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Introduction

- Medicaid program history
- Dental Medicaid
  - <1% Medicaid budget in Texas
  - Small component of Medicaid in other states
- Texas Medicaid program made national news in 2004
  - *Frew v. Hawkins*
Background

• No published baseline in Texas
  ➢ Unpublished study in 1994

• Studies have been done in other states (CA, IA, OH, WA, LA, NC)
  ➢ Summary of studies
Objectives

- Evaluate perceptions and attitudes towards the Texas Medicaid program.
  - Sources of provider dissatisfaction
- Compare to other dental Medicaid programs
- Baseline for evaluating the effect of program changes that may result from consent decree
Materials and Methods

- **Self-administered mailed survey**
  - Pilot study ($800 budget – mostly postage)
- **Selection criteria**
  - Texas licensing database
  - Age, activity, form of practice
- **Sample size 500 of 7,768**
  - Census of all pediatric dentists (N=205)
  - Sample of active full-time general dentists
Questionnaire Design

- Medicaid activity level
  - Enrolled, active, and highly active providers
- Years of practice $\approx$ 2004 - graduation year
- Sources of dissatisfaction
- General dentist vs. pediatric dentist
Results

- Overall response rate (RR) 69% (347/500)
- Pediatric dentist RR of 57% (169/205)
- General dentist RR of 29% (171/295)
- 62% of pediatric dentists and 53% of general dentists (p<.0001) treated at least one Medicaid patient in the past year
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Dentists</th>
<th>Pediatric Dentists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolled Provider</strong></td>
<td>54% (92/171)</td>
<td>90% (152/169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Provider</strong></td>
<td>29% (49/171)</td>
<td>57% (94/169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt;10% time (p&lt;.05)</strong></td>
<td>17% (29/171)</td>
<td>48% (81/169)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

- Years practiced ranged from 1 to 39 (mean=16.8 ± 9.65)
- Recently graduated more likely to be active providers than others (p<.05)
  - Similar in other states
- 67% file claims electronically
Sources of Dissatisfaction

• General dentists more dissatisfied than pediatric dentists in the following areas:
  ➢ Slow payment*
  ➢ Denial of payment*
  ➢ Patient noncompliance*
  ➢ Complicated paperwork*

*p<.05
## Proportion of Active Provider Office Visits by Medicaid Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% time spent</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Dentists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 to 20%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 to 50%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pediatric Dentists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 to 20%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 to 50%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

- Points of dissatisfaction among all providers
  - 1. Broken appointments Patient-related
  - 2. Low reimbursement Programmatic
  - 3. Patient non-compliance Patient-related
  - 4. Denial of payment Programmatic
  - 5. Slow payment Programmatic

- Similar in other states
### Rank-Ordered Dentists’ Sources of Dissatisfaction with Dental Medicaid Programs: A Comparison of Six Statewide Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low reimbursement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken appts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. noncompliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow payments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of payments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior approval</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of Study

- Relatively small sample size
- No follow-up of non-responses
  - Sampling bias could exist
- Did not identify underserved areas (HPSA)
Similarity Between Sample And Population

- Licensure database listed year of graduation from dental school
  - Estimated years of practice (2004-YOG)
  - Compared mean years of practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of mean years of practice</th>
<th>Mean diff</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p (t=0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resp. vs. Non-resp.</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. vs. Population</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample vs. Population</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• Activity level and provider dissatisfaction similar to those of other states

• Perceptions and attitudes different between active and inactive/non-providers
  ➢ Patient noncompliance, complicated paperwork

• Level of participation differed between pediatric dentists and general practitioners
Conclusions

• Newer providers more likely to participate
• Specific details outlined in *Frew vs. Hawkins* consent decree need further investigation.
• Repeat study with larger budget
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