHC	394	52.3%	90.6%	98.7%	93.9%
PHT/North Dade	5	3.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PHT/PET Center	84	46.7%	95.2%	100.0%	95.2%
PHT/SFAN	361	27.4%	87.3%	98.6%	84.5%
UM-CAP	42	42.4%	81.0%	97.6%	97.6%







#### DISPARITIES IN TREATMENT OUTCOMES & RETENTION IN CARE

#### **STRATEGY DV1.4 (VLS)**

Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Haitian Male (HM) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase Haitian male VL suppression levels to 80% by CY 2021.

#### **STRATEGY DV1.5 (VLS)**

Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Haitian Female (HF) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase Haitian female VL suppression levels to 80% by CY 2021.

#### **Retention in Care**

Data included for continuity.

## HAITIANS BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

DI WICH SOURCEFILINI, II 2013-20						
MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS	
All RWP Haitian Clients	727	10.9%	92.8%	99.6%	84.2%	
AHF Coconut Grove	2	0.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
AHF Homestead	1	1.3%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
AHF Jackson North	46	15.1%	95.7%	100.0%	91.3%	
AHF Liberty City	4	2.9%	75.0%	100.0%	75.0%	
AHF Miami Beach	4	1.1%	75.0%	100.0%	75.0%	
Borinquen	90	17.6%	85.6%	100.0%	87.8%	
CR Little Havana						
CR Miami Beach						
CR Midtown	62	4.8%	87.1%	98.4%	88.7%	
Citrus						
CHI	34	10.5%	85.3%	100.0%	76.5%	
Empower U	37	16.7%	100.0%	97.3%	89.2%	
Jessie Trice	33	22.9%	97.0%	100.0%	84.8%	
MBCHC	108	14.3%	91.7%	100.0%	86.1%	
PHT/North Dade	49	36.8%	93.9%	100.0%	77.6%	
PHT/PET Center	14	7.8%	100.0%	100.0%	92.9%	
PHT/SFAN	237	18.0%	96.2%	99.6%	81.4%	
UM-CAP	6	6.1%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	







#### **DISPARITIES IN TREATMENT OUTCOMES & RETENTION IN CARE**

#### **STRATEGY DV1.4 (Tx Outcomes)**

Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Haitian Male (HM) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase Haitian male VL suppression levels to 80% by CY 2021.

#### **Retention in Care**

Data included for continuity.

## HAITIAN MALES BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP Haitian Male					
Clients	341	5.1%	93.5%	99.7%	82.7%
AHF Coconut Grove	1	0.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AHF Homestead	1	1.3%	100.0%	100.0%	0.00%
AHF Jackson North	26	8.6%	100.0%	100.0%	96.2%
AHF Liberty City	2	1.4%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%
AHF Miami Beach	3	0.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Borinquen	37	7.2%	83.8%	100.0%	89.2%
CR Little Havana					
CR Miami Beach					
CR Midtown	26	2.0%	92.3%	96.2%	84.6%
Citrus					
CHI	16	4.9%	81.3%	100.0%	75.0%
Empower U	16	7.2%	100.0%	100.0%	93.8%
Jessie Trice	22	15.3%	95.5%	100.0%	86.4%
MBCHC	49	6.5%	91.8%	100.0%	83.7%
PHT/North Dade	23	17.3%	87.0%	100.0%	78.3%
PHT/PET Center	8	4.4%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%
PHT/SFAN	107	8.1%	98.1%	100.0%	76.6%
UM-CAP	4	4.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%







#### **DISPARITIES IN TREATMENT OUTCOMES & RETENTION IN CARE**

#### **STRATEGY DV1.5 (Tx outcomes)**

Identify VL suppression vulnerabilities of RWP Part A/MAI Haitian Female (HF) MCM and OAHS clients and address them with specific interventions: Increase Haitian female VL suppression levels to 80% by CY 2021.

#### **Retention in Care**

Data included for continuity.

## HAITIAN FEMALES BY MCM SUBRECIPIENT, FY 2019-20

MCM Site	Total	% Total	% RiC	% On ARVs	% VLS
All RWP Haitian Female					
Clients	386	5.8%	92.2%	99.5%	85.5%
AHF Coconut Grove	1	0.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AHF Homestead					
AHF Jackson North	20	6.6%	90.0%	100.0%	85.0%
AHF Liberty City	2	1.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AHF Miami Beach	1	0.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Borinquen	53	10.4%	86.8%	100.0%	86.8%
CR Little Havana					
CR Miami Beach					
CR Midtown	36	2.8%	83.3%	100.0%	91.7%
Citrus					
CHI	18	5.5%	88.9%	100.0%	77.8%
Empower U	21	9.5%	100.0%	95.2%	85.7%
Jessie Trice	11	7.6%	100.0%	100.0%	81.8%
МВСНС	59	7.8%	91.5%	100.0%	88.1%
PHT/North Dade	26	19.5%	100.0%	100.0%	76.9%
PHT/PET Center	6	3.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PHT/SFAN	130	9.9%	94.6%	99.2%	85.4%
UM-CAP	2	2.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%







## Thank you! Any questions?

### **Contact Us**

Robert Ladner, Ph.D., President

<u>rladner@behavioralscience.com</u>

305-443-2000 ext 110

Petra Brock, M.S., Director of Research

pbrock-getz@behavioralscience.com 305-443-2000 ext 108

Clarice Evans, M.A., Quality Management Research Associate

cevans@behavioralscience.com

305-443-2000 ext 103

Behavioral Science Research Corporation 2121 Ponce de Leon Blvd, Suite 240 Coral Gables, FL 33134





