

**Summary of Board Meeting of April 4 & 5, 2016  
Lutheran Church–Canada, East District**

**Opening Devotions**

Rev. Timothy Teuscher led the meeting in opening devotions on both Monday and Tuesday mornings.

**LCC Restructuring Presentation**

Rev. Bill Ney, chair of the CCMS and Rev. Les Stahlke, CCMS's consultant for their restructuring study, presented to the Board the results of the national survey done on restructuring. The Board spent considerable time (at least 4 ½ hours) discussing with Rev. Stahlke and Rev. Ney the feedback from the national survey and the process the CCMS will be following going forward. Rev. Ney and Rev. Stahlke both indicated that the feedback received from the Board was most valuable.

**East District Board Discussion on LCC Restructuring Plan**

The Board and additional staff discussed the nine points for discussion that the CCMS had provided and directed the Secretary to prepare a report based on this discussion to be sent to the CCMS. See Attachment A for the Board's report.

**Adoption of Agenda**

The following items were added to the agenda:

- i. Emeritus Crucis Nomination
- ii. Housing Allowance - District President and Mission Executive
- iii. Business Manager Job Description
- iv. Pastor Roster Analysis

**16-015 Motion:** That the agenda as amended by the addition of the above items be adopted.  
M/S/C

**Approval of Board Minutes of February 8, 2016**

**16-016 Motion:** That the minutes of February 8, 2016 be approved as presented. M/S/C

**Business arising from the Minutes**

**Follow-up on action items**

The Board reviewed the items, and the status of each is as shown below.

**A. From October 2015 Board Minutes**

Item	Person Responsible	Status
Minute 8.1 - non-giving congregations	President Zabel - To be included at March 10 CC meeting with report for April Board meeting.	NOT DONE
Minute 15 - Review of job description	Reg Tiegs, Kent Schappert - report for April Board meeting	ON AGENDA see minute 17.2
Motion 15-080 public accountant review	Bob Klages (DfF liaison) - In Progress	ON AGENDA see minute 16.1.2

**B. From February 2016 Board Minutes**

Item	Person Responsible	Status
Motions 16-003 to 16-006	Secretary	DONE
Minute 8.3	Business Manager	DONE
Minute 9	Property committee	DONE
Minute 10.1 re Concordia	President Zabel	DONE
Minute 10.2 re English District	President Zabel	DONE

Minute 11.3 re Survey	President Zabel	in process
Motion 16-007 re Our Saviour, Niagara Falls	President Zabel, Rev. Bublitz	DONE
Minute 12.2 re Rev. Smith	President Zabel	DONE
Minute 13.1.1.b re Moving Fund	Bob Klages to DfF	ON AGENDA see minute 16.1.4
Minute 13.1.1.c&d	Secretary to put on next agenda	DONE
Minute 13.1.5 re Collingwood sale	Business Manager to report re history details	DONE
Minute 15	Mission Executive	ON AGENDA see minute 15.2
Motion 16-008 re Collingwood	Secretary to notify congregation	DONE
Motion 16-009 re debt reduction payment	Rev. Bublitz to notify at appropriate time	will do as soon as budget approved
Minute 14.2.1.a re assistance forms	Rev. Bublitz, Secretary	ON AGENDA see minute 6.2
Motions 16-010, 16-012, 16-013	Chairman to notify	DONE
Motion 16-014 re archivist	President Zabel to notify	DONE

### Revised Assistance Forms

Rev. Bublitz circulated a revised form titled "Annual Financial Report Form" for the Board's consideration. Two small corrections were suggested.

**16-017 Motion:** That the revised form be approved. **M/S/C**

### Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

### Governance Committee

There was no report.

### Strategic Plan Review

There was no discussion on the strategic plan.

### Treasurer/Business Manager Reports

#### Audited Financial Statements 2015/2016

The board reviewed the statements.

The board requested that in future the zero-interest loans be listed separately from the other loans.

Regarding the CEF it was noted that there was a loss this year. It was suggested that we should rethink our policy on surplus distribution to take into account years when there is a loss and perhaps in the future, delay any distribution for at least a year, in case the surplus is needed to cover future losses.

**16-018 Motion:** That the Department for Finance review the CEF policy regarding distribution of surplus in order to take into account years where there is a loss. **M/S/C**

**16-019 Motion:** That the audited financial statements for the fiscal year ending January 31, 2016 be approved. **M/S/C**

#### 2016/17 Budget

The Board reviewed that budget and noted that the main change from the previous draft was the incorporation of revenue of \$136,000 from the new Partner-to-Partner program and matching grant revenue of \$136,000 from the CEF (lines 7103 & 7111).

**16-020 Motion:** That the 2016/2017 budget as presented in the amount of \$1,572,674 be approved. **M/S/C**

**Request for funds from the LCC Treasurer**

**16-021 Motion:** That the board approve, as requested, an additional \$35,000 for LCC as the East District share of the cost of the restructuring study, with financing to come from the CEF fund balance. **M/S/C**

By consensus the board agreed to maintain the usual 40% of unrestricted revenues as the budgeted amount to be sent to LCC. (The approved budget estimates this amount as \$455,400 – very close to the 2015 estimate. The figure of \$480,000 in the Synodical Treasurer's letter seems to be incorrect.)

The chairman will report this decision to LCC.

**Policy re LCC Mission Contribution Remittance**

By consensus this report from the Business Manager was referred to the Department for Finance to review and report back to the board at its June meeting.

**Properties Committee**

The report was received for information.

**New Business:**

**Atlantic Canada Circuit Rider**

The board welcomed Rev. Mark Smith to the meeting and he presented his report.

He pointed out several issues that should be considered as we think ahead:

- there needs to be thought given to how to provide fiscally prudent transportation and assistance when it is necessary to spend more than one day in a location
- consideration should be given to calling an additional worker to Atlantic Canada
- if retired pastors (or other pastors) could assist temporarily in providing Word and Sacrament to established locations, this would give him more time to visit areas where there is promise for establishing new preaching stations
- consideration should be given to establishing an official multi-point parish to bring some unity to the various groups now meeting.

**Emeritus Crucis Nominations**

The Board voted on a recommendation for this award.

President Zabel will report our recommendation to Dr. Winger.

**District President**

**Report of the District President**

The President updated the board on changes occurring after the writing of his report. The report was received. The President requested that consideration be given to changing the date of the next District Convention to later in 2018 because of possible changes coming from the restructuring study.

**16-024 Motion:** That the date of the 2018 District convention be altered, and the convention now be scheduled to start on October 14, 2018. **M/S/C**

**LSO Status of Lutherwood**

The Board had before it a letter sent by the District President to the Chairman of Lutherwood, indicating that in light of actions taken by the Lutherwood board to have the organization become secularized, he would be recommending to the East District Board of Directors that they request Synod to remove Lutherwood's Listed Service Organization status. The President reported that he had received no response to his letter.

**16-025 Motion:** That the board recommend to Synod's Board of Directors that Lutherwood's status as a Listed Service Organization be revoked. **M/S/C**

The Chairman will contact Synod as soon as possible regarding this request.

## **Mission Executive**

### **Report**

The Mission Executive's report was received.

### **2016 Mission & Ministry Report**

The 2016 report was reviewed. Some duplications on page 3 were pointed out. Also the DFO report should say at end "2015 Chairman".

The report will be available for congregations shortly.

### **Partner to Partner Program**

Rev. Mohr presented the details of this program including the objectives, timelines, brochure, and donation card. It was suggested that the brochure should show the target amount of money being asked for. Board members were also asked whether they would be able to participate in presenting the program.

By consensus the board approved the details of the Partner-to-Partner program.

## **Department Reports**

### **Finance**

#### **Department Liaison Report**

The report was received as most of the items were included in the reports submitted by the chair.

#### **Audit Services**

The Department chair reported on the recommendation of the DfF re audit services.

**16-026 Motion:** That the board approve the recommendation from the DfF that, based on the proposals received, the board retain Famme & Co as the public accountants for the District's annual audit. **M/S/C**

#### **DFF - Minutes of February 26, 2016**

The minutes were received for information.

#### **Moving Assistance Policy**

As there was no one present at the meeting to answer questions on this matter, by consensus it was deferred to the board's June meeting.

In the interim, the board has requested the DfF to review the possibility of increasing the weight limitations in the policy and report back for the June meeting.

#### **CEF Investment Policy Change**

This report was deferred to the June meeting in order to get the exact wording change for the policy.

### **Outreach**

There were no reports as there was no meeting since the last board meeting.

The board liaison advised that they are still lacking a member from the Stratford Circuit.

### **Parish Services**

The report of the Department chair was received. There was no meeting since the last board meeting.

## **Personnel Committee: Mr. Reg Tiegs**

### **Report re Housing Allowance for DP and ME**

President Zabel did not speak or vote on this matter.

By consensus it was agreed that on the basis of the report from the personnel committee no further adjustments were required to the housing allowance for the District President and the Mission Executive and they would remain at the 2015 levels.

### **Business Manager Job Description**

The Board reviewed the proposed job description. The chairman will rewrite it by grouping the various points into sections, and report back in June.

**Lutheran Church–Canada Report**

The Board received the written report from President Bugbee.

**East District Archivist**

No report

**Committee on Constitution and Membership**

Rev. Morley presented his report on the Pastor Roster Analysis. He emphasized the crisis facing the district in a few years as many pastors reach retirement age and urged action to deal with this crisis.

This matter will be placed on the June agenda for further discussion.

**Committee on Communication Services**

No report

**Abuse Prevention Committee**

No report

**Handbook Committee**

No report

**Next Meeting: June 20, 2016**

It was agreed that the board should be prepared for a two-day meeting in June i.e. June 20 & 21, with the hope that the meeting would end by noon on the Tuesday.

**Devotion Leader: Mr. Reg Tiegs****16-028 Motion:** That this meeting be adjourned. *M/S/C*

For further information on any of these items, contact the Board Chair, Mr. Reg Tiegs at:

[tiehm@rogers.com](mailto:tiehm@rogers.com)

*-from Lois Griffin, Secretary  
LCC, East District*

# ATTACHMENT A

LUTHERAN CHURCH CANADA, EAST DISTRICT  
ÉGLISE LUTHÉRIENNE DU CANADA, DISTRICT DE L'EST



275 Lawrence Avenue  
Kitchener, Ontario N2M 1Y3  
519-578-6500 1-800-465-8179  
FAX: 519-578-3369  
[www.lcceast.ca](http://www.lcceast.ca)  
[info@lcceast.ca](mailto:info@lcceast.ca)

## Comments from the East District Board of Directors regarding the CCMS POINTS FOR DISCUSSION OR INFORMATION

### GENERAL COMMENTS

**A.** There is general concern about placing heavy reliance on this survey as the basis for making changes to the structure of LCC, for the following reasons:

- 1) The situation in the ABC district has tended to skew responses. Hasty change born out of crisis is not necessarily good change.
- 2) Many of the questions were unclear and therefore responses are difficult to judge since people interpreted the questions in different ways.
- 3) Many questions were leading questions, pointing to the response wanted. (One respondent said in response to a particular question that they didn't really know if there was a problem, but since the question was asked, assumed there must be and so answered in the affirmative.)
- 4) Specific questions have questionable responses (e.g. the same response from ABC to both questions 5 & 6; the 32% positive response to question 46 even though it can be demonstrably shown that there is no overlap; the similar responses to both questions 38 and 39, even though they are opposites; and the list could go on). This places great doubt on the validity of basing any decisions on this survey. At best, the responses show respondents perceptions (partly the result of leading questions), rather than fact.
- 5) Many questions could really not be answered properly by just choosing from 1-6.

**B.** The Board feels that the nine discussion points leave out some key issues that deserve more discussion. These are: Ecclesiastical supervision, synod as a federation of districts vs. synod as a whole, unity of doctrine as an overarching principle.

**C.** Regarding the slide show presenting the results of the survey, the questions should be printed word for word as they were in the survey. This was not always done. The criteria used for evaluating responses were inconsistent. For example, in some cases a positive response of 40% was characterized as a majority response while in some cases it was viewed less favourably; in some cases a large no opinion or neither for or against was viewed as significant and worth more discussion or action while in other cases it was ignored and only the for or against were considered. It seems that the results were being interpreted according to some predetermined bias.

**D.** Finally, the focus now seems to be too much on accountability and who reports to whom, while the heart of the matter, namely, why our members perceive problems (sometimes where none exist) and what they expect a new structure to do, remains unclear. Until this is known (why do we need to restructure, how will the new structure solve the issues raised and better provide the services, and at what cost) it is difficult to properly address the issue of either whether to restructure or how to do it.

## COMMENTS ON THE NINE DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Survey gave clear indication that the respondents favour dissolving the Districts and restructuring the Synod to function with one Administrative structure, including the possibility of restructuring the circuits/regions geographically.

  0   I agree with what the survey, the CCMS, and the Board of Directors favour.

  2   I will support this change, even though I would prefer something else.

  5   I need more time to consider this option for restructuring LCC

  2   I do not support this option of restructuring LCC.

### Discussion Summary

Note that none of the questions actually ask the question of whether the districts should be abolished. The questions only talked about retaining or abolishing legally incorporated entities. The abolishment of these does not necessarily imply the abolishment of districts. In reviewing the responses to questions 51 and 52, it is difficult to characterize this as strong support for dissolving districts or giving clear direction, given the large number that were not in either the "for" or "against" position.

Other comments:

1) The current good working relationship between the district and its congregations may be lost if the above is implemented.

2) At present, on this and many other questions, there is a distinct difference between different regions of the country. (East vs. West, or East vs. Central vs. West, or East and Central vs. West, etc.) This needs to be addressed or the results could be very divisive.

3) Smaller regions might allow for a more intimate relationship between leader and congregations.

4) How will many of the services currently provided by districts be provided in a centralized administration?

5) Our country is large and diverse and it would be hard for one central board of directors to be sufficiently knowledgeable about all aspects of the country's mission and ministry to be able to make effective decisions and provide effective accountability.

6) Many of the accountability problems result from either fuzzy lines of accountability or not implementing properly the current structure. Consideration needs to be given to fixing this rather than developing a whole new structure.

7) Has the structure used by others been reviewed rather than trying to create something new for LCC?

8) The current money flow is opposite of what it should be - congregation to district to synod; it should be congregation to synod to districts.

---

2. The Survey indicated that the District CEFs ought to be merged into one Synodical CEF subject to legal review.

  0   I agree with what the survey, the CCMS, and the Board of Directors favour.

  0   I will support this change, even though I would prefer something else.

  0   I need more time to consider this option for restructuring LCC

all I do not support this option of restructuring LCC.

### Discussion Summary

There is strong disagreement to this approach by the Board, East District office staff (who were invited to give their very practical day to day wisdom), and members in the East District. There have been many East District people who have indicated they will withdraw their funds if there is

a move to amalgamate. **We strongly urge that amalgamation not be recommended.** The East district has a strong and vibrant CEF that should be retained.

We also point out that it is difficult to conclude that the survey indicates that the CEF's should be merged since overall, less than 40% of the respondents were in favour of this.

---

3. The Survey respondents reaffirmed our practice that each congregation of Synod may cast two votes at a Convention (currently at District Conventions). The two votes are to be cast as follows: one vote to be cast by **ONE OF ITS ROSTERED CHURCH-WORKERS**, and **ONE TO BE CAST BY A LAY PERSON**. If the Districts are dissolved as indicated above, then the majority of Survey respondents were in favour of having every congregation in LCC be represented in this manner at subsequent National Conventions.

0 I agree with what the survey, the CCMS, and the Board of Directors favour.

0 I will support this change, even though I would prefer something else.

0 I need more time to consider this option for restructuring LCC

all I do not support this option of restructuring LCC.

### Discussion Summary

This question was difficult to answer as it is really two questions wrapped into one. Also, the writing suggests that the words in bold represent the current practice. **This is incorrect.** It is not the procedure spelled out in the current Synodical Handbook. Why then was this wording put into the question and why in capital letters? In presenting it this way (i.e. one vote to be cast by **ONE OF ITS ROSTERED CHURCH-WORKERS**) it is suggesting that either this is what we currently do (which is incorrect) or this is what we should be doing (which has no place being presented at this stage since we are being told that no opinions are being expressed).

We suggest that consideration be given to the following:

- i) One Synodical convention every 4 years, with one day being given to district conventions.
- ii) All congregations have two delegates to the convention - **ONE BEING THEIR ORDAINED CLERGY AND ONE BEING A NON-CLERGY**. This would allow a deacon to be a non-clergy delegate.

We do not support the vote distribution as in the words in bold in the above discussion question.

- iii) Right now, congregations that share a pastor must also share a vote, i.e. they don't each get to name a delegate. As more congregations move in this direction, it has the possibility of more congregations losing a vote. We recommend that all congregations, even those sharing a pastor, be allowed to have a delegate. The imbalance in lay vs. clergy that this would cause could then be rectified by allocating the required number of clergy votes to correct the imbalance to the advisory pastors. The advisory pastors as a group would then vote to decide who amongst themselves would fill these positions.

This issue needs to be addressed.

---

4. The Survey showed that a majority of the respondents preferred having the Synodical Presidency divided into two separate positions: "Spiritual Leader" and "Administrator".

I agree with what the survey, the CCMS, and the Board of Directors favour.

I will support this change, even though I would prefer something else.

I need more time to consider this option for restructuring LCC

all I do not support this option of restructuring LCC.

## Discussion Summary

Unfortunately, questions 33 and 34 did not use consistent language so it is difficult to properly evaluate the answers and hence we challenge the assertion in the above statement. Furthermore, neither of the questions used the terms "spiritual leader" or "administrator" so the presumption in the question above is incorrect as is the statement that a majority supported it. (The support was less than 50%). Question 34 used the term "President", which term implies more than "spiritual leader", so again your presumption is incorrect.

Right now, at all levels, it would appear that the administration is mostly handled by an office administrator/ business manager/treasurer, so in practice the actual work is already split. In many instances, at least at the district level, the issues of finance often overlap with "spiritual" issues that involve the president and so dividing these two for accountability purposes is not a good idea. In all cases it is the office administrator/ business manager/treasurer who actually provides reports to the board, who are the ultimate accountable body. It is obvious from the comments to this question that many respondents had the mistaken impression that the President needs to be proficient in finance and accounting.

---

5. The CCMS with the support of the Board of Directors of LCC would like to have a discussion across Canada by groups to explore the options for the title for the "Spiritual Leader". Note: A large majority of lay people preferred "President" and a large majority of the clergy preferred "Bishop".

We invite your suggestions for a name for the spiritual leader of the Synod and the regions, e.g., National Pastor, Regional Pastor, or National Counselor, Regional Counselor, Circuit Counselor, or any other titles that you may wish to suggest.

## Discussion Summary

Because of the large number of lay opposed to this, this issue will be very divisive and will take too much focus away from more critical issues, both now and at the convention. The Board is cognizant of the fact that many clergy support the title of "bishop", and agrees that having a discussion on this is good, and can be used as a teaching opportunity to bring the laity around to the understanding of why this title is appropriate. **However, the board strongly recommends that this discussion take place outside of the discussions on restructuring.**

It should also be noted that from an LCC corporate perspective it is necessary for a corporation to have a president, so someone will have to assume that title and the responsibilities inherent in that position. Thus a dual title of President/Bishop may be appropriate.

---

6. Although restructuring the training of deacons was shown to be a high priority for Survey respondents, it must be noted that the Board of Directors of LCC are currently involved in extensive discussions, consultations, and decision making regarding that restructuring and so any helpful ideas will be passed on directly to them. Any restructuring in this area will come about as a result of the Board of Directors action.

## Discussion Summary

There could be assistance from Ann Arbor or River Forest in developing a program that could be offered through one of our seminaries. Don't create a new school. It was suggested that CLT in Edmonton could handle the Deacons program and CLTS in St. Catharines the PAT program.

---

7. The question of the Seminaries was answered at the 2011 Synodical Convention where the direction was given to the Board of Directors by the Convention to implement a Memorandum of Understanding between the two Seminaries which would facilitate more cooperation and financial savings. This has been done, is in effect, and has resulted in financial savings, significant growth in the number of young men entering the Seminaries and an improved common curriculum between the Seminaries. Attached are the MOU and the 2014 Convention Resolution regarding the Seminaries.

**Discussion Summary**

This is another issue that could be distracting to the overall restructuring issue, so is best left out. However, it is very unfortunate that the question was asked as part of the survey as it has raised expectations that something new will be considered.

---

8. The Survey indicated that respondents wanted a clarification of the relationship between the Lutheran Church-Canada and Concordia University of Edmonton. That clarification is currently being prepared by the Board of Directors and will be made available to the church at large in the near future.

**Discussion Summary**

No further comments.

---

9. The relationship between Lutheran Church-Canada and Canadian Lutheran World Relief is also being clarified and established by the Board of Directors of LCC at this time. Once the shape of this relationship is firmed up, the Board will communicate that relationship to the whole church.

**Discussion Summary**

We are unhappy that this question was even part of the survey as it just raises concerns in the minds of some that there is a problem that needs to be addressed. In our opinion, this organization is well known by our members, and is supported by them. The high level of "no opinion" is more a reflection of the wording of the question (What does healthy mean?), than an indication of a need for more communication.

---

Name of Group: East District Board of Directors

Date of Meeting: Presentation on April 4, 2016  
Discussion by Board on April 5, 2016

Present were: Board members (7)  
East District Mission Executive, Gift Planner, Administrative  
Secretary, Assistant to the Business Manager, Atlantic Canada Circuit Rider

Total number present: 12

*Report prepared by Lois Griffin, Secretary, East District*