



OMA Leader Compensation Policy FAQs

General Questions

What has changed in the OMA Leader Compensation Policy as compared to the previous policies?

The previous three compensation policies: Financial Matters – Council and Non-Board Committees Policy, Board Director Compensation Policy, and Funding for Constituency Groups Policy are all being replaced by a single OMA Leader Compensation Policy.

This new policy:

- Introduces a single hourly meeting honoraria rate of \$170/h, and a single travel honoraria rate of \$100/h which replace the previous tiered hourly meeting and travel honoraria rates.
- Introduces annual stipends for certain leadership positions, which include built in prep time to recognize the additional workload and responsibility for these roles.
- Creates a new constituency group funding model which represents a significant investment in the OMA's constituency groups.
- Provides reimbursement for reasonable accessibility and accommodation costs required to enable participation in OMA business.
- Ensures all OMA leaders are covered under OMA's Directors & Officers and Errors and Omissions insurance policies.

Why did we review the compensation model?

We reviewed the compensation model to ensure it reflects OMA's governance transformation and commitments to members. With new structures, charters, and role descriptions in place, compensation policies must evolve to match. As with all OMA policies and processes, compensation should be reviewed on a regular cadence to remain current and effective.

The review aimed to:

- Align with governance to reflect updated responsibilities and expectations.
- Promote fairness and equity by replacing the tiered system with consistent, equitable recognition.
- Steward member dues responsibly by balancing fair compensation with fiscal accountability.
- Reduce administrative burden by streamlining processes with standardized rates and stipends.
- Support recruitment and transparency by providing a predictable, transparent model that attracts and retains leaders.

How did we settle on the recommendation for a single base honoraria rate of \$170/h for all physician leaders as opposed to the current tiered honoraria system?

Several considerations informed this decision:

- Fairness and equity: Members told us they wanted compensation that reflects the work they do, not how many days they serve. Standardizing at a single rate removes inequities created by the tiered system.
 - Responsible stewardship of member's dues: At \$170/h, the rate is fair and competitive while keeping costs sustainable.
-

- Member impact: Currently, 94% of OMA leaders are paid at tier 1 (\$138/h). Standardizing at \$170/h gives most leaders a substantial increase, while maintaining consistency across all roles.
- Comparison between similar organizations: An environmental scan showed that \$170/h is in line with or better than what many comparable organizations are providing in compensation. Few comparable organizations compensate for travel, yet OMA continues to provide a separate \$100/h travel rate, making the overall package competitive.

What is the total scope of the policy and how many leaders (physician and public members) receive compensation for doing OMA work?

The review covers all elected and appointed physician and public member leadership roles across the OMA including board directors, constituency group executives (sections, districts, and fora), as well as physician leaders serving on committees, panels, task forces, and working groups. Subsidiary organizations and president roles are not included in this review. For context, 666 physician leaders received remuneration under the current policies for work done on behalf of the organization in 2024.

How did you decide which roles get stipends versus hourly pay?

We looked at the nature and predictability of the work. Roles with consistent, ongoing responsibilities (e.g., board directors, and members of NTF, PSC, and PPC) were best suited to stipends. Stipends recognize not just meeting attendance but also preparation, leadership and/or fiduciary responsibilities, and between-meeting work, while reducing administrative burden for both leaders and staff.

For other leadership opportunities where the workload is more variable or episodic (e.g., most committees, task forces, working groups, and constituency executives), hourly pay remains the fairest approach. This ensures flexibility while still compensating members equitably for their contributions.

How are you addressing the symbolic nature attached to whatever base rate we decided on? A rate that is too low may look like we are under valuing physician contributions and a rate that is too high could inadvertently incentivise the wrong behaviour like less clinical work.

We recognize that the base rate carries symbolic weight. If it's set too low, it risks sending a message that OMA undervalues physician leaders' contributions; if it's too high, it could create unintended incentives to prioritize OMA work over clinical practice.

That's why the \$170/h recommendation reflects a careful balance:

- Competitive but not excessive: The rate is aligned with comparable organizations and represents an increase for most leaders (94% currently earn \$138/h).
- Fairness and equity: It eliminates the tiered system that disproportionately rewarded frequent meeting attendance without necessarily reflecting greater responsibility.
- Recognition beyond meetings: Leadership roles with heavier workloads are compensated through stipends that include preparation time and additional responsibility, rather than inflating the base hourly rate.
- Stewardship: It ensures compensation is fair but sustainable, respecting that funds come from member dues.

How is prep time recognized in the new compensation model?

Prep time is recognized in two ways under the new model. First, most roles received a substantial increase to the base hourly rate, from \$138 to \$170, to better reflect the work including the preparation and between-meeting work that occurs across all physician leadership roles.

In addition, explicit prep time is built into stipends (or added for hourly roles) at 25% or 50% of meeting time, depending on the role. To further recognize the additional responsibilities, Chairs receive an extra 25% and vice-chairs an extra 12.5% of meeting time, reflecting the added leadership, coordination, and accountability expectations of those roles.

Will travel honoraria and expenses still be reimbursed?

Yes. For leadership roles travel honoraria and out of pocket expenses will be paid separately as they occur. For roles on stipend, these expenses are reimbursed outside of the stipend.

Why hasn't the compensation of the President, Past-President and President-Elect been included in the review?

We have begun reviewing these roles, but their duties and time commitments can vary significantly from year to year depending on the individual in the role and the issues facing the profession at the time. To ensure fairness, consistency, and transparency, we first need to review these roles. This will allow us to identify themes and trends across terms and set compensation that reflects the actual scope of the work.

The president and immediate past-president currently receive stipends, and we remain committed to reviewing those amounts as part of this process. We also intend to introduce a stipend for the president-elect. This work is currently underway.

There appears to be a preference for virtual meetings in the new compensation model, why is this?

The preference for virtual meetings reflects both member feedback and broader accessibility considerations, especially related to those meetings shorter in duration. Virtual participation makes leadership opportunities more accessible for those with family responsibilities, less flexible clinical schedules, or who live outside the GTA. It also reduces the time and costs associated with travel, making it easier for a broader range of members to participate.

At the same time, the model still supports in-person meetings where they are essential (e.g., full day meetings, negotiations, key bilateral sessions, or larger member meetings).

Stipends

Which roles will be moving to an annual stipend?

Annual stipends will be implemented for the Negotiations Task Force (NTF), the Physician Services Committee (PSC), the Physicians Payment Committee (PPC), board directors, board chair, board vice-chair and board committees. A partial stipend will be implemented for the Chair of the General Assembly Steering Committee (GASC) for their roles as board observer and member of the Governance and Nominating Committee.

How will stipends be paid?

Stipends will be calculated on an annual basis and will be paid in monthly installments.

How were stipend amounts calculated?

Based on preestablished meeting schedules we estimated annual meeting time. Prep time was added for each role as a percentage of total meeting time. The \$170/hour rate was then applied. Additional amounts were included for chair and vice-chair responsibilities.

What if actual workload is higher than the stipend assumes?

We will monitor meeting time and propose adjustments to stipends if work estimates are inaccurate or if exceptional circumstances cause a significant increase in workload.

Constituency Groups Funding

What's changing in the constituency group funding model?

A new constituency group funding model was created which provides constituency groups with three funding streams:

- Funded meeting time
- Flexible funding for work done outside of meetings
- Funding to support member engagement activities

A cap has been introduced on in-person meetings eligible for reimbursement of in-person expenses (travel time honoraria and out-of-pocket expenses). Meetings exceeding the cap are encouraged to be held virtually. The funding previously earmarked for in-person expenses has now been permanently allocated to other funding streams to better support constituency groups.

Flexible funding can be used for a wide variety of work required of constituency groups to fulfill their mandates and aligned with the new charters, including work outside of meetings.

A new member engagement funding stream was created and is a combination of the previous communication funding, AGM funding, and billing guide funding. This stream provides greater flexibility in how members can use their funding to engage with members including but not limited to:

- Travelling into the community to engage with members
- Hosting events including venue costs, food costs and speaker fees
- Hiring consultants or staff for tasks such as developing websites, billing guides or member facing communications

Fora have also been added to the constituency group funding model and will receive an annual allocation of funding in the same streams described above.

Why does it appear that smaller constituency groups are getting a greater increase in funding than larger ones?

Smaller sections and districts will receive proportionally more support than before, while larger groups will still have capacity through their executive size and meeting entitlements. Through the constituency review, we heard that smaller groups had insufficient capacity to do the work needed to best support members. That review resulted in more executive positions available to support constituency group work and this review ensures the new structure is properly funded.

The new constituency group funding model introduces a cap on in-person meetings. Why limit in-person meetings when some work is more effective face-to-face?

We agree there are times when face-to-face interaction is essential, for example, complex negotiations, high-impact discussions, or building relationships. The new model still supports in-person meetings in those cases.

What has changed is the unlimited entitlement to in-person meetings, which created inequities and higher costs in the old model. By capping the number of in-person meetings, we can rebalance resources into flexible funding and member engagement, ensuring every group has the capacity to do meaningful work.

Additionally unlimited in-person meetings created inequities and also introduced barriers to participation. Requiring travel can exclude members with family responsibilities, less flexible clinical schedules, or those living outside major urban centres. By capping in-person meetings and making virtual participation the default, we broaden access and ensure leadership opportunities are open to more physicians across Ontario.

What changes have been made to the funding of Medical Interest Groups and Branch Societies?

There have been no changes made to the funding of these groups as they have not yet been reviewed as part of the constituency governance review, and do not have new charters. Members will be paid at the new meeting and travel honoraria rates of \$170/h and \$100/h but the overall annual funding allocation for these groups has not changed.

Overall Impact

How will you address inequities that arise as this new policy is implemented?

To identify and address inequities we will:

- Track workload and participation, monitoring actual meeting time, prep and engagement across groups to ensure assumptions built into stipends and units remain accurate.
- Evaluate recruitment and retention, watching whether compensation changes affect the ability to attract and keep qualified leaders, especially from diverse specialties and regions.
- Engage members regularly, seeking feedback from physician leaders and constituency groups on how the model is working in practice.
- Review on a regular cadence, like all OMA policies, compensation will be revisited periodically to make sure it continues to be fair, competitive and sustainable.

Is it possible these changes will discourage members from taking on leadership roles that require heavy workloads?

The intent of the new model is the opposite, to make leadership roles more attractive by ensuring they are fairly and transparently compensated. Under the old system, preparation and between-meeting responsibilities were often unpaid or inconsistently recognized. The new model builds this into stipends for roles with heavier workloads (e.g., board, NTF, PSC, PPC), so the additional time and responsibility are explicitly valued.

How will you measure whether the new model is hurting or helping recruitment?

We will assess the impact of the new model by looking at both the number and diversity of applicants to leadership roles, as well as the overall quality of those applicants. If the pool of candidates continues to reflect a broad mix of specialties, practice settings, geographies, and career stages, it will suggest the model is supporting recruitment. We will also monitor retention and turnover, paying attention to whether leaders are choosing to stay engaged or stepping away due to concerns with compensation. Just as important, we will gather direct feedback from members and applicants to understand whether the model makes leadership roles feel more accessible, fair, and attractive. Together, these indicators will give us a clear picture of whether the model is helping or creating barriers and allow us to adjust if needed.

What's the plan if applications for certain committees drop off?

If we see a decline in applications for specific committees, we will first work to understand the cause, whether it is linked to compensation, workload, time commitments, or other factors. Compensation will be one area we monitor closely, and if evidence shows it is acting as a barrier, we will revisit stipends or entitlements to ensure the role remains attractive. At the same time, we will also strengthen recruitment strategies, clarify expectations, and highlight the value of leadership opportunities.