Texas Dentists' Attitudes Towards the Medicaid Program

Aaron Blackwelder, B.S.

Mentor Dr. Jay Shulman



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 Unpublished study in 1994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 ≈ 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

	General Dentists	Pediatric Dentists
Enrolled Provider	54% (92/171)	90% (152/169)
Active Provider	29% (49/171)	57% (94/169)
>10% time (p<.05)	17% (29/171)	48% (81/169)

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*



Proportion of Active Provider Office Visits by Medicaid Children

% time spent		n	%	
General Dentists		49	100%	
and the second	$\leq 10\%$	20	41%	
all all	>10 to 20%	11	23%	
and all a	>20 to 50%	9	18%	
and Turks	>50%	9	18%	
Pediatric Dentists		94	100%	
1112	$\leq 10\%$	13	14%	
2.2.2	>10 to 20%	10	10%	
1977-12	>20 to 50%	43	46%	
	>50%	29	31%	

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

Sources of Dissatisfaction	California 1990	lowa 1996	Ohio 1993	Washington 1998	Louisiana 1997		exas 4 2004
Low reimbursement	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Broken appts.	3	2	3	7	1	1	1
Pt. noncompliance	and the second	3			3		3
Paperwork	5	5	2	1	6	4	7
Slow payments	7	7	3	ES STAT	5	3	5
Denial of payments	2	4	a Seland		State and	5	4
Prior approval	6	9		5	8		10

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

Comparison of mean years of practice	Mean diff	Ċ	p (t=0)
Resp. vs. Non-resp.	80.0	0.065	ns
Resp. vs. Population	1.71	1.405	ns
Sample vs. Population	1.82	1.521	ns

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

Acknowledgements

 This study was supported by the Baylor Oral Health Foundation and the NIH/NIDCR DE07188

