

Handout 1: Selecting CHPC Progress Indicators for 2022-2026 Plan

Indicators Selected at February and March QPM Meetings

Indicator	Description	2019 Baseline	2026 Goal
New HIV Diagnoses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people newly diagnosed with HIV 	220	
Knowledge of HIV Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of PLWH aware of their status 	91%	
Late Testers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of people presenting with or diagnosed with AIDS within 3 months of their initial HIV diagnosis 	29%	
Linkage to Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of newly diagnosed who attended a routine HIV care visit within 1 month of diagnosis 	87%	
Contact Tracing / Partner Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of newly diagnosed clients interviewed by DIS / Partner Services The percent of partners tested The percent of partners who test positive 	143 interviews 43 / 143 partners (30%) 10% tested positive	
Viral Load Suppression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of PLWH in care who are virally suppressed (<200 copies/mL) Percent of people with diagnosed HIV who are virally suppressed 	90% 74%	
Disparities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual number of new HIV diagnoses among: MSM, Black men and women, and Latino men and women Viral load suppression among MSM, Black MSM, Latino MSM, Black women, transgender women, people who inject drugs, and youth (13-24) 	See epi profile (15% decrease for previous plan)	

Different CHPC and NHAS Indicators: Which Should We Use?

CHPC Indicator	NHAS Indicator	Rationale for Each Indicator
<p><u>PrEP-to-Need Ratio</u>: The number of people taking PrEP divided by the number of people newly diagnosed with HIV.</p>	<p><u>PrEP Coverage</u>: Percent of people with indications for PrEP who have been prescribed PrEP.</p>	<p>NHAS Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator is easier to understand <p>CHPC Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator is based on actual data (vs. estimates) RI and MA also using PrEP-to-Need Ratio NHAS estimate is not accurate at the state level

Handout 1: Selecting CHPC Progress Indicators for 2022-2026 Plan

CHPC Indicators with No Comparable NHAS Indicators: Which Should We Include in the 2022-2026 Plan?

CHPC Indicator	Reasons for Keeping Indicator	Reasons for Not Including or Revising Indicator
<u>HIV Testing</u> : Percent of positive HIV tests from: state-funded routine testing programs, and state-funded targeted testing programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing is a key strategy in reducing late testers and linking people to care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to understand what indicator means Only for state-funded testing programs Provides limited guidance for improving testing
<u>Syringe Services Program (SSP)</u> : Number of SSP clients served, number of syringes distributed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key strategy in reducing new diagnoses among people who inject drugs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be more appropriate as a performance measure for the SSP strategy
<u>STIs</u> : Total number of syphilis cases, number investigated, number referred to PrEP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of syndemic approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could add other STIs (new STI Coalition will focus more broadly on STIs)
<u>Hepatitis C</u> : Number of newly diagnosed chronic Hep C infections.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of syndemic approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Additional Indicators: Should We Include in the 2022-2026 Plan?

Potential Indicator	Reasons for Adding Indicator	Reasons for Not Adding Indicator
<u>Substance Use</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DPH dashboard has data on overdoses and overdose deaths CT School Health Survey has data on substance use among high school students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of syndemic approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The School Health Survey has traditionally had a low response rate, so may not be an accurate measure. There is pending legislation that would require selected schools to participate, so this measure may improve in the future.

Indicators in Development:

- Housing Stability – discussed at March meeting; will revisit after the new indicator is finalized.
- Not in Care – new analyses being conducted by DPH this spring; plan a QPM presentation and discussion later in 2022.