

SYNOD COUNCIL MEMBERS

The Rev. James Anderson
Mr. William Anderson
The Rev. Edward Barnett
Mr. Leonard Bartkus
The Rev. William Baum
Bishop Stephen P. Bouman
Mr. Robert Buescher, Treasurer-Elect
Mr. Alan Chen
Ms. Christine Connell, DM
Ms. Maria del Toro
Ms. Elizabeth Hoffmann
The Rev. James Krauser
Mr. John Litke, Vice President
Ms. Christina Lord-Barry
The Rev. Patt Margolis
Dr. Earl Marsan
The Rev. Fred McElderry
The Rev. Annemarie Noto, PhD
Mr. Patrick O'Brien

Ms. Marion Steadman
Ms. Sharon Wilson

EXCUSED

The Rev. Albert Ahlstrom
Mr. Carl Blomke
The Rev. Kathleen Koran
Ms. Katie Montano
Mr. Paul Jensen, Treasurer
Ms. Beverly Small
Mr. John Vercelletto

STAFF

The Rev. Cherlyne V. Beck
Ms. Joanne Strunck

AUXILIARY REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. Delores Gray
Judge Daniel Joy

- I. CALL TO ORDER Vice President Litke
- II. DEVOTIONS Vice President Litke
- III. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
- IV. MINUTES, April 27, 2004, consideration of
Correction to Ms. Gray's remarks: second bullet, July should be *February*; third bullet, *greater than 50%*; last bullet, *September 18th* rather than September 20th. Minutes were approved with corrections noted.
- V. MINUTES, May 11, 2004 consideration of
Minutes were approved as submitted
- VI. REPORT OF THE BISHOP
- A. Lutheran Social Services-Camp Wilbur Herrlich Issue: President David Benke and Bishop Bouman met with leaders of the two organizations to work toward a win-win. A third neutral appraisal is being sought for the property. Bishop Bouman commended the leadership of both boards.
- B. St. Luke's, Bay Shore: Bishop Bouman reviewed the situation at St. Luke's. The pastor resigned from the roster of the ELCA but is still serving as their pastor. We will be scheduling a meeting with St. Luke's council over the next weeks.
- C. The Wartburg, Mt. Vernon: Pastor Douglas Kempe, who was called through synod council to serve as Director of Pastoral Care at The Wartburg, Mt. Vernon, was asked to resign his position. He has returned to Idaho.

- D. Bishop Bouman participated in a press conference at City Hall around the issue of affordable housing.
- E. The newly formed Lutheran Services-New York Alliance (LS-NYA) will hold an inaugural worship event on October 17 at 4 pm at The Interchurch Center. This alliance brought together ten social ministry organizations that used to work separately and now work together. The bishop encouraged council members to attend.
- F. Lutheran Ministries in Higher Education (LMHE) is a pan-Lutheran agency which runs campus ministry within the five boroughs. A blue ribbon committee conducted a lengthy evaluation of LMHE and will present proposals to the LMHE Board. Both Bishop Bouman and President Benke are basically in concurrence with these proposals. The synod's representative on this board is the Rev. H. Gaylon Barker.
- G. The synod's attorney, Mr. Howard Capell, will attend a future synod council meeting to discuss how we are handling properties that have come under our control.
- H. Mr. Henry Von Dam, who has been running St. Paul's Lutheran Church in Williamsburg during a difficult and divisive number of years, has died in Christ. Bishop Bouman suggested it may be time to revisit our relationship with this church.
- I. We are currently undergoing two intervention processes. The bishop explained that there are several ways to intervene in conflict situations and one of those ways is through the consultation process. He asked for prayers.
- St. John's, Bronx.
 - Zion St.-Mark's, Manhattan.
- J. Calls

ACTION (SC04:6/1) RESOLVED that synod council call the Rev. William Clark to serve as full-time interim pastor at Church of the Holy Redeemer in Brooklyn, effective July 1, 2004. This call is issued under ELCA continuing resolution 7.44.A96.b.1.5.

ADOPTED

- K. Staff Reports

Pastor Cherlyne Beck reported on some upcoming dates:

1. Staff retreat June 15-17. Nobody will be in the office on the 15th and 16th. Support staff will return on the 17th
2. Quadrant meetings
 - September 19, Cross of Christ, Babylon 4:00pm
 - September 20, Grace Yorktown Heights, 7:30 pm
 - September 26, Trinity 46th St., Brooklyn, 4:00 pm
 - September 27, Church of the Abiding Presence, Bronx, 7:30 pm

VII. REPORT OF THE TREASURER

- A. Financial report
- Reports were distributed but were not discussed. Mr. Litke asked that members familiarize themselves with the formats before the next meeting.
- Monthly Mission Support Receipts 1991-2004, Contributions Summary by Conference May 1, 2004-May 31, 2004, and Contribution Summary by

Conference February 1, 2004-May 31, 2004 (**Attachment A**)

- Mission Support 1998-2004 — congregations by conference (**Attachment B**)
- Income & Expenditure Summary Report 2/1/01-1/31/06 (**Attachment C**)
- Mission Support Data Analysis (**Attachment D**)
- FY01-03 Revenue & Expense Budget Differential — graph (**Attachment E**)

- B. 2005 Budget
We will discuss this at the July meeting.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Congregations under synodical administration:

1. Hope Lutheran Church, Scarsdale: Pastor Carla Meier accepted call in Connecticut. We will be in discernment about what to do with this property
2. Christ Lutheran Church, Yonkers: Bishop Bouman briefly reviewed the situation at Christ, where we sold the building for senior housing, setting aside money for a congregation to worship in that location or some place in Westchester County. We are in discernment as to where to locate that ministry since the former membership is dispersed.
3. Holy Trinity, Hollis: Holy Trinity Community School will remain open at least for another year while a blue ribbon committee helps us to decide the best plan for the school and to seek resources. Some repairs to make it safe for the children have already been made. Approximately one million dollars more is needed. There are two parsonages, one of which may have to be sold to help pay for repairs to the property.
4. Sion, Harlem (not officially under synodical administration, but under staff guidance): The ministry had dwindled to 8-9 people. Under the leadership of Eduardo Arias, it has begun to flourish.
5. Atonement, Staten Island: Atonement is officially closing on June 30.
6. Redeemer, Hicksville: Redeemer has closed and is on the market. There has been protest from the current tenants about use of this property.
7. St. Paul, Valley Stream: Nothing new.
8. St. Paul s Williamsburg: We will be pursuing this congregation once again.
9. St. Peter s Brooklyn will be visited while they discern whether or not to ask for synodical administration.

B. Mission Development Board (MDB) (**Attachment F**)

The MDB is intended to respond to churches that are considering synodical administration. We have adopted a structure for doing this in good order while being true to the mission of the synod. It is to be governed by a board of five people. The charter calls for three to be elected by the synod assembly, one by synod council, and one to be appointed by the bishop. There was not enough time to do this at our last

assembly so synod council will elect those three as well. This board will report to the synod council. It is self-funded, not on the synod budget.

Mr. Litke asked that synod council members read the document by the next council meeting on July 20, when we will be electing the board.

C. Synod Assembly Review

Since there was an outcry this year over the cost of the assembly, next year s will be held in a church — St. Peter s in Huntington Station on May 20-21. It was suggested that lunch service of some kind be supplied for at least one of the meals. Being in a sanctuary for the plenary will be a challenge.

D. Congregation Constitutions
No report

Secretary Krauser

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Executive Committee Nominations:

The following names were presented in nomination for the Executive Committee: the Rev. William Baum, Ms. Elizabeth Hoffman, Ms. Sharon Wilson, Mr. Alan Chen. Nominations were declared closed.

ACTION (SC04:6/2):RESOLVED that Secretary Krauser cast one unanimous ballot ADOPTED

B. Resolution: sale of parsonage at Atonement, Staten Island

ACTION (SC04:6/3): RESOLVED that synod council authorize the listing of the parsonage at Atonement Lutheran Church in Staten Island at a cost no less than the appraised value of \$370,000. ADOPTED

C. Date for adjourned Synod Assembly

ACTION (SC04:6/4): RESOLVED that the Executive Committee be authorized to schedule the synod assembly in the fall. ADOPTED

D. Subcommittee on Minutes of the Synod Assembly

ACTION (SC04:6/5):RESOLVED that a five-member sub-committee of synod council be formed to make recommendation on the approval of Synod Assembly minutes. ADOPTED

E. Alternates for Churchwide Assembly

ACTION (SC04:6/6): RESOLVED that the following people be named as alternate voting members to Churchwide Assembly, based on those who received the largest number of votes: the Rev.

**William Baum, clergy; Ms. Karla McKenzie, lay female; and
Mr. Charles Leib, lay male.**

ADOPTED

X. DEANS REPORT — no report

XI. YOUTH REPORT — no report

XII. AUXILIARY ORGANIZATIONS

- A. Women of the ELCA
- B. Lutheran Men in Mission
- C. Diaconal Council

Ms. Delores Gray
Mr. Charles Kalthorn/Judge Dan Joy
Deacon Peter Slingerland

XIII. NEXT MEETING TOPICS

- A. Elections for Mission Development Board
- B. Personnel Policy

XIV. CLOSING PRAYER AND ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne Strunck
Administrative Assistant to the Bishop

Attachment F

Proposal for a Mission Development Board

This document describes an approach to helping congregations that are at risk for a viable ministry to redevelop, re-deploy or liquidate their assets to the benefit of the mission and ministry of the congregation and the synod. The goal is a defined process and organization to focus skills, responsibility and decision making when congregations require the formal assistance that has been known as “Synodical Administration”. The proposed title for the new structure is the Mission Development Board.

The goal of the proposal is to make full use of existing pastoral and collegial resources from synod committees, commissions, and rosters but to supplement this resource with technical, legal, and business skills from compensated persons organized as part of an on-call team responsible to the Mission Development Board.

The broad outline of the process includes a persistent monitoring of the health of local congregations followed by a formal intervention process when required. The monitoring process both identifies congregations that are particularly skilled in some aspect of their ministry that they may be encouraged to share their experiences and skills, and identifies congregations that are particularly weak that they may be encouraged to seek assistance.

The formal assistance of the Mission Development Board sketched below will be invoked only when the monitoring process identifies a need that has not been met with the existing resources of the local pastor, Deans, and the Evangelical Outreach (EO) commission. Therefore the mechanism of the Mission Development Board (MDB) is only a small part of the continuing interdependent relationships of congregations to their conferences and to the Synod.

Synopsis

- The MDB is self funded from the proceeds of redevelopment so it does not affect the synod operating budget
- Each congregational administration activity is organized as a separate Limited Liability Corporation under the synod to manage risks.
- Deans are charged with providing monitoring and early warning of the health of congregations.
- There is a formal evaluation process to determine if synod administration is warranted and what its goals should be. This uses a team of synod representatives, congregational representatives, and MDB persons
- The MDB provides the core expertise to extract maximum benefit from each administration, subject to written goals and objectives for each.
- All proceeds, after paying costs, are reinvested in the mission of the synod, using a team for synod-wide planning, and individual care teams for each supported mission.

Monitoring

Monitoring is an important aspect of the whole process and it is already in place. Deans are charged with an annual congregational visit to (among other goals) support the

1 monitoring and identification of the economic and pastoral characteristics of a congregation
2 that may reasonably be or become at risk.

3 To assist this evaluation with respect to economic or congregational viability, the
4 Evangelical Outreach Commission will develop a data gathering instrument for use by the
5 Deans. The instrument could include worship attendance, annual unrestricted income,
6 benevolence rate, debt load, economic and attendance trends, etc. These reports will be
7 available to the Synod staff and form one resource for a decision to request intervention.

8 Rationale: The Dean's annual visits are intended to meet more concerns than just
9 congregational viability, so an organized instrument will be helpful to ensure
10 mission development concerns are not left out of the visit. Some of the suggested
11 data is available, in principle, from the parochial reports, but many parochial
12 reports are not submitted or not completed with credible data. If the Dean had a
13 draft data-gathering instrument, possibly partially filled in from previous parochial
14 report data, the instrument could prompt useful questions to help identify concerns
15 before they become serious.

16 Deans will be reimbursed for doing the formal annual evaluation reports at a fixed
17 honorarium per instance to help motivate these visits. Pastors that do not provide
18 reasonable collaboration in this process should be reviewed by the bishop.

19 Rationale: there is concern on the part of some that Deans may have too much to do,
20 particularly considering their own congregational concerns, so that congregational
21 visitation may not be done conscientiously. A modest stipend is intended to
22 motivate these visits. Should this strategy be accepted, we should track it's
23 effectiveness in motivating Deans. The last sentence is just stating the obvious and
24 is not intended as a new concept.

25 **Formal Intervention Organization**

26 To be formally responsible for the overall process of synodical intervention in 'at risk'
27 congregations, the synod would charter a Mission Development Board. The charter of the
28 board is to:

- 29 • assist in the evaluation of whether or not a congregation at risk requires Synodical
30 Administration for the purpose of reorganization, redeployment or dissolution;
- 31 • manage the real assets of congregations that are under synodical administration so as
32 to realize the most value from those assets; and
- 33 • assist the synod in identifying and forming plans for new mission development that
34 would use the resources released from the congregations under synodical administration.

35 Rationale: A formal organization provides discipline for the process and also
36 accumulates experience that can be applied to future engagements. The core
37 competency of the organization is in the management and redevelopment process
38 and it should operate relatively independently in this area. Its expertise will be
39 applied in collaboration with others in the evaluation (intake) and new mission
40 development processes.

41 This board would:

- 1 • Be organized as a distinct unit within the MNYS and be the responsible unit for
2 managing the individual LLC's, one for each property that the Synod has
3 administrative control over;
- 4 • Report annually to the Synod Assembly and on appropriate schedule to the Synod
5 Council;
- 6 • Have a core team of experts with various legal, real estate, building engineering,
7 financial and political/governance skills. These persons would be paid for their
8 assistance using some form of per diem or per task billing as their assistance is needed
9 by the Board;
- 10 • Be separately accounted as a temporarily restricted fund distinct from the normal
11 operating financial activity of the synod. The customary financial processes and
12 oversight of the synod financial officers will apply;
- 13 • Pay the costs to do the day to day management and other redevelopment efforts
14 commended to the board from proceeds of resource redevelopment.

15 Rationale: These two provisions intend that the finances be separately tracked in
16 the manner of standard fund accounting so cross subsidies do not occur without
17 explicit visibility and/or authorization. Because expenses are paid from proceeds, it
18 also follows that expenses may not exceed proceeds unless there were some specific
19 fiscal agreement do so so. Temporary transfers to cover a cash flow problem are one
20 possibility, but the current informal team working on these issues (without benefit
21 of the proposed structure) has planned for adequate cash flow to avoid unfunded
22 expenses. Reporting and review of financial reports would be on the same schedule
23 as normal synod financial reporting.

24 The trustees of the MDB are elected to 4 year terms. They include 1 Synod Council person
25 appointed by the Bishop, 1 member elected by the Synod Council and 3 persons elected at
26 large by the Synod Assembly. The Bishop is an advisory member of the board and appoints
27 the chair from among the board members. No member of the board may serve more than 10
28 consecutive years.

29 Rationale: smaller boards are more effective, larger are more representative so a
30 board of five is a compromise. In general, the governance of the MDB involves
31 Synod Council members to ensure relevance to overall synod goals and objectives
32 (also, see below). It is undetermined whether or not there is sufficient time and
33 energy in Synod Council members to accept these additional expectations. The
34 provision that a majority are directly elected by the Synod Assembly is intended to
35 provide a more strategic synod-wide viewpoint than the more tactical concerns of the
36 Synod Council.

37 **Process**

38 The process of working with a congregation is in three phases.

39 • Intake

40 When intervention by the synod in a congregation seems plausible, a formal process will
41 be used to ensure all aspects of a situation are objectively evaluated before any decision
42 to act is made. This analysis period is the Intake phase of the overall MDB process.

- 1 • Resource Management
- 2 If the congregation enters synodical administration, the processes to manage the real
- 3 assets and extract the most appropriate value from those assets are part of the Resource
- 4 Management phase.
- 5 • Mission Development
- 6 The results of the Resource Management phase will provide financial (and possibly real
- 7 property) assets that are dedicated to supporting the mission of the synod or the ELCA.
- 8 The processes used to determine how to use these assets and managing their use are
- 9 part of the third (Mission Development) phase.
- 10 During the Intake and Mission Development phases, the board has an advisory role in
- 11 collaboration with other persons and resources in the Synod. During the Resource
- 12 Management stage the board has primary authority for acting but receives advice from
- 13 other persons and resources in the Synod.

14 ***1.a) Intake:***

15 The Intake phase is designed to be a proactive process that thoughtfully determines

16 appropriate goals and means for responding to mission crises in congregations. Should the

17 decision be that the Synod should administer the property of the congregation for purposes

18 of redevelopment, redeployment, or liquidation and reinvestment in mission, then the

19 Synod will obtain the legal right to administer the real assets of the congregation. This

20 process follows the conclusion of the analysis phase of the Intake Process and the result is a

21 congregation or property under Synod Administration.

22 There may be causes that result in Synodical Administration before the Intake analysis is

23 complete. This could include circumstances such as imminent bankruptcy, unexpected

24 liabilities, or unresolved dissension that require urgency in the assumption of responsibility

25 inherent in Synod Administration. Such causes are alluded to in the governing documents

26 S13.24¹, S 13.25², and C7.01³ among other places. Should this occur, the Synod

27 Administration of the assets will be charged with asset preservation against undue

28 deterioration, mitigation of risk and other normal conservation actions until the Intake

29 Analysis can complete and a decision made as sketched below.

¹ S13.24. If any congregation of this synod has disbanded, or if the members of a congregation agree that it is no longer possible for it to function as such, or if it is the opinion of the Synod Council that the membership of a congregation has become so scattered or so diminished in numbers as to make it impractical for such a congregation to fulfill the purposes for which it was organized or that it is necessary for this synod to protect the congregation's property from waste and deterioration, the Synod Council, itself or through trustees appointed by it, may take charge and control of the property of the congregation to hold, manage and convey the same on behalf of this synod. The congregation shall have the right to appeal the decision to the Synod Assembly.

²S13.25. This synod may temporarily assume administration of a congregation upon its request or with its concurrence.

³ C7.01. If this congregation ceases to exist, title to undisposed property shall pass to the Metropolitan New York Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

1 The Intake phase can be entered either by the recommendation of EO or synod staff with
2 concurrence of the Bishop, or voluntarily by request of the congregation. The intake phase
3 is for investigation and data gathering to support a decision at the end of the phase. The
4 intake phase is limited to 6 months or less and the phase is ended by production of a report.

5 Each intake (including those that begin with urgent assumption of responsibility via Synod
6 Administration) begins with a written statement of the problem as then known and the
7 care or assistance required. Involuntary intake statements are written and signed by the
8 Office of the Bishop. Voluntary intake statements are written and signed by congregational
9 authorities with the concurrence of the Office of the Bishop. The intake process formally
10 begins when the MDB leadership accepts the statement.

11 Rationale: there is a difficult balance in this process. The process of analysis and
12 decision should not be assigned solely to the MDB, but it is a process of the Synod
13 and its leadership. On the other hand, it is essential that a decision for resource
14 development via synodical administration (for involuntary intakes) be done
15 systematically, objectively, and fairly. Thus there is an attempt to balance in this
16 process the formality, expertise and objectivity of an MBD process, the collegial
17 participation of representative elements of the Synod, the responsibility of the
18 Bishop and Synod Council for supervision and the obligation of congregations for
19 responsible self-governance.

20 When the intake phase begins, the Office of the Bishop forms a care team of three to eight
21 persons. The team always includes an administrative expert from MDB as convenor,
22 Teams should include persons with a diversity of views and experience, such as a Dean, a
23 Synod Council member, members appointed by EO, the pastor/vice pastor of the
24 congregation and members from the congregation. Synod staff may be assigned to work
25 with or on a care team. This team is charged with support, investigation, analysis, and
26 recommendation. Investigation will include:

27 Definition of the governing documents including a copy of the Constitution and a list
28 of officers (present and recent past) for the congregation and any directly dependent
29 organizations.

30 Analysis of financial status, including debt, income and expense. An audit may be
31 performed. This should include issues such as liability, worker's comp and disability
32 insurance; real estate tax status; payroll tax liabilities; personnel policies and
33 benefit packages.

34 Analysis of real property status, both physical, financial, and legal

35 Analysis of archival and historical assets to include at least parish records and items
36 of historic or artistic value that should be particularly cared for.

37 Analysis of congregational dynamics as an organization

38 Analysis of neighborhood mission context, opportunities and challenges.

39 Other analyses as suggested by the intake proposal statement or the experience of
40 the care team.

41 Congregations voluntarily entering intake must commit to financial support of
42 expenditures required during the intake period. The MDB board may limit the number of
43 congregations in the intake process if resources are not available to support the care teams.

1 Rationale: it is probably unusual that (e.g.) a congregation would spontaneously seek
2 an analysis of whether and how to dissolve. On the other hand, the expertise of the
3 MDB can and should be used to inform congregational decisions of whether to
4 relocate/rebuild, merge with other congregations, or engage in substantial real
5 property development. Voluntary entry of the intake process envisions a formal
6 acknowledgement that the processes and skills of the MDB can be used to provide
7 noncompulsory advice to congregations so long as congregations bear the directly
8 attributable costs of the analysis and investigation.

9 The end of the intake phase is an MDB report that includes the data gathered and a
10 recommended action. The recommended action could include (e.g.) self-governed
11 redevelopment, assisted redevelopment, Synod Admin with dissolution, Synod Admin with
12 reorganization, relocation, or merger.

13 For voluntary intakes, the MDB report is communicated to the congregation and the Intake
14 phase is complete. For involuntary intakes, the MDB report is forwarded to the Synod
15 Council and the Office of the Bishop for decision. The Synod Council, with the concurrence
16 of the Bishop, determines the proper course of action.

17 Rationale: it is important that any decision on how to make best use of resources for
18 the mission of the synod be assigned to the supervising authority of the Office of the
19 Bishop and the Synod Council. Therefore, the intake process produces advice, data,
20 and recommendations on the question, but the decision resets with the elected
21 leadership and the Office of the Bishop.

22 If the determined action includes Synodical Administration and legal title has not already
23 been obtained, then the MDB will begin the process of acquiring the appropriate legal
24 rights to the real property of the congregation and assigning those rights to an LLC
25 organized for management of that congregation's assets.⁴

26 ***1.b) Resource Management:***

27 Once title to real assets is assigned to the LLC formed for the purpose, the congregation
28 enters the Resource Management phase⁵. There are two types of management processes
29 that can engage the Resource Management phase of the Mission Development Board.

30 1.b.1) Self Governed and Assisted Redevelopment

31 Self-governed redevelopment may use the expertise of the MDB team, but the congregation
32 reimburses all expenses incurred by that assistance. In this case, the assigned care team is
33 dissolved and collaboration with the congregation is commended to the EO commission.

34 For assisted redevelopment, the assigned care team or its successor should be retained and
35 assigned the responsibility to coordinate the process. This arrangement may use the
36 technical resources of the Resource Management team on a cost-reimbursed basis. The
37 redeveloping congregation will pay all costs of the assistance.

⁴ In some urgent circumstances, such legal rights may have been already been obtained as noted previously.

⁵ If the management of the LLC does not anticipate litigation, then the LLC publishing activity may be deferred until necessary as part of the management responsibility of the MDB.

1 Rationale: these types of resource management envision the possibility that the
2 MDB expertise teams are a resource for congregations. It is not likely that this type
3 of relationship would be very common, but by defining the possibility it is not
4 excluded.

5 1.b.2) Synod Administration and Redevelopment

6 If a congregation is synodically administered, then a written plan is required for the
7 Resource Management process. A written plan will state the end goals for the Resource
8 Management process and the anticipated time for the process. If the recommended action
9 could result in liquidation of the real assets of the congregation, the Resource Management
10 plan may anticipate sale, transfer, redeployment or other redevelopment options for those
11 real assets. Plans must be developed in the context of the strategic insight of the Mission
12 Planning Team and the comments of the Mission Planning Team must be solicited before
13 the plan is presented to the MDB and the Synod Council.

14 Rationale: The redevelopment process may best provide a rehabilitated real
15 property for the use of other missions. Therefore, redevelopment should not be
16 decided solely on the basis of the property under consideration, but also consider the
17 mission planning of the synod with respect to the locality of the real property under
18 consideration. This requirement ensures that strategic mission planning will be
19 part of the decision of the MDB and the Synod Council for each property under
20 synod administration.

21 When this plan is written and approved by both the MDB and the Synod Council, the MDB
22 organizes a redevelopment team that is given the authority to seek those goals. If the
23 process requires more than one year, then the redevelopment team will make annual
24 written reports to the MDB board and the Synod Council, noting the progress, steps still to
25 be done, and anticipated completion time and result. Any substantive required changes to
26 the original written plan must be approved by the MDB board and the Synod Council.

27 The original assigned care team becomes advisory and is relieved of direct responsibility.
28 The MDB board has management authority over each redevelopment team.

29 Rationale: the MDB is chartered to act independently, subject only to observing the
30 intent of the written plan for Resource Management and to annual reports to the
31 Synod Assembly and periodic reports to the Synod Council. This is a deliberate
32 decision designed to reduce the difficulties from varieties of second thoughts, micro-
33 management, and individual sensitivities. The written Resource Management plan,
34 of course, may specify the observance of specific constraints. However, the more
35 detailed the constraints upon Resource Management, the more costly the process
36 and the less likely that optimal resource recovery can be obtained. Approval by
37 Synod Council ensures that the plan includes all reasonable issues important to the
38 synod. Approval by the MDB ensures that plans do not include unreasonable
39 specificity that would seriously hamper the Resource Management tasks.

40 ***1.c) New Missions Development***

41 Resources released from congregational administration support the cost of that
42 administration. Because costs often must be expended before the realization of a benefit,
43 the MDB will retain sufficient working capital to support the ongoing work. Resources
44 available beyond these anticipated costs are devoted to mission work of the synod.

1 Rationale: the design deliberately de-couples the recovery of resource value from the
2 commitment of available resources to new ministries. As recovery of value is often
3 uncertain as to both time and amount, this is reasonable and prudent management.
4 It also prevents the temptation of not only counting chickens before they are
5 hatched, but also selling the mature birds as a futures contract to eager buyers!
6 Thus the process design anticipates that the MDB will retain a working capital of
7 several hundred thousand dollars (probably) and release monies only as they are
8 clearly available and not necessary to support the development costs of properties
9 under administration. This plan also is designed so the operating costs of the MDB
10 will not be a burden to the operating budget of the synod.

11 It is also possible that a Resource Management plan may specify rehabilitation or
12 renovation of a property so that it can be returned to a synodical mission purpose. If
13 this is the case, the process would use working capital from previous Resource
14 Management processes rather than release the monies to a Mission Planning teams
15 (see below).

16 As resources become available for release (as determined by the MDB), a Mission Planning
17 team is charged with developing a mission plan for the use of releasable resources. The
18 Mission Planning team consists of the Bishop, a Dean or other member of the ministerium,
19 a representative from the EO commission appointed by the Bishop, one or two synod staff
20 members as advisors and a Synod Council member elected by the Synod Council. Other
21 than the Bishop, the terms of the Mission Planning team are 4 years, with no member
22 serving longer than 10 consecutive years.

23 The Mission Planning team will report to the Synod Assembly and Synod Council annually
24 on the overall state of the mission developments in progress. Each individual mission
25 development (below) also will provide an annual written report to the Synod Council
26 comparing current progress to the expectations in the original plan.

27 Each proposed individual mission development requires a 5 year written plan defining
28 goals, people and financial resources (per year), and success/failure criteria per year. If
29 approved by the Bishop and the Synod Council, then a mission team is formed to shepherd
30 each venture. A Mission team includes the Bishop, a Dean or other member of the
31 ministerium from the locality of the proposed mission, a Synod Council member, a member
32 of the staff of the Office of the Bishop and 2 members from the area being developed. Each
33 mission team is responsible for annual evaluation of progress and report to the Synod
34 Council. The Synod Council must approve any commitment of mission support from MDB-
35 released resources to extend beyond 5 yrs, with a limit of 7 yrs of support.

36 Rationale: this process requires that mission development plans have a planned
37 specific, bounded support time before the mission will be either self-supported or
38 supported by other resources. The process would discourage the beginning of
39 missions that require continual support by synod mission development funds.