

**MINUTES
COMMISSION ON HANDBOOK**

**Hilton St. Louis Airport Hotel
January 6–7, 2017**

9. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dr. Dale Sattgast, on January 6, 2017 at 8:00 a.m. with other voting members Ms. Heidi Abegg, Mr. David Hawk, Dr. Richard Nuffer, Dr. Dale Sattgast, and the Rev. David Totsky present. Advisory members Dr. George Gude, representative of the Commission on Constitutional Matters (CCM); Mr. Ronald Schultz, Chief Administrative Officer; and Dr. John Sias, Secretary of the Synod, were also in attendance.

10. Welcome

Chairman Sattgast thanked those in attendance and drew the commission's attention to the revised agenda emailed January 5 and handed out at the start of the meeting.

11. Opening Devotion

Dr. Richard Nuffer served as our meeting chaplain and led the commission in praying Responsive Prayer 2, basing his devotion on Matt. 2:1–12. He noted that this is the Epiphany of Our Lord and the numerous myths/stories surrounding the event. He emphasized that the real center and focus of the event is Christ and reminded us of the darkness of our sin and our need for the light of Christ and the forgiveness He offers. Living under Christ and in His light, we then can share the light of Christ with those around us. The hymn "As with Gladness Men of Old" was sung.

When the commission reconvened on Saturday at 8 am, after its Friday evening dinner recess, Dr. Nuffer led the Commission in praying Responsive Prayer 1, basing his devotion on Matt. 3:13–17. He spoke about the Baptism of Our Lord and how in this event we see what God had promised concerning the coming Messiah fulfilled. In Christ, our Lord, we see God's Word and promise "filled full." This is a powerful epiphany of our Lord when we are directed and pointed to the waters of Baptism. The hymn "On Jordan's Bank the Baptist's Cry" was sung.

12. Review / Adoption of the Agenda

The revised agenda was presented and reviewed. It was agreed to add an item regarding the publication of the *Handbook*. Time was allowed for personal introductions, and the agenda was adopted as amended.

13. Overview of Commission on Handbook (COH) portal and flash drive

Ron Schultz gave an overview presentation on the use and function of the commission's "portal" web site and flash drive, distributed to members, containing various historical documents. He handed out information about and demonstrated a process for searching the historical documents. The handout is posted on the portal under "instructions."

It was agreed that in the future the commission would use an electronic copy of the agenda. Individuals may print a copy for themselves if desired.

It was requested that commission members making a presentation to the commission provide their materials to Ron Schultz prior to meeting to allow the materials to be posted on the commission portal prior to the meeting.

It was noted that the agenda, in the future, needs to include an item for ratification of previous meeting minutes. Initial approval will be by e-mail consent, after a suitable review period, in order to expedite publication of the minutes.

14. Commission on Handbook Tracking Spreadsheet

Ron Schultz handed out a copy of the 2013–2016 COH Tracking Spreadsheet and a blank one for 2016–2019, explaining the format and use of the document.

15. COH Changes / Corrections for 2016 Handbook (COH Issue 16-001)

Dr. Sias led the commission in a review of convention actions, CCM opinions, and/or non-substantive editorial corrections requiring the commission's attention in the 2016 *Handbook*. A complete draft of the 2016 *Handbook* was presented to the commission, which incorporated all explicit constitutional and bylaw changes adopted by the convention (not listed here, but indicated in the red-lined 2016 *Handbook* published electronically by the commission) and which also indicated other points potentially requiring present or future actions. Those items acted upon for the 2016 *Handbook* are as follows:

- Bylaw 1.5.8: It was noted that the double-asterisked portions of Res. 12-11, as printed in *Today's Business* 2:382f., were not included in what the convention adopted (*Proceedings*, p. 233) and are therefore not to be included in the Bylaws.
- Bylaw 1.8.2: "Recission" was changed to the more common spelling, "rescission."
- Bylaw 1.10.4[f]: "Accuser" was changed to "complainant" and "accused" to "respondent," as appropriate to the dispute resolution (as opposed to expulsion) process (as recommended in CCM Op. 16-2799).
- Bylaw 1.10.5: A reference to dispute resolution policies of CUS schools was added, to read:

...so that it can be determined whether this is the appropriate bylaw procedure (Bylaw section 1.10) or whether the matter falls under Bylaw sections 1.8, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, or 2.17, or Bylaws 3.10.5.7.9, 3.10.6.7.1, and 3.10.6.7.5.2. In regard to this consultation:...
- Bylaw 1.10.15.3: It was determined, as a non-substantive change, to remove the phrase "administrate the hearing," as this is redundant with "chair the panel" and no longer preferred language (cf. Bylaw Sections 2.14–17) for the work of hearing facilitators.
- Bylaw 1.10.18.1[a]: The wording "of any organization owned or controlled by the Synod," inconsistent with 1.10.2, was changed to "of the Synod or an agency of the Synod" (prompted by the recommendation of CCM Op. 16-2799).
- Bylaw 1.10.18.1[f]: It was noted that the Appeal Panel does not call witnesses. The words "Appeal Panel" were deleted from this bylaw.
- Bylaws 1.10.18.1 [h][3] and 2.14.7.8 [k][5]: The modification adopted by the convention in Res 12-08 (*Proceedings*, p. 228) was modified to more clearly convey the facilitation of the hearing facilitator:

...may, through the hearing facilitator, also request resource materials and personal assistance from the executive director of the CTCR or from a theologian recommended by the executive director...
- Bylaw 2.11.2.2 [a]: Res. 12-03 directed the COH to implement changes to candidate status, and to remove non-candidate status. CCM Op. 16-2795 indicates the scope of these changes. Bylaw 2.11.2.2 [a] was therefore modified to read:

(a) A candidate may be continued on the roster for a period not to exceed ten years by act of the president of the district through which the person holds membership. A candidate may be further continued on the roster for a period not to exceed five additional years upon recommendation of the applicant's district president and approval of three fourths (75%) of the Council of Presidents.
- Bylaw 2.11.2.3: Res. 12-03 directed the COH to implement changes to candidate status, and to remove non-candidate status. CCM Op. 16-2795 indicates the scope of these changes. Former Bylaw 2.11.2.3 was removed.
- Bylaw 2.12.1.4: The *Proceedings* corrected the wording misprint in R11-13, to read:

A missionary or chaplain serving under a call by the Synod shall hold membership in the Synod through the district designated by the missionary or chaplain if approved by the president of that district after consultation with the president of the district through which membership is currently held and the Office of National Mission or the Office of International Mission, as appropriate.

- Bylaw 2.12.1.5: A change made by COH in the Nov. 19–20, 2014, meeting inappropriately included “a congregation or,” confusing the coverage of this bylaw with that of Bylaw 2.12.1.2. The commission removed this conflicting element, resulting in the reading:

An individual member of the Synod who is serving ~~a congregation or~~ an agency other than a district and other than a missionary or chaplain serving under call by the Synod shall hold membership...

- Bylaw 2.14.2 [a], [b]: The CCM recommended that the terminology be changed to avoid potential confusion of the use of “party.” The COH, in agreement, replaced “party,” in [a], with “member” and, in [b], with “person or congregation,” so as now to read:

The definitions of terms used in this bylaw are as follows:

(a) Accused: The member named by the accuser as being in violation of Constitution Art. XIII and under the procedural ecclesiastical supervision of Bylaw sections 2.14–2.17.

(b) Accuser: The person or congregation who accuses a member under the provisions of Constitution Art. XIII through the process of Bylaw sections 2.14–2.17.

- Bylaw 2.14.5–2.14.5.3, 2.14.6: The CCM has identified issues with the constitutionality of using referral panels as a mechanism of appeal for action and with referral panels in general. This is treated in the *Standard Operating Procedure Manuals* for affected bylaw sections, and so does not need to be indicated in the *Handbook*. These bylaws will be dealt with under the Res. 12-14 process, now underway.
- Bylaw 2.14.7.8 [e]: It was noted (CCM Op. 16-2799) that the accuser is no longer a “party to the matter,” but clearly should not communicate *ex parte* with the panel or its members. The lack of a prohibition of such is an oversight. The COH corrected the wording to read:

No party to the matter, nor the accuser, nor anyone on the party’s or accuser’s behalf, shall communicate either directly or indirectly with the panel or any member of the panel without the full knowledge of the other party to the matter.

- Bylaw 2.14.7.8 [g][1]–[2] and 2.14.7.8 [k]: The word “dispute” was changed to “matter” to bring language into conformity with the rest of the section, as opposed to that of Bylaw section 1.10 (as recommended in CCM Op. 16-2799).
- Bylaw 2.14.7.8 [k][5]: The term “lay reconciler” (as included by Res. 12-08) was changed to “individual member” (as in Bylaw 1.10.18.1 [h]) because of the change in the panel composition by R12-09.
- Bylaws 2.14.7.9 [a], 2.14.9.1: The words “the district president who/that imposed the suspension” were changed to “the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor,” the language preferred by Res. 12-05A.
- Bylaw 2.14.7.9 [b]: Bylaw 2.14.8 indicates that the President of Synod can only appeal a Hearing Panel decision when doctrine or practice is involved. To avoid a contrary understanding here, the commission added a bylaw reference, to read:

The decision of the Hearing Panel shall be subject to appeal by the accused, the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor, or the President of the Synod (as provided in Bylaw 2.14.8).

- Bylaw 2.14.8: The word “chairman” was altered to read “hearing facilitator,” who now chairs panels, and the language of Res. 12-05A was adopted, namely, to use “suspending ecclesiastical supervisor,” instead of “district president who imposed the suspension,” resulting in the reading:

The decision of the Hearing Panel may be appealed by the accused (if an active participant in the hearing before the Hearing Panel), by the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor, or by the President of the Synod if a question of doctrine or practice is involved (Constitution Art. XI B 1–3) within 15 days after receiving the decision. Such request for an appeal shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Synod with copies provided to the district president(s) of the accuser and the accused, the hearing facilitator of the Hearing Panel, the accuser, and the President of the Synod, and shall be accompanied by a written memorandum stating the basis for the request.

- Bylaw 2.14.8 [a]: The commission added “the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor” to the list of those who might initiate an appeal, as required by Res. 12-09 and Res. 12-05A, to read as follows:

Within 21 days after receipt of an appeal from the accused, the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor, or the President of the Synod, an Appeal Panel shall be selected by the Secretary of the Synod. The Appeal Panel shall be made up of three district presidents who shall be trained for such service.

- Bylaw 2.15.7.9 [a]: The commission removed a redundant phrase, “the president of the Synod who imposed the suspension,” and changed “his/her” to “the accuser’s” (to account for the possibility that a congregation might be the accuser), to read:

Copies of the decision shall be mailed to the accused, the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor, the accuser, and his/her district president, the Secretary of Synod, and the President of the Synod.

- Bylaw 2.15.7.9[b]: A reference, “(as provided in Bylaw 2.15.8),” was added to clarify that President of the Synod can appeal (as such) only in questions of doctrine or practice. Discussion noted that although Res. 12-09 added the ability of a suspending ecclesiastical supervisor to appeal for any reason in Bylaw sections 2.14 and 2.17, the same general appeal was not allowed the President of the Synod in this case.
- Bylaw 2.17.4: It was noted that the changes of Res. 12-04A to the consultation timeline (as effected in Bylaw 2.14.3) are inapplicable to the Bylaw 2.17 process.
- Bylaw 2.17.5–2.17.5.4, 2.17.6: The CCM has identified issues with the constitutionality of using referral panels as a mechanism of appeal for action and with referral panels in general. This is treated in the *Standard Operating Procedure Manuals* for affected bylaw sections, and so does not need to be indicated in the *Handbook*. These bylaws will be dealt with under the Res. 12-14 process, now underway.
- Bylaws 2.17.7.9, 2.17.8: R12-05A supersedes R12-09, yielding the language: “suspending ecclesiastical supervisor.”
- Bylaw 2.17.7.9[b]: A reference, “(as provided in Bylaw 2.17.8),” was added to clarify relation to 2.17.8, as above in Bylaws 2.14.7.9 / 2.14.8.
- Bylaw 2.17.8 [a]: As in 2.14.8, “the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor” was inserted to correct an inadvertent omission.
- Bylaw 3.1.6.2 [b]: Outdated (2004) language, “in the process of dispute resolution,” was replaced with “under formal proceedings (Bylaw 2.14.2 [j]),” the language appropriate to Synod’s present process.
- Bylaw 3.3.3.2[b]: The commission added “and expulsion” to process(es) administered by Secretary (as recommended in CCM Op. 16-2799).
- Bylaw 3.6.6.1: Noted were changes of Res. 7-03A and Res. 7-06B to the same section, in which “facilitating” takes precedence over “providing,” as well as details provided (as referenced) in Bylaw 3.10.6.7.3. The explicit reference, it was felt, clears up any perception of conflict between the sections.
- Bylaw 3.9.4.1 [1]: The commission clarified the bylaw language to be consistent with the sense of Res. 11-12 to indicate that the length of term applies to all members and not only to the attorneys, to read:

Of the five voting members, three shall be individual members of the Synod and two shall be attorneys. Terms of voting members shall be for six years, renewable once.

- Bylaw 3.10.6.5: The commission relocated the text adopted by Res. 7-02B as Bylaw 3.10.6.2 [9] (“Recognizing its fiduciary duty as a board...”) to its own bylaw paragraph, Bylaw 3.10.6.5.
- Bylaw 4.1.1.3[b][2]: The commission replaced the outdated “Department of Planning and Research” with “Department of Rosters, Statistics, and Research Services.”
- Bylaw 4.7.2: At the Synod level, regional board of director positions will now be handled through the nominations committee (Bylaw 3.12.2.8), rendering the prohibition of district nominating committees handling regional nominations (Bylaw 4.7.2) inconsistent. The commission brought Bylaw 4.7.2 into

congruity with the convention's action on Bylaw 3.12.2.8 (Res. Res. 11-05) by striking from Bylaw 4.7.2 the final phrase, "and any regional board of director positions," and inserting "and" before "vice-presidents." The CCM was asked to ratify this action of the COH.ⁱ

- Bylaw 4.7.4: Beginning with the 2004 *Handbook*, subparagraphs (1) and (2) were run into this bylaw paragraph; previously, they were printed as separate bullets, making clear that the last sentence ("However, districts may adopt bylaws setting such terms at six years instead of three years") applies *only* to (2), elected board and commission members, whose term is ordinarily three years. The more recent formatting suggests the above allowance might apply to (1), elected officers, appointed boards and commissions, as well—which conclusion would be incorrect. The commission acted to reformat this bylaw to make (1) and (2) separate paragraphs (as in pre-2004 *Handbooks*), with the final sentence clearly included in paragraph (2), to convey the accurate meaning.

16. Revised Handbook Index

Dr. Sias presented an initial draft of the revised index to the *Handbook* aimed at making the *Handbook* much more user friendly and less frustrating. The commission authorized the Secretary to replace the index to the *Handbook* with the new version in the upcoming electronic edition. It was also suggested that he should conduct field trials with *Handbook* users, soliciting and incorporating input into subsequent versions.

17. Request for Glossary (Re: "confusing terms like parish and member")

There was discussion about the need for a glossary or clarification of terms, *i.e.*, "parish," "member," "staff," *etc.* in order to clarify how terms are used within Synod. It was noted that it might be better to include such terms in the "Definition of Terms" section (Bylaw 1.2.1). While some terms have a clear definition via CCM opinions, *etc.*, others would necessitate a bit more work in determining usage and meaning. It was suggested that the terms be assigned individually for study to Commission members.

18. Other Matters / New Business (including matters referred by CCM's Handbook review)

Secretary Sias and CCM Chairman and Representative Gude also brought a number of issues which will require further study, development, and in some cases, convention action, before they can be addressed in the *Handbook*. These received "COH Issue" numbers, and were assigned as follows:

- Const. Art. II, etc.: "Member" is a *Handbook* term sometimes cited as confusing. It was considered sufficient, though, that attention be drawn to the definition of "Member of the Synod" in Bylaw 1.2.1 [I]. (COH Issue 16-008, determined not to be necessary)
- Const. Art. V, etc.: "Parish" is a *Handbook* term of various significations, which are sometimes confused. Clarification or definition may be helpful. (COH Issue 16-007, assigned to Totsky)
- Const. Art. V B, XII 10 B, and VI 3, 6: explicit lists in the Constitution of various classifications of ministers of religion—commissioned have proved problematic for consistency and maintenance. Could these be dealt with generally in the Constitution and defined more precisely in the bylaws? (COH Issue 16-009, assigned to Schultz)
- Const. Art. XII 9 c, etc.: The use of "(school)teacher" here does not account for a wide variety, today, of other types of ministers of religion—commissioned. The Constitution as a whole should be examined for such dated categories and language and perhaps a revision should be proposed. (COH Issue 16-010, assigned to Schultz)
- Const. Art. XII 10 B and Bylaw 4.2.3: Constitution and Bylaws, on the surface, at least, disagree on who is to attend district conventions as advisory members—an apparent disagreement that is as old as the invention of "associate pastors" but that is now exacerbated by the removal of "assistant pastors" from the list of advisory members in Const. Art. XII 10 B. The sense of Bylaw 4.2.3 seems to be correct, and perhaps its language should be incorporated into the Constitution, rather than the other way around. (COH Issue 16-011, assigned to Schultz)

- Bylaw 1.5.1.1: Here and elsewhere, “staff” is an unhelpfully vague term, raising interpretive questions about its scope. Should clarification be attempted? For comparison, “employees” is used in Bylaw 3.10.5.6[j]. (COH Issue 16-006, assigned to Schultz)
- Bylaws 1.10.5; 2.14.3; 2.17.3; 3.10.5.7.5, 8–9; 3.10.5.7.10[b][3]; 3.10.6.7.1; 3.10.6.7.5–3.10.6.7.5.2: There is a lack of clarity on which process(es) to follow, and in what order, in the case of faculty. CCM is working on *Standard Operating Procedure Manual* language, but a clarification in the bylaws might eventually be useful. (COH Issue 16-013, assigned to Gude, to report on CCM work)
- Bylaw 1.10.7.3: The Dispute Resolution Process timeline differs at this point from the Bylaw section 2.14–2.17 processes, despite the attempt of the 2016 convention to bring the processes into line. The language is subtly different and should be rendered clearer and either consistent or more purposefully distinct. (COH Issue 16-014, assigned to Hawk)
- Bylaw 1.10.10: Problems have become apparent with requirements, timeline, and procedures for reconciler appointment. The Secretary of the Synod is invited to work with the Council of Presidents (COP) to propose a solution. (COH Issue 16-015, assigned to Sias for work with COP)
- Bylaws 1.10.10–1.10.12: Bylaws suggest district reconcilers could be appointed to replace those called up to be Synod hearing facilitators—but this is impossible, given the present timeline and training requirements. The Secretary of the Synod is invited to work with the Council of Presidents to propose a solution. (COH Issue 16-016, assigned to Sias for work with COP)
- Bylaw 1.10.15: Members of the initial Dispute Resolution Panel should be excluded explicitly from being drawn for the Review Panel, as is the case in 2.14–2.17 processes. (COH Issue 16-002, assigned to Sias for wording)
- Bylaw 1.10.15: Bylaw 2.14.4.1 acknowledges that a district president may be disqualified from handling an expulsion case (although its application to the consultation phase is not particularly clear). If a dispute is *with a member’s district president* there should probably be allowance for someone else to conduct the consultation (CCM Op. 16-2799). (COH Issue 16-012, assigned to Sias for wording)
- Bylaws 2.8.1 [d] and 3.10.5.7.10 [h][1]: It was noted that possible clarification is needed as there is a possible inconsistency with between bylaw and practice as to the term “academic year.” Since this is beyond the purview of the COH responsibilities, Secretary Sias will bring this to the attention of Dr. Baneck, Executive Director of the Office for Pastoral Education.
- Bylaw 2.11.2.2 [c][4]: It was noted that “willingness to consider a call or appointment,” a criterion for continuance of candidate status the roster of synod, may appear to exclude many of those transferred by the convention from non-candidate to candidate status. Noting CCM Op. 16-2795, the commission referred the language dealing with candidate status qualifications to the Council of Presidents for potential clarification (as needed, with the help of COH). (COH Issue 16-026, assigned to Sias, to present to Council of Presidents)
- Bylaw section 2.12: Clarification is needed concerning who has ecclesiastical supervision of certain members. Should the district membership / ecclesiastical supervision distinction be preserved? What about “other workers” appointed by OIM who are not “missionaries or chaplains” (2.12.1.4) but should be treated the same? The Secretary of the Synod is invited to work with the Council of Presidents to propose a solution. (16-003, assigned to Sias for work with COP)
- Bylaw sections 2.14–2.17: Res. 12-14 requires changes to expulsion processes to account for a district president *or the President of the Synod* failing to act or declining to suspend (cf. CCM Op. 16-2791, 16-2797). Changes proposed by the Secretary under 2016 Res. 12-14 will have to be reviewed for consistency of language by the COH before their presentation to the Board of Directors for adoption. Subsequent to Board of Directors adoption, these changes will have to be incorporated in the *Handbook*. Thereafter, the official triennial edition can be published, electronically and in print. (COH Issue 16-004, assigned to Sias to deliver draft)

- Bylaw 2.14.7.9 [d][3] (and similar): The President of the Synod does not ordinarily adjust the roster, as Bylaw 2.14.7.9[d][3] and like bylaws seem to suggest. This should probably be removed, unless further “carrying out” is intended. Referred to CCM for study and suggestions. (COH Issue 16-017, assigned to Gude, for referral to CCM)
- Bylaw section 2.15: Res. 12-09 added the ability of a suspending ecclesiastical supervisor to appeal a panel decision in Bylaw sections 2.14 and 2.17 *for any reason*, but did not address Bylaw section 2.15, in which the President of the Synod (there, the suspending ecclesiastical supervisor) already had the right to appeal, but only in matters of doctrine or practice. This observation was referred to the CCM for study and confirmation.
- Bylaw 3.2.4 [c]: Inauguration of commission members on Sept. 1 is problematic, as they cannot possibly be appointed by that time. Formerly, inaugurations were staggered. The whole of Bylaw 3.2.4 probably requires examination. (COH Issue 16-018, assigned to Sattgast)
- Bylaws 3.2.5, 3.10.5.4, etc.: The treatment of seminary regent vacancies in Bylaw 3.10.5.4 does not include the member appointed by the COP. In general, vacancy language should be examined for coherence with (and possibly incorporation in and reference to) Bylaw 3.2.5. (COH Issue 16-022, assigned to Schultz)
- Bylaw 3.6.2.2.1[c]: There is probably a need to revisit standards for document retention and archival to account for the electronic era—and also a need to evaluate whether the required procedures are being carried out synodwide, to deposit required items into the archives (and to avoid deposit of non-required, historically useless items). Perhaps a new, uniform standard or clarifying policy would better serve the Synod and its archives, and should be reflected in the bylaws. (COH Issue 16-019, assigned to Sias, to draft with Schultz a letter to CHI inviting discussion and proposal)
- Bylaw 3.9.1.1: The Commission for Doctrinal Review meets “as often as necessary” (Bylaw 3.9.3.2) and was not (apparently) subject to the previous requirement of agencies (including commissions) to meet quarterly “unless otherwise specified.” New Bylaw 3.9.1.1 requires commissions (without an exception for as “otherwise specified”) to meet at least twice a year. How this applies to the Commission on Doctrinal Review should be clarified. (COH Issue 16-005, assigned to Gude)
- Bylaws 3.9.2.1.1, 3.9.4.1.1: Selection process language requires clarification. If two (or three) identical seats are open, is the President presented with two or three lists of five names, or one list of ten or fifteen? (Compare Bylaw 3.12.3.6[a] and common practice.) The language should be clear in this and possibly other respects. (COH Issue 16-020, assigned to Sias)
- Bylaw 3.10.5.2 [4]: The CCM has been asked to clarify “Appointed members may not vote on the appointment of other members to the board.” This language could be clarified, or a substantive change proposed. A forthcoming opinion, CCM 16-2805, may provide guidance on re-formatting, which should be addressed as soon as possible. (COH Issue 16-021, assigned to Abegg)
- Bylaws 3.10.5.5[e][2] and 3.10.6.4[e][2]: The phrase “surplus institutional funds above an adequate working balance” calls for clearer definition, best provided by the Board of Directors of Synod. It is noted the term “surplus funds” is also used (but with authority to clarify it granted) with reference to the Board of Directors of Concordia Publishing House in Bylaw 3.6.3 [e]. (COH Issue 16-023, assigned to Schultz to convey to LCMS Board of Directors)
- Bylaw 3.12.2.1 [b]: Ties can involve *many* additions. This is an issue properly to be addressed by the Res. 11-10 Nominations and Elections Task Force. (assigned to Sias to communicate to Res. 11-10 Nominations and Elections Task Force)
- Bylaw 3.12.3.6: CCM Op. 16-2799 suggests that COH incorporate into Bylaws aspects of Res. 11-14: “Resolved, that the Bylaw 3.2.5 committee selected by the CCN be empowered to act on behalf of and in the name of the CCN for actions needed subsequent to the issuing of the CCN’s final report prior to the convention.” Res. 11-10 Task Force on Nominations and Elections may be bringing proposals to Bylaw

Section 3.12. COH will check to see that this language is properly incorporated. (COH Issue 16-024, assigned to Sias to communicate to Res. 11-10 Task Force)

- Bylaw 4.1.1.4: In relation to 4.1.1.3, it was asked whether this meant that Synod is allowing district boundaries to be altered in this manner. Discussion noted that CCM Op. 12-2636 dealt with this and COH Issue 13-053 did not produce any changes. The commission considers the matter resolved.
- Bylaw Section 4.7: The whole interplay of Synod and district convention, nomination, and election bylaws is extremely complex and may call for clarification (see CCM Op. 15-2755). District-level conventions, nominations and elections are governed in part by inference from Synod bylaws relating to Synod-level conventions, nominations, and elections, with the inferences sometimes not clear. This presents a problem for districts revising their bylaws—especially after the Synod has revised its own (possibly with hidden implications for districts inferring their procedures from Synod bylaws). Secretary Sias was asked to inquire with the Council of Presidents whether this was a periodic annoyance (not worth addressing thoroughly) or a significant burden worth a comprehensive solution. He was also asked to remind the Res. 11-10 Task Force to be sensitive to the impact on districts of changes to Synod nominations and elections bylaws. (COH Issue 16-025, assigned to Sias to communicate with Res. 11-10 Task Force and Council of Presidents, for possible work toward proposal)

19. Publication of 2016 *Handbook*

The completed clean text and redline versions will be sent to COH members for review, estimated to be sent by January 11 with reviews to be completed by January 25. Comments should be sent to Secretary Sias and copied to all. Formal approval will be conducted electronically after review, with ratification pending the subsequent meeting. Formal voting / authorization for release should be completed by February 1.ⁱⁱ

20. Date for Next Meeting

The commission set the date for its next meeting as September 29–30, 2017, 12:00 p.m. to 12:00 p.m.

21. Adjournment and Closing Prayer

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m, with Dr. Nuffer offering the closing prayer.

Respectfully submitted,

Reverend David W. Totsky, *Secretary*
Commission on Handbook

ⁱ Such a change having been suggested in the minutes of its November 18–19, 2016, meeting, the CCM ratified this action of the COH by a unanimous e-mail vote on January 12, 2017.

ⁱⁱ The commission authorized the electronic release of the reviewed 2016 *Handbook* by unanimous electronic or telephonic consent on January 30, 2017.