#### 2017-2021 Comprehensive Plan for HIV Prevention and Care Services

#### **Evaluation Workgroup**

3:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 14, 2020

Meeting Location: Online or via phone – Please do not come in person

Join Zoom Meeting by clicking on this link: <a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83066500277">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83066500277</a>

Meeting ID: 830 6650 0277

Passcode: Ryanwhite

To join via telephone call: (346) 248-7799, then enter 674043748

#### **AGENDA**

#### Goal of Today's Meeting:

Continue evaluation of Year 3 (2019) Comprehensive Plan implementation

I. Call to Order Nick Sloop and Steven Vargas,

A. Welcome and Introductions

Co-Chairs

B. Moment of Reflection

C. Adoption of the Agenda

D. Approval of the Minutes

II. Review Year 3 (2019) Comprehensive Plan Implementation

Amber Harbolt, Health

Planner, Office of Support

A. Develop Year 3 Evaluation Conclusions

1. Review Objective and Benchmark Measures

III. Next Meeting

Nick Sloop and Steven Vargas,

A. Mon. 10/19 @ 2:30p – Any remaining evaluation activities

Co-Chairs

1. May be cancelled if all activities are completed on 10/12 and 10/14

IV. Announcements

V. Adjourn

<sup>•</sup> Harris County Public Health

# 2019 Comprehensive Plan Objectives & Benchmarks

## System Objective Evaluation Tool

Obj	ective to Be Measured	Recommended Data Source (Reference)	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
*	OBJECTIVE 1: Number of new HIV diagnoses in the Houston Area	TDSHS eHARS	1,386 (2014)	≤1,157	1,350 (2018)	× Not met	↓ at least 25% to ≤1004 (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
*	OBJECTIVE 2: Percentage of newly diagnosed individuals identified through <i>targeted</i> HIV testing who are informed of their HIV+ status	HHD, TDSHS HIV Testing & Awareness Data	97.2% (2015)	97.2%	90.4% (2018)	Pending request	Maintain or increase ≥97.2% (local target)	Region is Houston/Harris County for HHD; EMA for TDSHS Target exceeds NHAS 90% goal; TDSHS only, HHD not reflected
*	OBJECTIVE 3: Proportion of newly-diagnosed individuals linked to clinical care within one month of their HIV diagnosis	TDSHS Linkage to Care Data	66% (2015)	77.4%	60% (2018)	<b>★</b> Not met	↑ to at least 85% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
*	OBJECTIVE 4.1: Percentage of new HIV diagnoses with an HIV stage 3 diagnosis within one year	TDSHS Late Diagnoses Data	25.9% (2014)	22.0%	23% (2017)	× Not met	↓ at least 25% =19.4% (DHAP target)	Region is EMA
*	OBJECTIVE 4.2: Percentage of new HIV diagnoses with an HIV stage 3 diagnosis within one year among Hispanic/Latino men age 35 and up	TDSHS Late Diagnoses Data	36% (2014)	30.6%	HL: 29.7% Male: 23.9% 35+: 13.1% (2017)	✓ Met	↓ at least 25% = 27% (local target)	Region is EMA
*	OBJECTIVE 5: Percentage of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients who are in continuous HIV care (at least two visits for HIV medical care in 12 months at least three months apart)	CPCDMS	75.0% (2014)	84%	74.8% (2019)	× Not met	↑ to at least 90% (NHAS target)	
*	OBJECTIVE 6: Percentage of individuals with diagnosed HIV in the Houston Area who are retained in HIV medical care (at least two documented HIV medical care visits, viral load or CD4 tests in a 12 month period)	TDSHS Retention Data	61% (2014)	78.4%	68% (2018)	× Not met	↑ to at least 90% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
*	OBJECTIVE 7: Proportion of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients who are virally suppressed	CPCDMS	80.4% (2014)	≥80.4%	77.4% (2019)	× Not met	Maintain or increase ≥80.4% (local target)	
*	OBJECTIVE 8: Percentage of individuals with diagnosed HIV in the Houston Area who are virally suppressed	TDSHS Viral Suppression Data	55% (2014)	70%	59% (2018)	* Not met	↑ to at least 80% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
*	OBJECTIVE 9: Number of gay and bisexual men of color and women of color receiving pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) education each year	HHD	2,822 (2017)	≥2000		Pending request	≥2000 (local target)	Among HIV-negative clients seen by HHD frontline staff (i.e. DIS and SLWs) and HHD-funded contractors

## Prevention and Early Identification Benchmarks

Benchmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data Source (Reference)	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
❖ BENCHMARK 1: Number of new HIV diagnoses in the Houston Area	TDSHS eHARS	1,386 (2014)	≤1,157	1,350 (2018)	× Not met	↓ at least 25% to ≤1004 (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
❖ BENCHMARK 2: Number of HIV/STD brochures distributed	HHD	88,700 (2014)	88,700		Pending request	Maintain =88,700 (local target)	Region is Houston/Harris County
❖ BENCHMARK 3: Number of publicly-funded targeted and routine HIV tests							Region is Houston/Harris County for HHD; EMA for TDSHS
	HHD, TDSHS HIV Testing & Awareness Data	10,109 (2015)	10,109	6,805 (2018)	Pending request	Maintain = 10,109 (local target)	TDSHS only, HHD not reflected
	HHD, TDSHS HIV Testing & Awareness Data	117,610 (2015)	117,610	98,429 (2018)	Pending request	Maintain = 117,610 :(local target)	TDSHS only, HHD not reflected
BENCHMARK 4: New diagnoses positivity rate for publicly-funded targeted HIV testing	HHD, TDSHS HIV Testing & Awareness Data	1.76% (2015)	1.76%	1.54% (2018)	× Not met	Maintain = 1.76% (local target)	Region is Houston/Harris County for HHD; EMA for TDSHS;
❖ BENCHMARK 5: Percentage of newly diagnosed individuals identified through targeted HIV testing who are informed of their HIV+ status	HHD, TDSHS HIV Testing & Awareness Data	97.2% (2015)	97.2%	90.4% (2018)	Pending request	Maintain or increase ≥97.2% (local target)	Region is Houston/Harris County for HHD; EMA for TDSHS Target exceeds NHAS 90% goal TDSHS only, HHD not reflected

## Prevention and Early Identification Benchmarks

Benchmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data	Baseline	2019	2019	Met?	2021 Not	es
	Source	(year)	Target	Measure		Target	
A PRINCE AND COMMENT OF THE PRINCE AND COMME	(Reference)	25.00				1	D : : DX
SENCHMARK 6:	TDSHS Late Diagnoses	25.9%	22.0%	23%	× Not met	↓ at least 25% =19.4%	Region is EMA
Percentage of new HIV diagnoses with an HIV stage 3 diagnosis within one year	Data	(2014)		(2017)		(DHAP target)	
♦ BENCHMARK 7:	TDSHS Linkage to Care	66%	77.4%	60%	× Not met		Region is EMA
Proportion of newly-diagnosed individuals linked to clinical care within one month of their	Data	(2015)	77.470	(2018)	- Not met	(NHAS target)	Region is LIVIA
HIV diagnosis		(2010)		(2016)		(111111) tangety	
♦ BENCHMARK 8:	CPCDMS	80.4%	≥80.4%	77.4%	× Not met	Maintain or increase	
Proportion of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients who are virally suppressed		(2014)		(2019)		≥80.4%	
				(====)		(local target)	
♦ BENCHMARK 9:	TDSHS Viral Suppression		60%	59%	× Not met	T	Region is EMA
Percentage of individuals with diagnosed HIV in the Houston Area who are virally suppressed	Data	(2014)		(2018)		(NHAS target)	
♦ BENCHMARK 10:							
Number of new HIV diagnoses in high HIV/STD morbidity zip codes targeted for intervention							
1		:56	: 48	:		.↓25%	:
(77036 and 77074)	eHARS	(2014)	:	:	-	=42	:
C	·			<del>.</del>	*	(NHAS target)	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		:34 :(2014)	÷ 29	:		↓25% :=26	:
(77055 and 77051)	enaks :	.(2014)	:	:		(NHAS target)	:
Greater 5th Ward	 HHD,	28	 : 24			↓25%	<u> </u>
(77020 and 77026)	-	:(2014)	. <del>2 -</del> :	:		=21	:
(,	:		:	:		(NHAS target)	:
Acres Home	;HHD,	:32	: 27	,	,	:↓25%	,
(77088 and 77091)	eHARS	(2014)	:	:	:	=24	:
	:		:	:		(NHAS target)	:
		:26	: 22	:		:↓25%	:
(77006)	eHARS	(2014)	:	:		=20	:
				:		(NHAS target)	:
	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	:	:	: :	:	:	: :	
	:	:	:	:		:	
	:	:	:	:		:	:
	<u>:</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>:</u>	<u>.</u>	<u> </u>	<u>:</u>

## Prevention and Early Identification Benchmarks

Ber		Recommended Data Source (Reference)	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
*		HHD, STDMIS	CT: 600.4 GC: 184.1 P&S: 7.6 (2016)	CCT: 531.7 GC: 159.2 P&S: 7.3		Pending request Pending request Pending request	CT: =510.3 (local target) GC: ↓0.6%/ year =157.0 (local target) P&S: 6.7 (HP 2020 males target)	Region is Houston/Harris County CT/GC targets based on available historical data
*	BENCHMARK 12: Number of condoms distributed	ННО	450,000 (2014)	450,000		Pending request	Maintain =450,000 (local target)	Includes mass and targeted condom distribution efforts
*	BENCHMARK 13: Number of high-risk individuals that completed an evidence-based behavioral intervention to reduce risk for HIV	HHD	4,944 (2015)	4,944		Pending request	Maintain =4,944 (local target)	Includes completion of ILI or GLI intervention only (not CLI)
*	BENCHMARK 14:  Percentage of prevention and care staff receiving standardized pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) training	HHD, RWGA, TRG	100% (2017)	100%		Pending request	100% (local target)	
*	BENCHMARK 15: Number of MSM and transgender persons of color receiving pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) education	Project PrIDE	1,215 (2017)	2,000		Pending request	2,000 annually (local target)	Among HIV-negative clients seen by HHD frontline staff (i.e. DIS and SLWs) and HHD-funded contractors
*		HHD Project PrIDE, ECLIPS, Maven	68% (2017)	71.5%		Pending request	10% increase to 75% (local target)	Among HIV-negative clients seen by HHD frontline staff (i.e., DIS and SLWs) and HHD-funded contractors

# Gaps in Care/Reaching OOC Benchmarks

Ber	schmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data Source (Reference)	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
*	BENCHMARK 1: Proportion of PLWH with Unmet Need	TDSHS Unmet Need Data	25.0% (2014)	20.2%	(2018)	× Not met	↓ 1.6% annually =17.0% (local target)	Region is EMA Target based on available historic data (2010= 33.1%)
*	BENCHMARK 2: Proportion of newly-diagnosed individuals linked to clinical care within one month of their HIV diagnosis	TDSHS Linkage to Care Data	66% (2015)	77.4%	60% (2018)	× Not met	↑ to at least 85% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
*	BENCHMARK 3: Percentage of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients who are in continuous HIV care (at least two visits for HIV medical care in 12 months at least three months apart)	CPCDMS	75.0% (2014)	84%	74.8% (2019)	× Not met	↑ to at least 90% (NHAS target)	
*	BENCHMARK 4:  Percentage of individuals with diagnosed HIV in the Houston Area who are retained in HIV medical care (at least two documented HIV medical care visits, viral load or CD4 tests in a 12 month period)	TDSHS Retention Data	61% (2014)	78.4%	68% (2018)	× Not met	↑ to at least 90% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
*	BENCHMARK 5: Proportion of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients who are virally suppressed	CPCDMS	80.4% (2014)	≥80.4%	77.4% (2019)	× Not met	Maintain or increase ≥80.4% (local target)	
*	BENCHMARK 6: Percentage of individuals with diagnosed HIV in the Houston Area who are virally suppressed	TDSHS Viral Suppression Data	55% (2014)	70%	59% (2018)	× Not met	↑ to at least 80% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA

## Address Needs of Special Pops. Benchmarks

Benchmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data Source (Reference)	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
❖ BENCHMARK 1:					:		:
Number of new HIV diagnoses among each special population:			<u>:</u>			<u>:</u>	<u>:</u>
Youth (13-24)	TDSHS eHARS	360 (2014)	186	308 (2018)	× Not met	↓25% =70 (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
Homeless	HMIS (potential)	: 54 (2014)	46	: 39 (2018)	✓ Met	\$\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Region is Harris/Fort Bend County 2019 PIT Report – 2.9% homeless also PLWH. Applied to 2018 new dx
Incarcerated in Jail	TRG	Baseline to be established	:		Pending request	↓25% (NHAS target)	
Incarcerated in Prison	TDCJ	Baseline to be established			Pending request	↓25% (NHAS target)	
PWID	TDSHS eHARS	: 66 : (2014)	56	60 (2018)	× Not met	. ↓25% =50 (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
MSM	TDSHS eHARS	930 (2014)	791	919 (2018)	× Not met	↓25% = 698 (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
Transgender and Gender Non-conforming	HHD, HIV Surveillance System	20 (2016)	16		Pending request	↓25% =14 (NHAS target)	Region is Houston/Harris County
Women of Color	TDSHS eHARS	219 (2017)	205	246 (2018)	× Not met	\$\\ \pm25\% = 164\$ (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
Aging (50 and older)	TDSHS eHARS	45+ = 264 55+ = 88 65+ = 20 (2014)	45+=217 55+=72 65+=16	45+=303 $55+=112$ $65+=14$	➤ Not met ➤ Not met ✓ Met	$\downarrow 25\%$ 45 + = 198 55 + = 66 65 + = 15 (NHAS target)	Region is EMA

Address Needs of Special Pops. Benchmarks

Benchmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data Source	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
❖ BENCHMARK 2: Proportion of newly-diagnosed individuals within each special population linked to clinical care within one month of their HIV diagnosis	(Reference)						Where region is EMA, Baseline and 2019 measure reflects 3
Youth (13-24)	TDSHS Linkage to Care Data	74.0% (2014)	: : 80.6% :	81% (2018)	✓ Met	85% (NHAS target)	month linkage window Region is EMA
Homeless	Needs Assessment	53.9% (2016)	72.6%	45.2% (Unstable housing) 45.2% (Homeless) 2020	No set target	85% (NHAS target)	Region is HSDA Baseline: Unstable housing
Recently Released from Jail (*linked within 1 month of release)	TRG	Baseline to be established			Pending request	: 85% : (NHAS target)	Region is HSDA Harris County Jail only.
Recently Released from Prison (*linked within 1 months of release)	TRG	Baseline to be established			Pending request	85% (NHAS target)	Region is HSDA
PWID	TDSHS Linkage to Care Data	85.0% (2014)	.: .≥85.0%	76.9% (2018)	× Not met	85% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
MSM	: TDSHS Linkage to : Care Data		82.2%	79.2% (2018)	× Not met	: 85% : (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
Transgender and Gender Non-conforming	Needs Assessment	54.1% (2016)	72.7%	27.2% (2020)	× Not met	: 85% : (NHAS target)	Region is HSDA
Women of Color	TDSHS eHARS	81% (2017)	83%	82% (2018)	× Not met	85% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA
Aging (50 and older)	TDSHS eHARS	45+ = 83% 55+ = 85% 65+ = Not available (2014)	45+ = 85% 55+ = 85% 65+ = 85%	55+ = 75%	× Not met × Not me × Not me	85% (NHAS target)	Region is EMA

## Address Needs of Special Pops. Benchmarks

Benchmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data	Baseline	2019	2019	Met?	2021	Notes
	Source	(year)	Target	Measure		Target	
❖ BENCHMARK 3:	(Reference)			:	:		: NHAS 90% retention
Proportion of PLWH with unmet need within each Special Population	:	:		:	:		target
Youth (13-24)	TDSHS Unmet Need	24.0%	15.6%	23%	× Not met	10%	Region is EMA
	Analysis	(2014)	: :	: : (2018)	:	(NHAS target)	:
Homeless	TDSHS Unmet Need	60%	30%	48.3%	✓ Met	10%	Region is EMA
	Analysis	(2015)		(2018)	:	(NHAS target)	
Recently Released from Jail/Prison	TDSHS Minority AIDS	Local data not	·	Local data not	No 2019 target	10%	Region is HSDA
	Initiative Coordinator	available	:	available	specified	(NHAS target)	2014 NA = 11.9%
PWID	TDSHS Unmet Need	27.0%	16.8%	: 28%	× Not met	10%	Region is EMA
	Analysis	(2014)	:	(2018)		(NHAS target)	
MSM	TDSHS Unmet Need	25.0%	16%	: 24%	× Not met	10%	Region is EMA
	Analysis	(2014)		(2018)	:	(NHAS target)	
Transgender and Gender Non-conforming		17%	13.5%	:	Pending	10%	Region is HSDA
	: Consultant	(2017)			request	(NHAS target)	
Women of Color	TDSHS Unmet Need	To be developed		22.8%	No 2017 target	100/	Region is EMA
women of Color	: Analysis	To be developed		22.870	specified	(NHAS target)	Region is EMA
Aging (50 and older)	TDSHS Unmet Need	45+ = 24%	45+=14%	45+ = 25%	× Not met	10%	Region is EMA
	Analysis	55+ = 26%	55+ = 15%	55+ = 25%	× Not met	(NHAS target)	:
	:	. ` ′	65+ = 16%	65+ = 31%	× Not met	:	:
	:	65+ = 21%	:	:	:	: :	:
❖ BENCHMARK 4:	: HHD: RWGA; TRG	To be developed	Turnela andre	<u>:</u>	Donding	T11	Region is Houston/Harris
Percentage of grievances relating to cultural and linguistic competence received	HHD: KWGA; IKG	To be developed	Track only		Pending request	Track only	Count; EMA; HSDA
through the Ryan White grievance lines and the HHD prevention "warmline"					request		Count, Livin, Hobri
and website							

#### Coordination of Effort Benchmarks

Ве	nchmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data Source (Reference)	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
*	BENCHMARK 1: Proportion of Ryan White Planning Council members who are not employed at HIV care or prevention service providers	RWPC-OS FY Membership Roster (Program Terms Report)	19/37 (51%) (FY16)	46% - 56%	18/34 (53%) (FY19)	✓ Met	Maintain within 5 percentage points of 51% (local target)	
*	BENCHMARK 2: Number of non-HIV prevention and care service providers requesting information about HIV services	RWPC-OS	110 (2015)	>110	These data are not reliably collected	These data are not reliably collected;	Increase (local target)	Data cannot be reliability collected and therefore cannot be measured
*	BENCHMARK 3: Proportion of PLWH reporting barriers to using Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Core Medical Services	Needs Assessment	40.5% (2016)	<40.5%	56.6% (2020)	* Not met	Decrease (local target)	Baseline: Numerator = 203; Denominator = 501 Measure: Numerator = 312; Denominator = 551
*	BENCHMARK 4: Proportion of PLWH reporting barriers to using Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Support Services	Needs Assessment	20.2% (2016)	<20.2% (2016)	9.9% (2020)	✓ Met	Decrease (local target)	Baseline: Numerator = 93 Denominator = 461 Measure: Numerator = 55; Denominator = 551
*	BENCHMARK 5: Proportion of PLWH reporting barriers to outpatient alcohol or drug abuse treatment services	Needs Assessment	8.2% (2016)	<8.2% (2016)	10.8% (2020)	× Not met	Decrease (local target)	Baseline: Numerator = 10 Denominator = 122 Measure: Numerator = 15 Denominator = 139

#### Coordination of Effort Benchmarks

Ber	chmark to Be Measured	Recommended Data Source (Reference)	Baseline (year)	2019 Target	2019 Measure	Met?	2021 Target	Notes
*	BENCHMARK 6: Proportion of PLWH reporting barriers to professional mental health counseling	Needs Assessment	12.1% (2016)	<12.1%	10.2% (2020)	✓ Met	Decrease (local target)	Baseline: Numerator = 32 Denominator = 265 Measure: Numerator = 30 Denominator = 293
*	BENCHMARK 7: Proportion of PLWH reporting housing instability	Needs Assessment	25.6% (2016)	≤25.6%	32% (2020)	× Not met	Maintain / decrease =25.6% (local target)	Target based on current resources and planning
*	BENCHMARK 8: Percentage of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients with Medicaid or Medicare enrollment	CPCDMS	27% (2014)	>27%		Pending request	Increase (local target)	
*	BENCHMARK 9: Proportion of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients who may qualify for Medicaid or Medicare, but who are not enrolled in either program	CPCDMS	To be developed		determine who may be qualified for Medicaid or	RWGA cannot determine who may be qualified for Medicaid or Medicare	Decrease (local target)	RWGA cannot determine who may be qualified for Medicaid or Medicare
*	BENCHMARK 10: Percentage of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients with private health insurance (including Marketplace QHPs)	CPCDMS	10% (2014)	>10%		Pending request	Increase (local target)	Baseline to be updated
*	BENCHMARK 11: Proportion of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program who may qualify for an Advanced Premium Tax Credit, but who are not enrolled in an ACA Marketplace QHP.	CPCDMS	23% (2017)	<23%		Pending request	Decrease (local target)	6.3% of RW enrolled in QHP in 2015