

2017 - 18 ANNUAL REPORT



HIV

CONSUMER

ADVOCACY

PROJECT

WHAT IS HCAP?



The **HIV Consumer Advocacy Project (HCAP)** assists people living with HIV/AIDS who experience difficulty accessing services from:

- ❖ Ryan White-funded programs located in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin Counties
- ❖ Agencies funded by the San Francisco Department of Public Health's HIV Health Services.

HCAP is the only program in the U.S. created to specifically undertake this function.



QUALIFYING FOR HCAP SERVICES



- ❖ **Consumer living with HIV/AIDS;**
- ❖ **Accessing or trying to access services from a program receiving Ryan White CARE funds or SF DPH's HIV Health Services; and**
- ❖ **Residing in San Francisco, San Mateo, or Marin County**

HCAP ORIGINS



HCAP was created by the HIV Health Services Planning Council to:

- ❖ Provide consumers an advocate who can help them navigate services**
- ❖ Mediate disputes between consumers and providers**
- ❖ Provide appropriate referrals to consumers**
- ❖ Assist service providers by removing barriers to service**

ASSISTING SERVICE PROVIDERS



HCAP works with service providers by:

- ❖ **Providing technical assistance**
- ❖ **Receiving direct referrals from service providers**
- ❖ **Work with service providers or directly with consumers to resolve issues affecting the consumer's quality of life**

HOW TO CONTACT HCAP



HCAP is currently housed at AIDS Legal Referral Panel (ALRP) at 1663 Mission St, Ste 500.

Consumers and staff from organizations can reach the HCAP Consumer Advocate by calling (415) 701-1200 ext. 322 or by emailing jeremy@alrp.org.

CONSUMERS SERVED

- ❖ 93 unduplicated consumers with a total of 131 HCAP matters during the 2017 – 18 contract year.
- ❖ Previous years:
 - ❖ 77 unduplicated consumers in 2016 – 17
 - ❖ 86 unduplicated consumers in 2015 – 16
 - ❖ 73 unduplicated consumers in 2014 – 15
 - ❖ 81 unduplicated consumers in 2013 – 14
- ❖ 3 cases were in Marin County, 2 cases were in San Mateo County, 126 cases were in San Francisco.



SELF-REPORTED CONSUMER DATA

GENDER	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
Male	83% (77)	87% (67)	83% (71)	81%	80%
Female	11% (10)	9% (7)	3% (3)	15%	14%
Transgender Female	5% (5)	4% (3)	12% (10)	4%	6% (combined)
Other/Decline to State	1% (1)	0%	2% (2)	0%	0%
Transgender Male	0%	0%	0% (0)	0%	6% (combined)

AGE	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
0-20	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0%	Not Counted
21-30	2% (2)	5% (4)	12% (10)	8%	Not Counted
31-40	14% (13)	12% (9)	12% (10)	15%	9%
41-50	24% (22)	18% (14)	30% (26)	34%	40%
51-60	49% (46)	44% (34)	30% (26)	32%	52%
61+	11% (10)	21% (16)	14% (12)	10%	Not Counted
Unknown/Decline to State	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	1%	Not Counted

RACE/ETHNICITY	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
White	59% (47)	51% (39)	45% (39)	56%	37%
Latino/a	23% (21)	23% (18)	14% (12)	18%	19%
African American/Black	20% (16)	18% (14)	26% (22)	19%	30%
Mixed Race	6% (5)	8% (6)	5% (4)	6%	6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3% (2)	4% (3)	3% (3)	1%	3%
Native American	1% (1)	3% (2)	0% (0)	0%	4%
Native Hawaiian	3% (2)	0% (0)			
Other/Unknown	9% (7)	3% (2)	9% (8)	10%	9%

SELF-REPORTED CONSUMER DATA

SEXUAL ORIENTATION	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
Gay/Lesbian	66% (61)	61% (47)	64% (55)	60%	66%
Heterosexual	17% (16)	16% (12)	10% (9)	23%	21%
Bisexual	8% (7)	10% (8)	16% (14)	10%	7%
Other/Decline to State	3% (3)	8% (6)	9% (8)	7%	5%

ANNUAL INCOME	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
Under \$15,000	80% (74)	77% (59)	78% (67)	82%	97%
\$15,001 - \$26,000	11% (10)	6% (5)	10% (9)	12%	Not counted
\$26,001 - \$30,000	0% (0)	1% (1)	1% (1)	0%	Not counted
\$30,001 - \$45,000	3% (3)	8% (6)	5% (4)	0%	Not counted
\$45,001 - \$50,000	2% (2)	0% (0)	0 (0)	3%	Not counted
Over \$50,000	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	0%	Not counted
Unknown/Decline to State	4% (4)	8% (6)	5% (4)	3%	Not counted

HCAP consumers are increasingly extremely low income.

- ❖ 80% of 2017-18 HCAP consumers report their yearly income us under \$15,000
- ❖ 91% reported income below \$26,000
- ❖ A large number of HCAP consumers rely primarily on Supplemental Security Income and/or Social Security Disability

SERVICE CATEGORY

SERVICE CATEGORY	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
Housing	27% (35)	27% (24)	30% (32)	32%	22%
Request for Assistance	See Consumer Issues	20% (18)	26% (28)	<i>Not counted</i>	<i>Not counted</i>
Primary Medical	13% (17)	18% (16)	11% (12)	15%	24%
Dental	18% (23)	12% (11)	10% (11)	8%	11%
Case Management	15% (19)	11% (10)	18% (19)	27%	17%
Social Support	9% (12)	11% (10)	4% (4)	7%	4%
Benefits Counseling	1% (1)	7% (6)	0% (0)	3%	1%
Food	2% (3)	6% (5)	5% (5)	7%	2%
Money Management	5% (7)	4% (4)	2% (2)	0%	4%
Emerg. Financial Assist.	9% (12)	4% (4)	0% (0)	6%	4%
Residential Substance Use	4% (4)	3% (3)	4% (4)	3%	2%
Hospice	1% (1)	1% (1)	2% (2)	0%	1%
Mental Health	3% (4)	0% (0)	3% (3)	11%	7%
Legal	2% (2)				
Other	1% (1)				

- ❖ Some consumers received assistance in more than one service category
- ❖ Emergency financial assistance includes housing (7) and non-housing (5) purposes

TYPE OF ISSUE

TYPE OF ISSUE	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
Quality of Care	36% (47)	37% (33)	34% (36)	22%	16%
Assistance Sought by Provider	12% (16)	20% (18)	26% (28)	7%	4%
Termination From Services	18% (23)	11% (10)	16% (17)	12%	6%
Access	22% (29)	10% (9)	4% (4)	15%	11%
Problematic Policy or Procedures	12% (16)	8% (7)	14% (15)	23%	17%
Eligibility	1% (1)	6% (5)	4% (4)	8%	4%
Non-Engagement with Regard to Grievance/Complaint	0% (0)	2% (2)	4% (4)	8%	2%
Miscommunication	12% (16)	2% (2)	7% (8)	15%	13%
Information and Referral	14% (18)	2%(2)	2% (2)	<i>Not counted</i>	<i>Not counted</i>
Failure to Observe Procedures	3% (4)	1% (1)	1% (1)	10%	2%
Confidentiality	1% (1)	0% (0)	4% (4)	6%	2%
Cultural Sensitivity	1% (1)	0% (0)	3% (3)	7%	3%
Billing	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (2)	<i>Not counted</i>	<i>Not counted</i>

- ❖ Some consumers have more than one issue per case
- ❖ “Termination From Services” includes suspension from services
 - ❖ 7% increase
- ❖ “Access” and “Information and Referral”
 - ❖ 12% increase in each
 - ❖ Many consumers did not know what services were available or that there are a number of providers in certain categories

SERVICE CATEGORY & ISSUE NOTES



Housing (35 cases)

- ❖ Remained at 27% but total cases increased
- ❖ Issues related to housing
 - ❖ *10 cases requesting help in accessing housing*
 - ❖ *5 requests for assistance from housing providers*
 - ❖ *1 eligibility issue*
 - ❖ *3 termination/suspension of services*
 - ❖ *3 allegations that service provider(s) failed to follow their own policy and procedures*
 - ❖ *12 cases with alleged problematic policies and procedures*
 - ❖ *12 cases involving quality of care*
 - ❖ *6 cases involving miscommunications*

SERVICE CATEGORY & ISSUE NOTES



Dental (23 cases)

- ❖ Increased to 18% from 12% in the 2016-17
- ❖ Issues related to dental
 - ❖ *7 cases requesting help in accessing dental services*
 - ❖ *1 case where the consumer felt there was a lack of cultural sensitivity*
 - ❖ *3 cases involving miscommunications*
 - ❖ *3 cases involving problematic policies and procedures*
 - ❖ *9 cases involving quality of care received*
 - ❖ *1 case of the agency failing to observe their own policies and procedures*
 - ❖ *10 cases of termination/suspension*

SERVICE CATEGORY & ISSUE NOTES

Case Management (19 cases)

- ❖ Increased by 4%
- ❖ 10 Medical Case Management
- ❖ 9 Non-Medical Case Management
- ❖ Issues related to case management
 - ❖ *2 cases involving quality of care received*
 - ❖ *4 cases were requests for assistance from the provider*
 - ❖ *1 case involving confidentiality*
 - ❖ *4 cases involving access to services*
 - ❖ *1 case involving problematic policy and procedures*
 - ❖ *4 cases of termination/suspension*

SERVICE CATEGORY & ISSUE NOTES



Primary Medical Care (17 cases)

- ❖ Dropped by 5%, but still in top four
- ❖ All cases involved ambulatory/outpatient medical
- ❖ Issues related to primary medical care
 - ❖ *2 cases were requests for assistance from the provider*
 - ❖ *1 case involved a miscommunication*
 - ❖ *14 cases involved quality of care received*
 - ❖ *2 cases of termination/suspension of services*
 - ❖ *1 case of misconduct*
 - ❖ *1 case where the agency allegedly failed to observe policy and procedures*

SERVICES RENDERED

SERVICES RENDERED	2017-18
Advice: Misc/Other	6% (8)
Advice: Request for a change in policy	5% (7)
Advice: Request for accommodations	7% (9)
Advice: Request for investigation	6% (8)
Advice/Consultation	63% (83)
Filing Grievance	13% (17)
Info: Agency policy and procedures.	48% (63)
Info: Legal rights and duties	14% (18)
Info: Misc/Other	9% (12)
Mediation	3% (4)
Referral: Alternative service providers	6% (8)
Referral: SF Human Rights Commission	1% (1)
Referral for Legal Services	8% (11)
Representation in meeting	7% (9)

- ❖ Some cases required more than one service to be rendered
- ❖ “Filing Grievance” includes appealing a suspension or termination

OUTCOMES

OUTCOMES	2017-18
Agency Action Rejected	1% (1)
Agency Action Sustained	5% (6)
Appeal of Initial Outcome	6% (8)
Case Still Pending	12% (16)
Grievance Filed	6% (8)
No Services Rendered	2% (2)
Services Rendered	86% (113)

- ❖ Some cases resulted in more than one outcome
- ❖ “Grievance Filed” includes appealing a suspension or termination

CONSUMER CHALLENGES



Mental Health & Substance Use

- ❖ Large number of consumers with mental health issues, substance use issues, or both
- ❖ Barriers to service
- ❖ Feel they are judged by service providers for their past
- ❖ Interactions with service provider may be negatively impacted
- ❖ Can impact housing
- ❖ Can impact participation in other services

CONSUMER CHALLENGES



Housing & Homelessness

- ❖ Ongoing crisis
- ❖ Percentage of cases stayed the same, but number of cases increased
- ❖ Causes difficulty:
 - ❖ *Keeping appointments*
 - ❖ *Following up on their cases*
 - ❖ *Maintaining good health*
- ❖ Increasing chance of homelessness due to:
 - ❖ Financial Issues
 - ❖ Mental Health Issues
 - ❖ Addiction
 - ❖ Behavioral Issues

CONSUMER CHALLENGES



Dental Services

- ❖ Lack of dental service providers, especially those that can do more complex work
- ❖ Service challenges
- ❖ Affordability of comprehensive care beyond the scope of the schools
- ❖ Termination is a scary possibility:
 - ❖ *Left without dental services*
 - ❖ *Limited amount of service providers*
 - ❖ *Limited amount of service providers offering complex services*

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

- ❖ 109 satisfaction surveys sent out
- ❖ In the process of sending surveys for the last quarter
- ❖ 27 surveys completed and returned (25% response rate)

<p>Overall Satisfaction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26 out of 27 respondents (96%) gave HCAP a 4 out of 4 satisfaction rating. • 1 out of 27 respondents (4%) rated HCAP 3 or below (out of 4).
<p>Cultural Sensitivity of Staff</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26 out of 27 (96%) consumers felt that staff was sensitive to their cultural identity and/or sexual orientation. • 1 out of 27 respondents (4%) left this question blank on their survey.
<p>Consumers' Stress/Worry About Their Issue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26 out of 27 respondents (96%) "felt better" (3 or 4) after contacting HCAP. • 1 out of 27 respondents (4%) left this question blank on their survey.

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Comments

- *“I feel as if we are old friends. As I have worked with you on many various deals and found the same courteous and professional and competence. Good work you guys.”*
- *“Very professional, courteous, and caring. Dependable, top notch, worthwhile. My number one choice for legal matters.”*
- *“[HCAP Staff] is amazing!”*
- *“[HCAP Staff] was fantastic – he solved my problems.”*

For HCAP assistance:

(415) 701-1200 x 322

Jeremy Tsuchitani-Watson

HCAP Advocate

1663 Mission Street, Ste 500

San Francisco, CA 94103

jeremy@alrp.org

