

MINUTES
COMMISSION ON HANDBOOK
Internet Conference Meeting (Zoom.us)
October 14, 2021

24. Call to Order and Opening Prayer

The meeting of the Commission on Handbook (COH) was called to order by Chairman Dr. Dale Sattgast with other voting members Ms. Heidi Abegg, Rev. Roger Carlisle, and Mr. David Hawk present. Advisory members Dr. George Gude, chairman and representative of the Commission on Constitutional Matters (CCM) and Dr. John Sias, Secretary of the Synod were also in attendance. Voting member Rev. David Totsky and advisory member Mr. Frank Simek, Chief Administrative Officer of the Synod, were absent. Chairman Sattgast called upon Rev. Carlisle to open the meeting with devotions, which he did on the basis of Psalm 65.

25. Review /Adoption of the Agenda

Chairman Sattgast introduced the proposed agenda, which had been distributed electronically prior to the meeting. The agenda was moved and adopted.

26. Unfinished Business

Chairman Sattgast reviewed the items previously assigned for evaluation and development of proposals:

- a. COH Issue 19-001: “Graduate students” are not faculty (Bylaw 3.10.5.7 [a])

Secretary Sias conferred on March 11, 2021, with presidents at both seminaries (including Interim President Preus and President-Elect Egger, of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, and President Rast, of Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne). All agreed with the below-proposed change and could see no reason to retain the above inoperative language, as graduate assistants are not considered part of a faculty. Proposed was the removal of language as follows:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

Seminary Faculties

- 3.10.5.7 The faculty of each theological seminary of the Synod shall consist of the president, the full-time faculty, and the part-time faculty.
- (a) Part-time or temporary faculty members are distinguished by an appropriate prefix or suffix (“visiting, guest, adjunct, emeritus”) ~~or the term “graduate assistant.”~~
- (b) Part-time or temporary faculty members shall hold nonvoting membership on the faculty.

As the language has been confirmed to be non-operative, the commission found the change to be non-substantive, adopted it, and authorized the Secretary to effect the change in the working *Handbook* draft.

- b. COH Issue 19-004 [formerly COH Issue 16-023]: Disposition of seminary and college or university “surplus funds” (Bylaws 3.10.5.5 [e][2] and 3.10.6.4 [e][2])

Bylaws 3.10.5.5 (e)(2) and 3.10.6.4 (e)(2) lack a clear definition of “surplus institutional funds,” an issue the commission brought to the attention of the Synod Board of Directors Governance Committee for study. In its meeting of April 28, 2021, the Governance Committee recommended simply deleting Bylaw 3.10.5.5 (e)(2). The parallel passage in Bylaw 3.10.6.4 (e)(2) should likewise be deleted (although this may prove redundant, as the passage would be removed by adoption of the present 2019 Res. 7-03 proposal). Proposed was the following substantive change:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

E. Seminary Boards of Regents

- 3.10.5.5 The board of regents of each theological seminary shall become familiar with and develop an understanding of pertinent policies, standards, and guidelines of the Synod.

...

(e) It shall approve institutional fiscal arrangements, develop the financial resources necessary to operate the seminary, and participate in its support program.

~~(1) Only the board of regents is authorized to establish a line of credit or to borrow for operating needs, subject to the policies of the Board of Directors of the Synod.~~

~~(2) All surplus institutional funds above an adequate working balance shall be deemed to be surplus and shall be deposited with the Chief Financial Officer of the Synod for investment. Earnings from such investments shall be credited to the depositing seminary.~~

F. Concordia University System Boards of Regents

- 3.10.6.4 The board of regents of each institution shall become familiar with and develop an understanding of pertinent policies, standards, and guidelines of the Synod and the Board of Directors of Concordia University System.

...

(e) It shall approve institutional fiscal arrangements, develop the financial resources necessary to operate the institution, and participate in its financial support.

~~(1) Only the board of regents is authorized to establish a line of credit or to borrow for operating needs, subject to the policies of the Board of Directors of Concordia University System and the Board of Directors of the Synod.~~

~~(2) All surplus institutional funds above an adequate working balance shall be deposited with the Concordia University System for investment. Earnings from such investments shall be credited to the depositing institution.~~

The commission adopted the changes as substantive and asked the Secretary to prepare the changes for incorporation in a suitable overture.

- c. COH Issue 19-005: Regulations for non-member entities in membership section; meaning of *call and be served by* in regard to non-congregational calling entities (Bylaws 2.5.2–3)

2019 Res. 10-02A, part B, applied the “call and service” requirements that apply to congregations (explicitly, and implicitly, to their association schools, Bylaw section 2.5) also to agencies, auxiliaries, and recognized service organizations. In the adopted changes, these other calling entities were treated in Bylaw section 2.5, a section with which they previously had little to no connection, its being more germane to congregations as members of the Synod (cf. Bylaw 2.5.4). Application of “call and be served by” language to recognized service organizations also called into question the meaning of “be served by” in their context. After discussion and conversation with the Commission on Constitutional Matters (CCM), resulting in CCM Op. 20-2957 (CCM Minutes, Oct. 30, 2020), the following changes were proposed to place requirements for each type of calling entity in a section of the bylaws more readily identifiable as applicable and to clarify the meaning of “be served by” with reference to auxiliaries and recognized service organizations on the basis of CCM Op. 20-2957. In these changes it was felt to be unnecessary to explicitly limit agencies of the Synod to calling and being served by rostered ministers, as it should be self-evident that they cannot do otherwise. Proposed changes are as follow:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

2.5 Calling Ministers of Religion by Congregations

- 2.5.1 Congregations and their association schools, association schools, agencies, auxiliaries, and recognized service organizations of the Synod shall seek the counsel of the appropriate their respective district president when calling ordained or commissioned ministers.

~~(a) A congregation or association school shall seek the counsel of its own district president.~~

~~(b) An agency, auxiliary, or recognized service organization shall seek the counsel of the district president who would, by virtue of the call, assume supervision of the minister (Bylaw section 2.12). If the call is such that the district president to assume supervision is not known, the counsel~~

~~of the president of the district within which the entity is located or with which it is associated shall be sought.~~

~~(c) If such a call involves multiple districts (such as by entity location or connection and/or position locale), the presidents of all such districts shall be consulted and mutually agree on which one of them will counsel the entity regarding the call and assume supervision of the worker called.~~

- 2.5.2 Congregations that are members of the Synod and their association schools, ~~as well as association schools, agencies, auxiliaries, and recognized service organizations~~ shall call and be served only by (1) ordained ministers who have been admitted to their respective ministries in accordance with the rules and regulations set forth in these Bylaws and have thereby become members of the Synod; (2) candidates for the pastoral ministry who have satisfied the qualifications and requirements for assignment of first calls by the Council of Presidents acting as the Board of Assignments; or (3) ordained ministers who are members in good standing of church bodies that have been formally recognized to be in altar and pulpit fellowship with the Synod when agreements for such calls are in place.
- 2.5.3 Congregations that are members of the Synod and their association schools, ~~association schools, agencies, auxiliaries, and recognized service organizations~~ shall call only (1) commissioned ministers who have been admitted to their ministries in accordance with the rules and regulations set forth in these Bylaws and have thereby become members of the Synod; (2) candidates of LCMS colleges and universities who have satisfied the qualifications and requirements for assignment of first calls by the Council of Presidents acting as the Board of Assignments; or (3) commissioned ministers (or those holding positions comparable to commissioned ministers) who are members in good standing of church bodies that have been formally recognized to be in altar and pulpit fellowship with the Synod when agreements for such calls are in place.
- 2.5.4 Congregations that violate these requirements and persist in such violation shall, after due admonition, forfeit their membership in the Synod.

Agency Operations

...

- 1.5.5.2 When calling ordained or commissioned ministers, agencies shall seek the counsel of the district president who would, by virtue of the call, assume supervision of the minister (Bylaw section 2.12). If the call is such that the district president to assume supervision is not known, the counsel of the president of the district within which the agency is located or with which it is associated shall be sought.

6.1 Auxiliaries

...

- 6.1.2.1 An organization desiring to be recognized as an auxiliary of the Synod shall satisfy the following requirements:

...

(g) Seek, when calling an ordained or commissioned minister, the counsel of the district president who would, by virtue of the call, assume supervision of the minister (Bylaw section 2.12).

- If the call is such that the district president to assume supervision is not known, the counsel of the president of the district within which the entity is located or with which it is associated shall be sought.
- If such a call involves multiple districts (such as by entity location or connection and/or position locale), the presidents of all such districts shall be consulted and mutually agree on which one of them will counsel the entity regarding the call and assume supervision of the worker called.

(h) Call and, in any sense involving distinctive function(s) of the pastoral office, be served by only those ordained ministers or candidates designated by Bylaw 2.5.2.

(i) Call only those commissioned ministers or candidates designated by Bylaw 2.5.3.

6.2 Recognized Service Organizations

- 6.2.1 The granting of recognized service organization status by the Synod signifies that a service organization, while independent of the Synod, fosters the mission and ministry of the church, engages in program activity that extends the mission and ministry of the Synod, is in harmony with the programs of the boards of the Synod, and respects and does not act contrary to the doctrine and practice of the Synod.

...

(d) A recognized service organization shall call and, in any sense involving distinctive function(s) of the pastoral office, be served by only those ordained ministers or candidates designated by Bylaw 2.5.2.

(e) A recognized service organization shall call only those commissioned ministers or candidates designated by Bylaw 2.5.3.

~~(f)~~ ...

- 6.2.2.2 The right to extend a Synod-recognized, regular call to a rostered worker is afforded to the board of directors of a recognized service organization, provided that:

(a) the board's composition contains at least the proportion of members of Synod member congregations required by recognized service organization program policies; and

(b) the appropriate district president who would, by virtue of the call, assume supervision of the minister (Bylaw section 2.12), is properly consulted in the call process.

- If the call is such that the district president to assume supervision is not known, the counsel of the president of the district within which the entity is located or with which it is associated shall be sought.
- If such a call involves multiple districts (such as by entity location or connection and/or position locale), the presidents of all such districts shall be consulted and mutually agree on which one of them will counsel the entity regarding the call and assume supervision of the worker called.

; and

(c) the call document is approved by the district president who would assume ecclesiastical supervision of the member as clearly stating that the organization:

- (1) expects that the worker will, without compromise or constraint, carry out the ministry for which ordained or commissioned, and to which called, according to the doctrine and practice of the Synod.
- (2) agrees to accommodate and encourage the ecclesiastical supervision of the worker by the appropriate district president.
- (3) submits, as an exclusive remedy, to the dispute resolution process of the Synod for the resolution of any issues arising under the divine call.
- (d) the organization demonstrates to the district president its ability to provide for the reasonable needs of the called worker for the duration of the period of the call.

The commission adopted the changes as substantive and asked the Secretary to prepare the change for incorporation in a suitable overture.

d. COH Issue 19-007: Concordia University System Governance Proposal (2019 Res. 7-03)

Secretary Sias updated the commission briefly on developments. Recently concluded is a six-month, Synod-wide "request for comment" period on the proposal and on the accompanying "Lutheran Identity and Mission Outcome Standards" for the ecclesiastical accreditation process that forms a key component of the proposal as it stands. The 2019 Res. 7-03 committee is meeting electronically on Friday, Oct. 22, to discuss feedback received. The committee will meet again, by itself and in concert with other interested groups, in connection with meetings of the Board of Directors, Council of Presidents, and Concordia University System presidents and board chairs in the week of November 15–19. The commission will be kept apprised of further developments as they may impact the *Handbook*.

- e. COH Issue(s) 19-009 A–C: Dispute Resolution and Expulsion Clarifications (Bylaws 1.10.12 (a), 1.10.12.2, 1.10.8.2 [a], and 2.17.8 [e])

In the continuation of a review sparked by comments provided by the Synod’s reconciler training contractor and other relevant observations, three items were identified as potentially requiring *Handbook* attention:

Issue 19-009A dealt with the meaning of Bylaw 1.10.12.2. It was proposed to add a clarifying sentence to Bylaw 1.10.12 (a) and to strike Bylaw 1.10.12.2:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

1.10.12 After the training of the reconcilers and in consultation ...

(a) Their term of service, monitored by the Secretary of the Synod, shall be six years, renewable without limit. Once appointed, the district membership of hearing facilitators no longer pertains to their eligibility for service in this position. Within three months after even-numbered conventions of the Synod (2010, 2016, etc.), the Secretary of the Synod shall contact all hearing facilitators to learn of their availability and willingness to continue for an additional term. Resulting vacancies on the roster of hearing facilitators shall be filled by the Secretary of the Synod from the Synod roster of reconcilers after consultation with the appropriate district presidents in time for resulting vacancies on district rosters of reconcilers to be filled by appointment by district boards of directors.

~~1.10.12.2 If a hearing facilitator moves from the district where nominated, such hearing facilitator may remain on the Synod’s roster of hearing facilitators.~~

~~1.10.12.32~~

(It should be noted that the final bit of Bylaw 1.10.12 [a] [“in time for resulting...directors”] is to be removed and the timing of hearing facilitator selection to be updated by the proposal of COH Issue 19-003, approved in March for inclusion in a suitable overture.)

Issue 19-009C regarded the wording of Bylaws 2.14.8 (b) and 2.17.8 (b), as to whether an apparently excess phrase, “an upholds the suspension of the ecclesiastical supervisor” inappropriately suggested an imbalance in a process that could be appealed either by the accused or by the ecclesiastical supervisor (or, in certain circumstances, the President of the Synod). The following change was proposed:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

Appeal Panel

2.14.8 The decision of the Hearing Panel may be appealed by the accused ...

(e) Within 30 days after its formation, the Appeal Panel shall issue its written decision in response to the request for reconsideration. If the Appeal Panel denies the request for reconsideration of the decision of the Hearing Panel ~~and upholds the suspension of the ecclesiastical supervisor~~, the decision of the Hearing Panel shall be regarded as final and shall

- (1) be binding upon the parties to the matter and not be subject to further appeal;
- (2) have no precedential value;
- (3) be carried out by the district president or the President of the Synod; and
- (4) shall be publicized as deemed appropriate under the circumstances by the district president or the President of the Synod.

The commission adopted the changes proposed in connection with issues 19-009A and C as substantive and asked the Secretary to prepare the changes for incorporation in a suitable overture.

Issue 19-009B dealt with a potential need for clarification of the term “minutes” in Bylaws 2.14.8 (b) and 2.17.8 (b). The commission consented to the suggestion that the CCM could include a suitable definition in the related Standard Operating Procedure Manuals (SOPM), referring the matter—along with a number of other observations more relevant to the SOPMs than to the bylaws—to the sister commission but retaining the issue on its agenda in case the CCM’s work would suggest a need for bylaw changes.

- f. COH Issue 19-013A: Language relating the Synod President and Chief Mission Officer (Bylaw 3.3.1.3 [g])

The item was retained on the agenda, pending an opinion expected from the Commission on Constitutional Matters.

- g. COH Issue 19-013E: Auxiliaries and “programs of boards of the Synod” (Bylaws 6.1.2.1 [d] and 6.1.3 [b])

Addressing further instances of “boards” that occurred in connection with Issue 19-013A’s treatment of the outdated language “programs of boards of the Synod” (COH Minutes of March 11, 2021), it was proposed to add “and offices” after each of the three instances of “boards” in Bylaws 6.1.2.1 (d) and 6.1.3 (b).

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

- 6.1.2.1 An organization desiring to be recognized as an auxiliary of the Synod shall satisfy the following requirements:

...

(d) Coordinate plans and programs with those of the Synod through regular sharing and contact with representatives of those boards and offices to which the Synod has assigned specific responsibilities (boards and offices of the Synod will share with the auxiliaries in a similar manner).

- 6.1.3 An auxiliary assumes the following responsibilities:

...

(b) It provides the Synod, through its chief elected officer, with an annual program report for sharing with the appropriate boards and offices.

The commission determined this to be a non-substantive change, adopted the changes, and authorized the Secretary to incorporate the changes in the working *Handbook* draft.

- h. COH Issue 19-019: Multi-congregation parishes involving multiple circuits or districts (Bylaw 2.5.5, etc.)

“The total number of congregations regularly cared for (served) by a pastor or pastors constitutes a *parish* as it applies to bylaws dealing with representation at circuit forums (Bylaws 3.1.2.1 [c]; 5.3.2) and district conventions (Bylaw 4.2.2; Const. Art. XII 10 A), and in voting for the Synod President (Bylaw 3.12.2.3).” (Bylaw 2.5.5) A parish is not necessarily contained within one visitation circuit or district. As of March 5, 2021, 13 parishes involved congregations from more than one district and 63 more involved congregations from more than one visitation circuit. Bylaws are silent as to how congregations involved in such situations are to be represented at district conventions and electoral and visitation circuit meetings, although CCM Op. 11-2618 settled representation at district conventions thus: “When a parish crosses district lines, it is nonetheless entitled to representation at district conventions by one pastor and one lay member. The pastor is a voting delegate to the convention of the district of which he is a member. The lay vote is shared by the congregations as in any other parish, presumably in a manner that is fair and equitable. The district membership of the congregation of the lay delegate determines the district convention that he/she will attend as a voting delegate.”

The 2019 convention of the Synod (Res. 9-05 and 9-08) and made two changes that, in addition to the increasing frequency of cross-district and cross-circuit multi-congregation parishes, suggest the need for a timely, explicit solution to these questions:

- Multi-congregation parishes are now represented at circuit forums by one pastor and one voting lay representative (lay representatives of congregations other than the one supplying the voting lay delegate are possible, but advisory / non-voting). Previously each congregation got a voting lay delegate.

- Congregations of a multi-congregation parish other than the one supplying the district convention voting lay delegate may send an advisory / non-voting lay delegate to the district convention.

Proposed was the following, in which CCM Op. 11-2618 is implemented in Bylaw 4.2.2 (c) to deal with cross-district parishes and the “minimally disruptive but dispositive” solution is implemented in bylaws dealing with visitation and electoral circuits. Assignment of the pastor to a visitation circuit is made the responsibility of his district president, emphasizing the ecclesiastical supervisory function of the circuit. Discussion noted concerns that circuit visitors be properly informed of which congregation is supplying the lay voter and of actions of other involved circuits and that it is certainly cleaner simply to arrange for a parish to be included in a single visitation circuit (and district), but that attempts to do so often meet confounding circumstances. A feeling was expressed that, while broader changes may be coming to bylaws governing the composition of circuits, the problem needs to be addressed and a minimally invasive approach is best at present. The proposal was as follows:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

4.2 District Conventions

...

- 4.2.2 The delegates of a voting congregation or multi-congregation parish to a district convention shall be accredited.
- (a) To be entitled to vote, delegates shall return the proper credentials provided by the district secretary and signed by two of the congregation’s officers, either by mailing them to the district office at a date determined by the district or by presenting them to the district secretary at the opening of the convention.
 - (b) All duly elected voting delegates shall attend all sessions of the convention regularly until the close of the convention.
 - (c) Should a multi-congregation parish involve congregations having membership in different districts, the pastoral delegate shall be accredited in the convention of the district in which he holds membership and lay delegates, voting and advisory, shall be accredited in the convention of the district in which each delegate’s respective congregation holds membership. No multi-congregation parish is entitled to more than one pastoral and one lay voting delegate because of its inclusion of congregations from different districts.

5.3 Circuit Forums

- 5.3.2 The circuit forum consists of one pastor and one layperson from each member congregation or multi-congregation parish designated by the congregation or parish. Congregations of a multi-congregation parish not contributing a lay voter may send an advisory representative, with voice but no vote.
- (a) Depending on each circuit’s adopted objectives, the circuit may provide for additional representation from each congregation. Such additional representatives have no vote in matters assigned to the circuit forum by the Bylaws of the Synod.
 - (b) The circuit visitor and any other officers shall have the primary responsibility of preparing the agenda for the circuit forum.
 - (c) The circuit visitor shall ordinarily serve as chairman of the circuit forum.
 - (d) Should a multi-congregation parish involve congregations having membership in different visitation circuits, each lay representative, voting and advisory, shall attend the forum of the circuit of which the representative’s congregation is a member. The pastoral representative shall attend the forum of that circuit, within which he serves a congregation and within the district in which he holds membership, to which he is assigned by his district president. No multi-congregation parish is entitled to more than one pastoral and one lay voting representative because of its inclusion of congregations from different visitation circuits.

Voting Delegates

...

- 3.1.2.1 Elections of voting delegates shall take place in accordance with established policy and procedure.
- (a) Each electoral circuit shall meet at the call of the circuit visitor(s) to elect its delegates not later than nine months prior to the opening day of the convention. When in-person meetings are burdensome (e.g., geographically large circuits), a circuit may select another manner of meeting (e.g., e-meeting technologies) that is suitable and made available to all participants, taking into consideration the need to provide for an open and fair exchange of ideas and secure, private, and confidential voting.
 - (b) Each electoral circuit may adopt procedures and methods that will insure efficiency and accuracy, including the use of mechanical, electronic, or other methods of casting, recording, or tabulating votes.
 - (c) The privilege of voting shall be exercised by one pastor and one layperson from each member congregation or multi-congregation parish of the circuit, both of whom shall have been elected in the manner prescribed by the congregation or parish. Congregations of a multi-congregation parish not contributing a lay voter may send an advisory representative, with voice but no vote. A pastor serving a congregation in an assisting capacity (Bylaw 2.5.6) is not eligible to cast that congregation's pastoral vote.
 - (d) Should a multi-congregation parish involve congregations having membership in different electoral circuits, each lay representative, voting and advisory, shall attend the forum of that circuit of which the representative's congregation is a member. The pastoral delegate shall attend the forum of the circuit, within which he serves a congregation and within the district in which he holds membership, to which he is assigned by his district president. His eligibility for election as circuit delegate shall be within that circuit only. No multi-congregation parish is entitled to more than one pastoral and one lay voting representative because of its inclusion of congregations from different electoral circuits. No circuit shall elect as a lay delegate or alternate a member of any congregation that is served (in other than an assisting capacity) by a pastor elected as delegate or alternate.

The commission determined these to be substantive changes, adopted them, and asked the Secretary to prepare them for inclusion in an appropriate omnibus overture.

i. COH Issue 19-020: Even- and odd-numbered conventions (Bylaws 1.10.10.1, 1.10.12; 3.12.3.1–3)

In the commission's review of COH Issue 19-003, it was suggested that the language regarding "even" and "odd" conventions, particular because of the use of years in connection with the language of Bylaws 1.10.10.1 and 1.10.12, will be confusing now that the exceptional addition of one year to the present triennium will leave even-numbered conventions (e.g. the 68th regular convention) to occur in odd-numbered years (e.g., 2023). A related unclarity exists in 3.12.3.1–3, which describes a schedule involving a double alternation but no means to determine where in the pattern the Synod might be in a given convention cycle.

Proposed were the following changes:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

- 1.10.10.1 The term of service of a reconciler shall be six years, renewable immediately following every even-numbered regular Synod convention (e.g., 64th in 2010, 66th in 2016, 68th in 2023, etc.) without term limitations. ...
- 1.10.12 After the training of the reconcilers ...
- (a) Their term of service, monitored by the Secretary of the Synod, shall be six years, renewable without limit. Within three months after even-numbered regular conventions of the Synod (e.g., 64th in 2010, 66th in 2016, 68th in 2023, etc.), the Secretary of the Synod shall ...
-
- 3.12.3.1 In preparation for an even-numbered regular convention of the Synod (e.g., 68th in 2023), one-half of the districts shall elect through their regular election procedures at the district convention one member to the Committee for Convention Nominations and an alternate:

Atlantic	Nebraska
California-Nevada-	North Wisconsin
Hawaii	Northern Illinois
Central Illinois	Northwest
Florida-Georgia	Oklahoma
Indiana	SELC
Iowa West	South Dakota
Minnesota South	Southern
Missouri	Wyoming

- 3.12.3.2 In preparation for the following, odd-numbered regular convention (e.g., 69th in 2026), the remaining districts shall elect in the same manner:

Eastern	New Jersey
English	North Dakota
Iowa East	Ohio
Kansas	Rocky Mountain
Michigan	South Wisconsin
Mid-South	Southeastern
Minnesota North	Pacific Southwest
Montana	Southern Illinois
New England	Texas

- 3.12.3.3 One-half of the electing districts shall be designated by the Secretary of the Synod to elect a professional church worker and the other half a layperson, with roles reversed every six years (e.g., in 2023, Atlantic: lay, California-Nevada-Hawaii: worker, etc.; in 2026, Eastern: lay, English: worker, etc.; in 2029, Atlantic: worker, California-Nevada-Hawaii: lay, etc.; etc.).

The commission determined these changes, which consisted primarily of explanatory or exemplary passages, to be non-substantive, adopted them, and authorized the Secretary to incorporate these changes into the working *Handbook* draft.

27. New Business / Other Matters

- a. COH Issue 19-021: Lutheran Church Extension Fund (LCEF) District Member Formula (Bylaw 3.6.4.2.2)

Secretary Sias noted that a typographical error has been discovered in the 2016 and 2019 printings of the *Handbook* with regard to the coefficients on certain terms in the formula for determining the number of members representing each district in the membership of LCEF. The commission ratified the decision of the Secretary to make the following change to the working *Handbook* draft:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING

- 3.6.4.2.2 The second class of members consists of representatives of participating districts, the number determined according to the following formula, with any fraction rounded to the nearest whole number:

$$\frac{\text{Baptized Members}}{50,000} + \frac{\text{Investments}}{\$10,000,000} + \frac{\text{Investments}}{\text{Baptized Members}} \times 0.015 +$$

$$+ \frac{\text{Fund Balance}}{\$100,000} \times 0.010 = \text{Number of Members per District}$$

It was also noted that, since November 1990, the total number of district members has been capped by LCEF Bylaws at 135, so that the formula does not compute the raw number of delegates but the proportion of that number of delegates to be allocated to each district. The Secretary is in discussion with LCEF regarding possible clarifications in LCMS Bylaws. The commission placed this item on its agenda as 19-021 and retained it pending further input from LCEF.

28. Upcoming Agenda and Meeting(s)

Barring other urgent business, the commission set its next meeting as in electronic format and to begin at 8:30 a.m. Central Time on May 5, 2022. Noted was the developing schedule for the 68th regular Synod convention, which is to be held July 29–August 3, 2023, with the usual pre-convention meetings, details to be determined (with the commission planning to be in attendance, tentatively, at least by mid-day on the Thursday preceding), in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Floor committee weekend is tentatively scheduled for June 9–12, 2023, in St. Louis.

29. Adjournment and Closing Prayer

The commission's scheduled work having been completed, Chairman Sattgast invited Rev. Carlisle to offer closing prayer and the meeting was adjourned.

John W. Sias
Secretary