

**Report of Administrative Commission  
Investigating Mr. Jud Hendrix,  
Former Pastor at Covenant Community Church, Louisville, KY  
Presented to Mid-Kentucky Presbytery on May 20, 2024**

**Members of the Commission**

1. Annica Gage
2. Jennifer Gingerich
3. Austin Green
4. Linda Reichenbecher
5. Sara Sutphin
6. Jerry Van Marter (secretary, not a voting member of the commission)

**Table of Contents**

• <b>Enabling Authority of the Commission</b>	3
• <b>Purpose</b>	4
• <b>Defining Sexual Abuse</b>	6
• <b>Investigation Procedure</b>	7
• <b>Findings of Facts and Conclusions</b>	10
• <b>Concerns About Ongoing Abuse</b>	19
• <b>Recommendations</b>	21
• <b>Appendix</b>	23

**Content Notice:**

The Covenant Community Church Administrative Commission was tasked with discerning the truth surrounding accounts of misconduct by a former pastor. As such, this report details findings of pastoral sexual misconduct with adult victims/survivors. While descriptions of this behavior are not graphic, they are forthright, and include incidents of grooming and sexual contact in the context of a faith community. Reader discretion is advised, especially for individuals with a personal history of sexual abuse or church trauma. Our hope is that such individuals are empowered to engage this content as they choose, and to take the care needed to avoid retraumatization.

### **ENABLING AUTHORITY**

At its stated meeting on September 18, 2023, Mid-Kentucky Presbytery, a council of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), passed a resolution for the creation of an administrative commission to investigate and review available information surrounding sexual misconduct allegations involving Jud Hendrix, former pastor of Covenant Community Church (CCC) in Louisville, KY. The resolution is as follows:

“The commission, at the request of Covenant Community Church, moves that the presbytery create an administrative commission under G-3.0109b(6) “to seek to reach a determination of the truth” surrounding misconduct allegations directed at its former pastor Jud Hendrix by Covenant Community Church. The commission will be composed of 5-7 members appointed by the moderator and COM chair and will begin its work guided by G-3.0109b(6) and informed by the rubric set forth by Covenant Community Church in its report to the Commission on Ministry.”

The enacting authority for such an administrative commission is authorized under G-3.0109b(6) of the Book of Order. Because Mr. Hendrix asked to be released from the exercise of ordered ministry in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) in 2013, ecclesiastical judicial proceedings were not available to Mid-Kentucky Presbytery for these allegations of misconduct that surfaced in 2020. Recent changes in polity in the Book of Order allow for administrative commissions to be authorized under the auspices G-3.0109b(6). In pertinent part the authority granted by G-3.0109b(6) states:

“making pastoral inquiry into persons accused of sexual abuse of another person (D-10.0401c) when jurisdiction in a judicial proceeding against such persons has ended due to death or renunciation of jurisdiction of the accused; such inquiries shall not be understood as judicial proceedings but shall seek to reach a determination of truth related to the accusation and to make appropriate recommendations to the designating council.”

The administrative commission created by Mid-Kentucky Presbytery and operating under G-3.0109b(6) has investigated the alleged sexual misconduct of Mr. Hendrix at Covenant Community Church. The definition for sexual abuse as used in G-3.0109b(6), the standard for the administrative commission, is set forth in the D-7.0901:

“Sexual abuse is any offense involving sexual conduct in relation to any person under the age of eighteen years or anyone without the capacity to consent, or any person when the conduct includes force, threat, coercion, intimidation, or misuse of ordered ministry or position. Sexual abuse is contrary to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and is therefore always an offense for the purpose of discipline.”

The administrative commission (“AC”) from inception and throughout its work is aware of mandatory reporting laws. Much is detailed in the following report. However, the commission is unaware of legally required mandatory reporting as a result of its findings. The focus of the report details sexual misconduct that would fall under the rubric of “coercion, intimidation, misuse of ordered ministry or position” that is detailed in D-7.0901.

## PURPOSE

The aforementioned “misconduct allegations” came to light in the midst of CCC’s conversation about their identity and history in 2020. This conversation included discussion of CCC’s relationship with former pastor Jud Hendrix, against whom a disciplinary case (#17-2011) was opened when a complainant filed a charge against Mr. Hendrix for his attempt to unzip her dress at a house party hosted and attended by members of Covenant Community Church. This case was opened in 2011 and closed in 2013, when Mr. Hendrix requested to be released from his ordination within the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).

As past and present members of CCC have gathered to reflect on their history and identity, they have become aware of a significant amount of ambiguity, unspoken assumptions, and unanswered questions regarding the nature of Mr. Hendrix’s allegations and disciplinary process. They have also become aware of Mr. Hendrix’s sexual relationships with numerous women within his congregation, many of whom were under the assumption that they were the only ones who had experienced this sort of sexual contact, and were left, as one member stated, “isolated in their experience.”

As one means of seeking restoration, justice, and healing as a spiritual community, the CCC session recommended the presbytery form an administrative commission tasked with the following goals:

- For the presbytery and CCC to learn from past breakdowns that allowed this abuse to occur and continue; including how Mr. Hendrix continued to moderate session and be the communication link between the 2011 misconduct investigation and the church.
- For the presbytery to hear and acknowledge the trauma this abuse had on individuals and the CCC congregation.
- For the presbytery to do what is in the presbytery's power to address and prevent any potential current and future abuse by responsibly collaborating with ecumenical/community entities. The CCC session hopes this could include sharing the public report developed by the AC with institutions with which Mr. Hendrix is associated.

The CCC session also requested that the following considerations be incorporated into the AC’s investigative process:

- For the AC to communicate updates about the process periodically with CCC session and assist the session in communicating the AC process with the congregation.
- For Faith Trust Institute’s *Responding to Spiritual Leader Misconduct: A Handbook* to be a resource for its investigative process. (Section three was identified as especially helpful for leading an investigation from a trauma-informed perspective.)
- For a member of the team to be knowledgeable about trauma and the impact of trauma.

- For the AC to do no further harm while gathering information and communicating with individuals.

This AC recognizes these goals and processes as vital to the health and healing of not only Covenant Community Church, but also of Mid-Kentucky Presbytery and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). The PCUSA is a deeply connectional church, with a nationally shared polity and frequent ministerial collaboration across parishes, presbyteries, and synods. Mid-Kentucky Presbytery is likewise a single body that is composed of 45 congregations throughout the central portion of Kentucky. When one of the congregations is facing a hardship, then in truth all congregations are facing the hardship.

This understanding of our communal health is not a quirk of Presbyterian governance or polity. It is rather rooted in our theology, in which we understand ourselves as individual entities who draw life from our shared connection to Christ, and are inherently connected to each other within Christ. In John 15:5 we are told, “I am the vine, you are the branches. Those who abide in me and I in them bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing.” This metaphor in John’s gospel serves predominantly to characterize our deep reliance on Christ as the source of our power. While that truth remains central, this metaphor also reveals an additional truth about the Christian community: just as no branch can thrive or even survive if cut off from its source, so does each branch’s presence or absence of a healthy connection to the vine affect all other parts of the whole. This serves as an illustration of why it is of the utmost importance that Mid-Kentucky Presbytery respond to this call to assist in accountability and healing following any sexual misconduct. All of us are branches connected to a single vine; as such, for all of us to bear fruit, each branch must be looked after.

## DEFINING SEXUAL ABUSE

The PC(USA) Book of Order's definition of *sexual abuse* includes "any offense involving sexual conduct in relation to ... any person when the conduct includes force, threat, coercion, intimidation, or misuse of ordered ministry or position" (D-7.0901). *Sexual misconduct* is a broader term that includes this abuse as well as harassment. One responsibility of Mid-Kentucky Presbytery is to facilitate and maintain the integrity of the relationship between spiritual leaders and congregants. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that there is a recognition of the inherent power dynamics between spiritual leaders and congregants, and that we work to maintain healthy boundaries in the ministerial relationship.

As spiritual leaders are granted significant authority and trust, they hold a level of power that inherently compromises their ability to be in a consensual relationship with a congregant. In such a dual relationship, a congregant who would otherwise be empowered to openly share their needs instead becomes pressured, consciously or otherwise, to defer to their sexual partner's pastoral authority. For these reasons, any sexual contact between a minister and congregant is considered sexual abuse.

It is illustrative for this analysis to look at the 2 Samuel 11-12 story of King David and Bathsheba. An illicit relationship is started when David utilizes his authority to demand that Bathsheba, who is married to Uriah, be brought to the palace to sleep with the king. A pregnancy results. In an attempt to hide the pregnancy of Bathsheba, David recalls Uriah from battle to spend time with his wife. Upon Uriah's refusal to do so, David sends Uriah to the front of the battle to ensure that he perishes. Upon the death of Uriah, David takes Bathsheba as a wife. Ultimately, David is confronted by Nathan with the story of the rich man and a poor man, and David is convicted by his abuse of power. While the story of David, Bathsheba, and Uriah contains elements of infidelity and sexual intercourse, it is neither Bathsheba's acquiescence to her king nor any specific expression of sexuality that Nathan condemns. Rather, it is David's abuse of the power granted to him as a leader. It is King David, not Bathsheba, who initiated the abuse and attempted cover-up, as it was King David who possessed power in need of accountability.

The power dynamics and the misuse of power laid out above are illustrative of why the leaders within the church are likewise responsible for maintaining appropriate boundaries between themselves and the communities they serve, and for holding each other accountable for misconduct and abuses. While the scale of power between monarch and spiritual leader are distinct, the power dynamics at play between king/citizen and pastor/congregant are, for all practical purposes, equivalent. A congregant's perceived consent to sexual contact does not negate the power difference between spiritual leader and community member, nor does it overrule the leader's responsibility to prioritize their congregant's autonomy and safety. Just as Bathsheba could not meaningfully grant or withdraw consent from King David, so are congregants who are propositioned by their pastors at a high risk of coercion by a person they experience as a spiritual, moral, and communal authority figure.

## INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE

The commission is composed of Mid-Kentucky Presbytery members Annica Gage, Jennifer Gingerich, Austin Green, Linda Reichenbecher, and Sara Sutphin, with Mid-Kentucky Stated Clerk Jerry Van Marter serving as secretary. These commissioners were invited to participate based on their pastoral and professional skills, informed by their respective roles in the fields of ministry, chaplaincy, psychotherapy, and law. In addition to their collective understanding of the commission's responsibility through the spiritual framework set forth in the "Purpose" section of this report, each commission member has brought distinct insights in evaluating the evidence and information available, informed by the lens of their own discipline. Taken together, the commission hopes this interdisciplinary collaboration and analysis will reveal a deeper understanding of the relational, cultural, and power dynamics at work during Mr. Hendrix's pastorate at Covenant Community Church.

The commission first met on November 29, 2023 with Mid-Kentucky General Presbyter John Odom, Stated Clerk Jerry Van Marter, and Commission on Ministry Chair Marissa Galván Valle to review the purpose and goals of this commission, and to plot a course for when and how to meet. Appropriate methods of storing and sharing documentation generated within this investigation were discussed, with the commission agreeing to utilize a shared, password-protected Dropbox folder to access relevant notes. Access to this Dropbox folder is limited to commission members and Mid-Kentucky Presbytery staff. The commission agreed to spend December 2023 reviewing orientational documentation, and to commence meeting weekly via Zoom the first week of January 2024, with the goal of presenting a completed report to the presbytery in either February 2024 or May 2024.

The commission spent December 2023 reviewing the following documents:

- Mid-Kentucky Presbytery Meeting and COM Meeting minutes (2011-2013, shared by Mid-KY Presbytery staff)
- COM Recommendations regarding Jud Hendrix (2013, shared by Mid-KY Presbytery staff)
- A reflection on CCC's cultural and pastoral history (written in 2020 and shared by Covenant Community Church)
- A timeline of CCC's history in relation to Jud Hendrix (2000-2023, compiled and shared by Covenant Community Church)
- A narrative of pastoral abuse at CCC (written in 2023 and shared by Covenant Community Church)
- *Responding to Spiritual Leader Misconduct: A Handbook* (FaithTrust Institute, 2022). (The commission continued to utilize this text as a resource to define, recognize, and discuss pastoral misconduct throughout this investigation.)

The commission began meeting weekly in January 2024. Upon review of the documents listed above, the commission deemed it necessary to request interviews with individuals who were active within Covenant Community Church in general, and within the period beginning in 2011 when the presbytery investigated a complaint of sexual misconduct regarding Mr. Hendrix. Informed by the guidance laid out in *Responding to Spiritual Leader Misconduct: A Handbook*

regarding trauma-informed communication with individuals and communities, the commission drafted an invitation (see Appendix A) to the congregants of Covenant Community Church to share their memories and experiences of Mr. Hendrix's pastorate. This invitation was completed in collaboration with CCC's current pastor and session, and released via letter and email to the current congregants of Covenant Community Church on January 27, 2024.

From February-May 2024, the commission hosted interviews with Mid-Kentucky community members. The parties who participated in interviews can be divided into three generalized demographics:

- 1) Current and former members and participants at CCC
- 2) Current and former pastors of CCC
- 3) Former COM/Presbytery Leaders

*Current and former members and participants at CCC:*

Members of the CCC community who agreed to interview reached out to a designated AC member, who then arranged time to interview. Respondents were also supplied with a statement of confidentiality (see Appendix B). Per that confidentiality statement, this commission agreed to make every effort to remove any and all identifying information related to victims in the final report. Respondents to this invitation to interview included parties with direct evidence of Mr. Hendrix's behavior, parties with credible secondhand accounts of Mr. Hendrix's behavior, and parties who were impacted by Mr. Hendrix's leadership both within and beyond CCC.

Respondents to this invitation also occasionally shared documentation of past correspondence between Mr. Hendrix and CCC congregants and staff.

*Current and former pastors of CCC:*

Rev. Abbi Heimach-Snipes initially met with the commission in February 2023 to share a summary of CCC's history, an analysis of Mr. Hendrix's grooming patterns, and multiple examples of Mr. Hendrix's abuse, shared with permission from victims who had disclosed their stories to their pastor. Abbi Heimach-Snipes would continue to be a collaborator, conversation partner, and liaison throughout the commission's investigative work. One key point of collaboration included connecting the commission with Into Account, an organization that assists individuals and communities seeking justice, accountability, and recovery in Christian contexts.

Rev. Mamie Broadhurst, who followed Jud Hendrix as pastor of CCC, was also interviewed.

*Former COM/Presbytery leadership:*

Informed by the documentation provided in their initial orientation, the commission identified and requested interviews with two leaders: Rev. Nancy Troy, who was part of the 2011 investigative committee and served on the Commission on Ministry as they supervised Mr. Hendrix, and Rev. Ken Hockenberry, Stated Clerk of the presbytery during this time period. These respondents pointed the commission to additional documentation for the commission to review, including Mr. Hendrix's investigation file (Case #17-2011), personnel file, and correspondence between Mr. Hendrix and presbytery staff.

As interviews were completed between February-May 2024, the commission utilized their weekly meetings to review incoming interview notes and documentation; identify recurring behaviors and themes shared by respondents; analyze Mr. Hendrix's behavior through the lenses



of the relational, cultural, and power dynamics within faith communities and pastoral relationships; and assign the work of drafting, writing, and editing sections of this final report to various commission members.

On March 27, 2024, the commission reviewed an outline of this report with representatives from Into Account, who provided feedback and guidance on both the content and the form of the final report. Into Account also advised the commission regarding whether and how to initiate contact with Mr. Hendrix. In addition, Into Account advised the commission on how best to allow for any additional victims of Mr. Hendrix's pastoral abuse to reach out to the commission and/or to the presbytery after this report has been released. Commission members completed their writing of this report with this guidance in mind.

The commission then compiled an executive summary containing the key themes and conclusions of this report and joined CCC's pastor in presenting this summary in a Town Hall at Covenant Community Church on April 14, 2024. CCC members in attendance were able to share questions, concerns, and feedback directly with the commission before the report was finalized. The commission utilized this feedback in its continued editing and finalization of this report.

Finally, upon the completion and gathering of all available evidence, the commission reached out to Mr. Hendrix on April 18, 2024, informing him of the impending presentation of this report to Mid-Kentucky Presbytery and extending the opportunity to respond to said report by April 26, 2024, if desired. Mr. Hendrix accepted this opportunity and responded to the commission via Zoom on April 28, 2024. During this meeting, Mr. Hendrix answered questions presented by this administrative commission regarding his pastorate and relationships at CCC, including a confirmation of his initiation and participation in sexual relationships with multiple congregants during his pastorate at CCC.

Having gathered written and reported evidence from the aforementioned sources, the AC drafted a preliminary version of this report to be shared with those who provided interviews and requested to review a copy of the report before its finalization. These respondents provided final feedback regarding their representation within the report, their comfort or discomfort with the inclusion of their comments and stories, and additional facts or themes that may contribute to a fuller understanding of Mr. Hendrix's leadership and relationships at CCC.

This report was finalized and submitted to Mid-Kentucky Presbytery on May 10, 2024. The following Findings of Facts and Conclusions and Recommendations were presented by this commission to Mid-Kentucky Presbytery on May 20, 2024.

## FINDINGS OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

### *Founding Culture of CCC:*

The AC heard from congregants about the unique aspects of CCC that drew community members to the church and that manifested organically as the congregation grew. Key learnings and themes included the following:

1. The congregation at CCC consisted of many young adults, with a critical mass of members in their 20's, 30's and 40's.
2. Many congregants gravitated towards CCC after leaving more "traditional" churches, where they often felt judged or rejected. These congregants especially appreciated CCC's acceptance of LGBTQ+ individuals, theological openness, and welcome for those who had been hurt by traditional models of worship. One respondent remembered arriving at CCC after recognizing their need "for a cohesive, queer-affirming community. CCC provided that in a way I wasn't experiencing anywhere else in Louisville."
3. Informed by that "church hurt," these congregants were often seeking alternative forms of worship compared to the more traditional or structured styles they had experienced elsewhere. Congregants and leadership at CCC were likewise seeking alternatives to the traditional, hierarchical structure of church leadership. Respondents noted their appreciation for CCC's "unconventional" culture as well as its prioritization of relationships rather than "rules of behavior."
4. Many young adults who found CCC were eager to engage topics that were taboo in their former faith communities, including sexuality and alcohol. Many were seeking affirmation of their "whole self" by their spiritual leaders and liberation within their faith community. One respondent recalled their appreciation that it was "okay to explore everything" at CCC.
5. Many young adults who found CCC were seeking friendships and relationships outside of church structure itself, and found friendship and fun as well as spiritual nurture within CCC's community. Respondents recalled feeling like "I belonged because I was there," and noting "It really meant a lot to be seen. CCC became my community." Congregants frequently spent time together outside of the church, including gatherings and parties in restaurants, bars, and each other's homes. Some of these gatherings were formal church events; others were organized spontaneously.
6. For a portion of the congregation, the church culture came to include heavy alcohol use and partying, loose boundaries in relationships, and, eventually, secret-keeping. One respondent remembered CCC as having "no boundaries" between leadership, congregants, and/or family members. Another respondent recalled "There was a lot of drinking and partying there, and I saw several marriages break up because of affairs people were having. Nothing was ever discouraged." Though there were "a lot of rumors" about the state of various relationships within the congregation, "No one talked much. The popular phrase at that time was 'That's not my story to tell.'"

*Behaviors that laid foundation for abuse:*

Rather than recognizing his primary responsibility to be a mentor for congregants seeking a safe faith community, Mr. Hendrix participated in and promoted a culture where lax boundaries between pastor and congregant were normalized. Mr. Hendrix's actions in his time as CCC pastor point to a pattern of acculturation and boundary-pushing that allowed him to act with relative impunity.

One strategy that enabled this impunity was the cultivation of a culture of exceptionalism, in which the "rules" of the church at large were framed as not applying to CCC. A member of the 2011 Investigative Committee recalled Mr. Hendrix's attitude as "We [CCC] don't...live by the same rules [as other churches]. We're special, ground-breaking, in many ways." This strategy additionally cultivated a culture of secrecy, in which CCC members were primed to avoid disclosing any of the "exceptional" behavior for fear of being chastised by the church at large. This framework of the need for secrecy to maintain exceptionality also meant that those who were uncomfortable with facets of CCC culture became hesitant to speak up, for fear of being ridiculed or ostracized by their own pastor and faith community. Key examples of this behavior included the following:

1. Mr. Hendrix refused to acknowledge the authority and power inherent in his role as pastor and Minister of Word and Sacrament, instead promoting the idea of a flat hierarchy within the congregation. One ruling elder remembered Mr. Hendrix's assurance that due to their own status as an elder, "I was his equal." Another worship leader recalled Mr. Hendrix's qualifying everyone at CCC, including himself, as "friends." Mr. Hendrix repeatedly described himself as merely another member of CCC, a claim which enabled him to engage freely in the "party culture" at CCC.
2. Mr. Hendrix encouraged and participated in drinking within the church building and at outside events. Even persons who were struggling with alcohol were encouraged to "come on, just have one." Mr. Hendrix also consumed alcohol in the building of James Lees Presbyterian Church (where CCC met during Mr. Hendrix's pastorate) and welcomed others to do the same.
3. Mr. Hendrix gave massages to both CCC members and wider community members, often using a massage table stored in the James Lees church building. When Stated Clerk Ken Hockenberry raised the concern about the potential for dual relationships in Mr. Hendrix's work as a pastor and a masseuse, Mr. Hendrix assured Rev. Hockenberry, "I know all the legalities." (It would later be discovered that while Mr. Hendrix presented himself as a licensed massage therapist, he held no such license.)
4. Mr. Hendrix continued to store and consume alcohol on church premises after the James Lees session became aware of this behavior, and revoked permission to do so.
5. Though he overtly encouraged authenticity in relationships, Mr. Hendrix also belittled those who expressed discomfort with his behavior. The congregation by and large followed his lead, responding to Mr. Hendrix's pastoral authority and, perhaps, their own hesitance to perpetuate the sex-negative, shame-driven theology that dominated the faith

communities many CCC members had left. This manifested most notably in Mr. Hendrix's failure to honor the validity or anonymity of the person who submitted a formal allegation against him in 2011. One respondent remembered a conversation in which Mr. Hendrix claimed his accuser "had overreacted and had a lot of mental health stuff going on." Multiple respondents confirmed their collective memory of Mr. Hendrix's accuser experiencing victim-shaming, with her own participation in CCC's "party culture" reframed as a plausible invitation for Mr. Hendrix's indiscretion.

A striking number of Mr. Hendrix's actions additionally demonstrated a consistent normalization of sexual/sexualized language and behavior, often under the guise of holistic, liberating, or countercultural theology, fellowship, and worship. Examples of this behavior included the following:

6. Mr. Hendrix frequently incorporated sex and sexuality as key themes in his spiritual metaphors and teaching. A former CCC member recalled there being "a lot of talk about sexuality...and spirituality" at the heart of multiple "Theology on Tap" gatherings at a local bar. Another attendee of Mr. Hendrix's Shema group recalled Mr. Hendrix's co-facilitation of a session with a female friend: "He did say something like, 'We're so connected that we don't even need to have sex' within the context of their spiritual connectedness."
7. Mr. Hendrix frequently hosted parties at his house, where he and congregants would use his personal hot tub. Those in the hot tub were occasionally nude or clothed only in underwear. (On at least one occasion, a congregant who voiced their discomfort with this communal nudity was "laughed at...for being so upset.")
8. Mr. Hendrix joined congregants in spontaneous meetings at bars, where games such as "spin the bottle" and "truth or dare" were played. Members of the congregation as well as new or prospective members were often asked very personal and sexualized questions within these games. One respondent recalled Mr. Hendrix frequently introducing newcomers to these gatherings to "his 'sexual spectrum quiz,'" where participants were encouraged to rate themselves "on a scale of 1-10" regarding various facets of their sexual identity and practice ("1 being straight, 10 being gay...1 being celibate, 10 being promiscuous," etc.).
9. Mr. Hendrix once attended a CCC Halloween party dressed as a Chippendale dancer, with a costume consisting of black tuxedo pants, a black tie, and no shirt.
10. While signing a note to a congregant, Mr. Hendrix distinguished the note as being from "Your lover."
11. Mr. Hendrix customarily exchanged a "Holy Kiss" with female congregants during the passing of the peace, whereby women were greeted openly with a kiss on the mouth. Participants remembered this practice being justified by the claim "That's how the early church did it."
12. Mr. Hendrix used double entendres to conjure sexual allusions within liturgy and worship. Most notable was Mr. Hendrix's jokes about the phrase "until he comes again"

within the Words of Institution for the Lord's Supper, with Mr. Hendrix emphasizing the double meaning of the word "come."

Taken as individual actions, each of these events granted Mr. Hendrix a level of plausible deniability. As one respondent explained in looking back over Mr. Hendrix's pastorate, there were many incidents that at the time were justified as silly, over-the-top, or "just Jud." However, taken as a whole, these behaviors reveal a troubling grooming pattern, with Mr. Hendrix normalizing boundary-crossing, and sexualized language and touch, and secret-keeping as behaviors CCC members not only became comfortable with, but even came to expect from Mr. Hendrix. By normalizing and justifying inappropriate behavior in the name of "countercultural fellowship" or "liberation," Mr. Hendrix laid the foundation for larger relational and sexual transgressions. Additionally, by consistently and casually utilizing sexual language and imagery, it is likely that Mr. Hendrix was enabled to identify whom within the community reacted positively or negatively to his engagement of sexuality—and, subsequently, whom in the community he could potentially approach for further sexual favors.

This pattern of acculturation becomes especially dubious in the context of the CCC community. CCC was made up of a number of young worshipers who grew up in the church, but left due to dehumanizing theology and shame-based morality systems. These ex-churched were drawn to CCC as an affirming community where their whole selves would be welcomed, and where holistic theology was explored. In this context of this active desire for holistic connection and affirmation, Mr. Hendrix reframed behavior well beyond the bounds of appropriate pastor-congregant relationships as expressions of sexual and theological liberation. By cultivating an atmosphere in which transgressive behavior was expected and even celebrated, Mr. Hendrix perpetuated a different sort of spiritual abuse. While those targeted at CCC were not having their humanity dismissed from the pulpit, they were internalizing the assumption that healthy relationships within a faith community entail sexual availability. Additionally, anyone who expressed discomfort with Mr. Hendrix's words or actions was put in a position of being a dissenting voice, risking accusations of the same sort of judgment, prudishness, or fundamentalism to which so many members of their own community were seeking an alternative.

#### *Resulting Abusive Behaviors:*

Having established a culture of exceptionalism, secret-keeping, and sexualized language and behavior at CCC, Mr. Hendrix was thus enabled to initiate sexual contact with congregants. The nature of this contact ranged from unwelcome erotic touch to ongoing sexual relationships, as described below:

1. Mr. Hendrix spoke with CCC members about his sexual attraction to their fellow congregants. One respondent recalled overhearing Mr. Hendrix talking to another congregant "about how attractive their mother was, and how nice sex with her would be."
2. Mr. Hendrix texted a photo of his genitals to at least one congregant.

3. Mr. Hendrix kissed women while attending CCC parties on multiple occasions, including a prolonged kiss with a female congregant while Mr. Hendrix was dressed as a Chippendale dancer at the aforementioned Halloween party. An attendee of this party remembered their alarm that “the minister of the church kissed [her] on the lips while he was half-naked,” as well as their sense that the kiss was unexpected and unwelcome.
4. Mr. Hendrix repeatedly attempted to unzip the dress of a female congregant during a party. This incident was reported to the presbytery and was the precipitating event for disciplinary case #17-2011.
5. Mr. Hendrix touched the breasts and/or genitals of multiple massage clients. While individual clients’ openness to continued erotic touch during future sessions with Mr. Hendrix varied, all who reported this behavior confirm that this contact was initiated without warning or the recipients’ expressed consent.
6. Mr. Hendrix engaged in sexual behavior with at least 10 women in the congregation. Some of these relationships continued after the end of his pastorate at CCC. Many of these women did not become aware that Mr. Hendrix had multiple sexual partners until after the fact. Others became aware of each other when Mr. Hendrix initiated sex with multiple partners in a single session.

By establishing dual pastoral and sexual relationships with multiple congregants, Mr. Hendrix not only failed to prioritize care for his congregants, but also leveraged his pastoral authority for sexual favors. These actions thus constitute sexual abuse, regardless of whether they were understood as consensual or non-consensual at the time by the individuals involved. The pastoral relationship created a power imbalance that inherently compromised Mr. Hendrix’s congregants’ ability to achieve a truly consensual sexual relationship. And the sexual relationship created a dual role that inherently compromised Mr. Hendrix’s sexual partners’ ability to approach their pastor as an impartial spiritual or relational guide.

#### *Mr. Hendrix’s Response*

When the commission interviewed Mr. Hendrix, he corroborated many of the reports shared by members of CCC. He admitted to being sexually involved with at least 10 members of CCC during his time as a pastor. He stated he now recognizes that these relationships were inappropriate, with “power issues involved” that made them “abusive and hurtful.” When asked why he thought his sexual partners likewise didn’t make their relationship with Mr. Hendrix public, Mr. Hendrix speculated that they may have experienced a sense of “shame, guilt, or not wanting to hurt others.” He also stated that alcohol was often used with other members and during sexual encounters with members. He confirmed that he gave massages on the property of James Lees Presbyterian Church without being licensed and that he used alcohol and gave massages on church property after this was forbidden by James Lees’ session. At the same time, Mr. Hendrix denied some findings collected from interview accounts and reports; specifically, he did not recall using sexualized language as a double entendre in worship services.

*History of Mr. Hendrix's initial investigation by the presbytery:*

In 2011, Mid-Kentucky presbytery investigated a complaint regarding Mr. Hendrix acting inappropriately toward a woman during a party in December 2010. He allegedly tried repeatedly to unzip the woman's dress. This complaint was resolved through an Alternative Form of Resolution through the presbytery's Permanent Judicial Commission (PJC) that included presbytery-mandated counseling and supervision of Mr. Hendrix for a period of time. The investigating committee noted concerns for excessive alcohol use and the pushing of boundaries by Mr. Hendrix. The PJC also referred to the Commission on Ministry (COM) a concern about Mr. Hendrix's dual role in working as a massage therapist within the church building and with members of the congregation. Highlighted in the initial Investigative Committee's report was concern about Mr. Hendrix's lack of an "internal sense of boundaries" and "only [recognizing] actions as harmful" if directly confronted.

Throughout this initial investigation and report, there was little direct communication between the Mid-Kentucky COM and the session of CCC. Interviews and communication with CCC members who were present during Mr. Hendrix's pastorate revealed that Mr. Hendrix was consistently enabled to speak on his own behalf in communicating his disciplinary proceedings to the CCC session and congregation. Respondents consistently reported that "Everything about the investigation was filtered through Jud." In those communications, Mr. Hendrix did not include any results of the investigative process. Instead, interviews suggest Mr. Hendrix leveraged the sense of exceptionalism he'd helped to cultivate at CCC to downplay his accusations, and to frame authoritative bodies such as the Presbytery of Mid-Kentucky as the "bad guys" who wanted to restrict their freedoms. As one respondent explained, "We did not hear anything directly from presbytery so we had no idea what was really going on." This contributed significantly to the sense of ambiguity and confusion regarding how Mr. Hendrix's actions were understood and remembered by current members of CCC. One respondent who was aware of the complaints made against Mr. Hendrix remembered feeling underwhelmed with what they perceived as the presbytery's "slap on the wrist" response to his accusations.

Mr. Hendrix completed the agreed-upon course of counseling as well as supervision with a small group of teaching and ruling elders appointed by the COM. In late 2012 and early 2013, the Executive Presbyter and COM became aware of evidence that Mr. Hendrix was continuing inappropriately to cross boundaries with congregation members. This included Mr. Hendrix continuing to encourage alcohol consumption at church parties and continuing to make derisive jokes publicly about the person who had filed a formal complaint against him.

Mr. Hendrix resigned as the pastor of CCC effective January of 2013. His resignation letter to the congregation, distributed via email to members of CCC in August 2012, indicated that he was moving to new ministerial goals and "feeling called to be a dreamer and innovator again." Mr. Hendrix mentioned nothing of the presbytery's investigation or his disciplinary assignments in this announcement. Instead, he indicated his desire to mitigate CCC's "'founders syndrome'...a stage where the gifts, abilities, and strengths of the founder actually become a hindrance to the further growth of the community" as being at the core of his discernment. He went on to assert "I feel that my gifts, strengths, and abilities are not what is needed, and that the future vision of CCC is not for me to know but for the whole community to discern. What has become clear to

me is that for both CCC and me to continue to grow and become, we need to transition out of our official relationship.”

On February 4, 2013, the COM voted to suspend its validation of Mr. Hendrix’s ministries with the Ecclesia commission as well as his consulting work with other presbyteries. Mr. Hendrix was directed to inform these entities that his work was no longer being validated by the presbytery. He was also directed to undergo an assessment with the North Central Ministry Development Center. This assessment did not contain any information about pastoral sexual abuse; as such, this commission is unsure whether Mr. Hendrix disclosed any information about his sexual relationships with congregants. In June 2013, subsequent to this assessment and to Mid-Kentucky Presbytery’s discovery of Mr. Hendrix’s continued consultation work despite his suspension, Mr. Hendrix formally requested to be released from ordained ministry. The COM concurred with this request.

Mr. Hendrix was released from ordained ministry in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) effective August 1, 2013. In his request to the COM, Mr. Hendrix noted his agreement “with the reflections and findings of the assessment...and the places in my life and personhood that make me unfit, or at least a ‘significant challenge’ for ordained ministry. In light of that assessment and other conversations with colleagues, friends, and therapists, I believe it is wise appropriate for me to set aside my Presbyterian ordination.”

At the time of his resignation, COM records denoted Mr. Hendrix as being “in good standing” with Mid-Kentucky presbytery. The AC believes that this designation was misleading. According to former Stated Clerk Ken Hockenberry, such designation was made to indicate that Mr. Hendrix was no longer under a formal investigation or judicial process. However, COM communications from that time period showed that the COM had serious concerns about Mr. Hendrix’s fitness for ordained ministry due to his penchant for pushing and crossing boundaries. A recollection from an original Investigative Committee member summarized the COM’s assessment of Mr. Hendrix at the time of his resignation: “We just don’t think he got it. Ministry means boundaries...I’m surprised—and I guess I should not be—but I’m surprised that he left in good standing.”

#### *Impact of abuse on survivors:*

Survivors of Mr. Hendrix’s abuse consistently report ongoing experiences of self-judgment and shame. Key themes from conversations with survivors regarding the impact of their relationship with Mr. Hendrix include the following:

1. A sense of complicity regarding their participation in a relationship with Mr. Hendrix. This theme was consistent in statements from Mr. Hendrix’s sexual partners (“I feel like I was a part of keeping secrets;” “I assumed it’s consensual—we’re adults...I feel complicit in it. I was, but I wasn’t”) and his friends (“After these women came forward, I realized I’ve been defending someone who had really hurt women”). Mr. Hendrix’s sexual partners also consistently expressed a sense of “guilt” for failing to interrogate Mr. Hendrix’s claim that “he and his wife were totally open to have sex with others,” and failing to consider whether Mr. Hendrix’s wife at the time “might not know or might not



want him to explore [sexual contact with additional partners].”

2. A misplaced sense of responsibility for the consequences of Mr. Hendrix’s behavior. Multiple respondents described a sense of responsibility to protect or disclose information about Mr. Hendrix for the sake of their larger communities. The congregant who initiated the 2011 complaint against Mr. Hendrix initially hesitated to do so, telling a friend they were “afraid of what that would do to the church.” Another respondent recalled feeling a sense of obligation to warn a colleague about Mr. Hendrix’s poor boundaries upon learning they were preparing to collaborate with him on a community project. This sense of responsibility to warn other community members was also cited as a common motivation to respond to this administrative commission’s call for interviews. One respondent expressed their hope that Mr. Hendrix will acknowledge his wrongdoings and “demonstrate a change in behavior so I wouldn’t have to warn people.” Another respondent who initially “didn’t think much of it all” later reached out to this commission upon becoming aware of “how we’re socialized to protect male abusers...I’ve decided to stop protecting abusive men.”
3. A struggle to trust their own judgment. As Mr. Hendrix contributed so strongly to the establishment of a culture of exceptionalism and the normalization of sexual contact between spiritual leaders and community members, survivors frequently described a fluctuating understanding of their own experiences. This was true for survivors who recognized and disclosed signs of abuse early, only to have their stories downplayed by other community members (“They don’t think this is a big deal...I must be overreacting”). This was also true for survivors who understood their relationships with Mr. Hendrix as positive or consensual at the time, only to later re-examine their experiences (“It was easy for Jud to present the narrative that he was just an innocent bystander or victim...I didn’t realize until 2019 or 2020 that it was really abuse”).
4. A damaged sense of self-worth. This is a common experience for survivors of sexual abuse, and one a respondent experienced within their internalization of the impression “that [my sexual availability] is my value. That’s what I have to offer.”
5. Ongoing concerns about being “found out” as a pastor’s past sexual partner. Multiple respondents requested the utmost discretion regarding the use of their words and stories. In justifying this request, these respondents consistently named their concern that their reputations or current relationships may be damaged should members of their own communities learn of their participation in an “affair” with a spiritual leader, especially one who remains active within both local and national spiritual communities.

#### *Impact of abuse on CCC:*

1. An ongoing culture of secrecy. One respondent who began attending CCC after Mr. Hendrix’s pastorate recalled their struggle to connect with existing congregants, and their sense that “only certain members” were privy to CCC’s full history or governance. Another respondent described “an undercurrent of secrets” that continues to affect

connections between members of CCC.

2. A struggle to connect with future pastors. As CCC members were wary of disclosing stories they understood as being in the past or “not mine to tell,” the pastors who followed Mr. Hendrix had to work harder to build trust and connection. One respondent recalled sensing “an invisible barrier” between CCC and Mamie Broadhurst, the pastor who immediately followed Mr. Hendrix. Rev. Broadhurst confirmed this experience in conversation with this administrative commission. Current Pastor Abbi Heimach-Snipes likewise recalled her growing sense, in conversation with CCC members, that “[Mr. Hendrix’s] boundary breaching was weighing heavily on people,” and her subsequent request to the CCC session to “plainly explain to me what sexual misconduct happened, because it kept coming up in my initial pastoral meetings.” Additionally, the aftermath of Mr. Hendrix’s overly familiar relationship with congregants made it difficult for some CCC members to know how to navigate a pastoral relationship with healthy boundaries. Some congregants, having been acculturated to the lax boundaries maintained by Mr. Hendrix, perceived subsequent pastors as cold or unfriendly. Others, traumatized by pastoral abuse, struggled to extend trust to a new pastor at all.
3. A damaged sense of self-worth. The reality of the abuse at CCC and the relational damage that ensued have caused some members to question CCC’s viability. One respondent recalled their wonderings, during Mr. Hendrix’s investigation, whether God “doesn’t want this church to continue.” Another respondent disclosed their ongoing struggle to reconcile the camaraderie, secrecy, and abuse that all co-existed at CCC, and their wonderings whether having CCC “closed completely” and given the opportunity to “start all over again” would be beneficial.
4. An unclear sense of communal history and needs. Mr. Hendrix’s past congregants and colleagues continue to experience a complex and often conflicting understanding of his goals and motivations during his pastorate at CCC, and a subsequent complex and often conflicting understanding of what CCC’s current community needs to heal. Some respondents interpreted Mr. Hendrix’s attitudes and behaviors as well-intentioned, but misguided attempts to counter the shaming of sexuality and embodiment that all too often plagues the church at large. Other respondents recognized Mr. Hendrix’s boundary-pushing as an intentional testing of the waters “so he could see what he could get away with.”

## **CONCERNS ABOUT ONGOING ABUSE**

This administrative commission recognizes it is a non-disciplinary commission whose assigned scope encompasses Mr. Hendrix's years at CCC. However, in the process of investigating those years, a striking number of respondents disclosed concerns about Mr. Hendrix's current access to vulnerable populations in his ongoing work as a spiritual leader, professor, and consultant. These respondents cited ongoing signs of Mr. Hendrix's continued grooming, via the same establishment of cultures of exceptionalism and the same normalization of sexual language, imagery, and contact exhibited at CCC. This commission concurs with this assessment, and presents the following discoveries as justification of concern for ongoing abuse:

1. Mr. Hendrix's boundary-crossing continued following his leaving CCC and his renunciation of his ordination. While he did acquiesce to the COM's assessment that he was unfit for ministry, Mr. Hendrix declined to end all of the sexual relationships he had established while serving as pastor at CCC. One respondent shared their observation of Mr. Hendrix's "lack of remorse, continuing his actions while people were complaining, and his failure to apologize." The commission also learned of one incident of sexual boundary-crossing from a community member who interacted with Mr. Hendrix after he had left CCC and the PCUSA.
2. Mr. Hendrix's ongoing proximity to alcohol and normalization of sexual/sexualized behavior in his subsequent roles. Just as Mr. Hendrix promoted a flat hierarchy of leadership to justify his participation in CCC's "party culture" and normalized sexual/sexualized language and behavior at CCC, so have respondents who interacted with Mr. Hendrix in his subsequent roles experienced similar acculturation. One respondent recalled participants of a workshop led by Mr. Hendrix joining each other for drinks immediately after their session, reminiscent of the alcohol-adjacent gatherings Mr. Hendrix encouraged and joined at CCC. This respondent likewise recalled being consistently greeted by Mr. Hendrix via a kiss on the lips in a group setting, reminiscent of the "Holy Kiss" Mr. Hendrix shared with women during worship at CCC.
3. Mr. Hendrix's ongoing normalization of sexualized language/imagery within his public-facing social media. One respondent made this AC aware of an erotic image posted to Mr. Hendrix's Instagram and Facebook page during the completion of this investigation, in which a man and a woman are depicted in a position suggesting penetrative sex. Two similar posts featuring erotic art, posted in the last six months, were observed on Mr. Hendrix's Facebook page. This consistent, casual presentation of sexualized imagery is reminiscent of the consistent, casual use of sexual language and imagery Mr. Hendrix engaged at CCC. It is possible that Mr. Hendrix continues to use this language and imagery to identify individuals in the community who react positively and who may be responsive to his boundary-crossing behavior.
4. Mr. Hendrix's familiar patterns of organization within his current workplaces. Within our investigation, this AC was made aware that the primary staff at Interfaith Paths To Peace, where Mr. Hendrix was serving as Executive Director at the beginning of 2024, consists predominantly of young women. A respondent also shared their learnings about Mr. Hendrix's participation in workshops "that take place in a house that involves self-

growth—this sounds like the same type of grooming patterns we’ve found at CCC and with the survivors after he left the ministry.”

In addition to these observed behavioral patterns, respondents also consistently expressed skepticism about Mr. Hendrix’s changed understanding of his behavior and concerns about his continued access to vulnerable populations. A former colleague who encountered Mr. Hendrix in the course of this investigation disclosed their dismay about Mr. Hendrix’s perceived “lack of remorse” about his actions at CCC. Another respondent, in recalling a survivor’s confrontation with Mr. Hendrix about their relationship, expressed their sense that Mr. Hendrix “didn’t seem to get it or accept responsibility.” Respondents additionally expressed concerns about Mr. Hendrix’s continued “easy access” to young women in his current roles, and their hope that Mr. Hendrix’s current employers are able to be made aware of Mr. Hendrix’s history and to take appropriate action to ensure the safety of the students, clients, and citizens in their care.

Mr. Hendrix stated to the commission that he has not engaged in pastoral leadership since his time at CCC, as he “was not fit” for parish ministry. Moreover, he stated he has not abused his role since that time in any way, nor has he engaged in any abuse or manipulation of others. While Mr. Hendrix is not currently serving as a pastor, he does continue to frequently serve in various leadership roles. If he does not recognize his authority within these roles, it is unclear whether he is willing or able to recognize his potential for a repeated abuse of power in his current roles. Furthermore, Mr. Hendrix’s denial of abuse since leaving CCC directly contradicts interview accounts. Mr. Hendrix’s apparent failure to disclose any information about any pastoral sexual abuse within his presbytery-mandated counseling and assessments also comes to mind as this commission assesses his claims about his current relationships.

Though this administrative commission’s investigative authority is limited to that of Covenant Community Church and Mid-Kentucky Presbytery, we feel it is important to highlight the parallels between the celebrations of exceptionalism and normalization of sexualized language that laid the groundwork for sexual abuse at CCC, and the behavioral patterns reflected in Mr. Hendrix’s current work and social media. This commission is concerned that these repeated patterns, still evident ten years after Mr. Hendrix’s initial investigation, indicate ongoing opportunities for boundary crossings and abuses of power within Mr. Hendrix’s current places of employment.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The commission recommends that this report, or a substantive summary thereof, be shared with the entities with whom Mr. Hendrix is currently or recently employed or associated in a leadership role, which we believe includes:

Bellarmino University  
 Interfaith Paths to Peace  
 Louisville-Jefferson County Metro Government  
 New Possibilities Associates

The presbytery directs the stated clerk to reach out to the entities listed above to confirm Mr. Hendrix's current or recent affiliation with their organizations via employment, contractual work, or consultation work. The stated clerk is also empowered to disclose this report to any future employers or associated organizations as such become known. Having completed this process, the stated clerk is to submit this report with an appropriate letter of introduction to the human resources director, board of directors, or similar role within these organizations.

This recommendation is made due to concerns about continued patterns of grooming gleaned from statements by Mr. Hendrix's peers (who express dismay regarding Mr. Hendrix's "lack of remorse" relating to his relationships at CCC) and postings on Mr. Hendrix's public-facing social media profiles (which include continued normalization of sexual language and imagery). By sharing this report with Mr. Hendrix's current employers, the AC hopes to make Mr. Hendrix's current peers aware of the patterns of behavior that paved the way for sexual abuse, and to urge intervention by those who are currently able to hold Mr. Hendrix accountable. The AC understands this action as a means of preventing harm to any future or potential victims of abuse of power/position.

2. The commission recommends that the [Mid-Kentucky Presbytery Teaching Elder Sexual Misconduct Policy \(2015\)](#) be amended by adding the following on page 5:

*9. The designated Commission on Ministry or Permanent Judicial Commission contact will provide sufficient information and updates to the accused leader's congregation, with the intent of maintaining honesty and transparency within the investigative process and facilitating the congregations' understanding of both the investigative process and the presbytery's response to the investigation's findings. Whenever possible, relevant information and updates will be communicated to the congregation directly by the designated Commission on Ministry or Permanent Judicial Commission contact. Congregational leaders may participate in these communications, if such participation is deemed appropriate by the investigative committee. However, the party under investigation shall not be permitted to communicate investigative updates on their own behalf.*

*10. The presbytery will ensure opportunities and a clear process for additional victims or witnesses to come forward during the investigation.*

*11. While responding to and investigating an allegation of pastoral misconduct, the presbytery will do everything in its power to maintain the accuser(s)' anonymity, and to respect appropriate requests for confidentiality. These efforts will likely include (but are not limited to):*

- a. refraining from speculation or commentary on allegations beyond the context of investigative interviews or meetings*
- b. refraining from speculation or commentary on allegations with community members who are not participants within investigative or disciplinary processes*
- c. utilizing sufficiently secure methods of storing and sharing information and documentation regarding the investigative process and findings*
- d. maintaining appropriate channels of communication when reaching out to (or redirecting) congregational and presbytery-level leaders*

*12. The document [Presbyterian Church \(U.S.A.\) Sexual Misconduct Policy and Its Procedures](#) provides additional guidance for responding to allegations, particularly in *Appendix C: Meeting the Needs of All Involved*.*

3. The commission recommends the addition of a page on the MKP website in which individuals can find easily-understood information on how to report sexual misconduct within a church or by a minister member. This page might briefly define sexual misconduct, state the presbytery's position that sexual misconduct is not condoned by the presbytery, list contact information for the stated clerk, and give the PC(USA) Helpline number (<https://www.presbyterianmission.org/legal-resources/creating-safe-ministries/i-need-to-make-a-report/>).
4. The commission recommends that the charge for the administrative commission be amended to allow the commission to meet ad hoc for the next three months to hear any additional individuals that wish to speak about their experiences. Confidential records from these interviews will be placed in the administrative commission's secure file. At the end of this time period, the administrative commission will be dissolved.

**APPENDIX A**

Mid-Kentucky Presbytery Office  
1044 Alta Vista Road  
Louisville KY 40205-1798  
Phone: 502-896-8159  
[office@midkentuckypresbytery.org](mailto:office@midkentuckypresbytery.org)  
[www.midkentuckypresbytery.com](http://www.midkentuckypresbytery.com)

**PRESBYTERY STAFF:**

**Rev. Dr. John Odom**  
General Presbyter  
502-235-7232  
[john@midkentuckypresbytery.org](mailto:john@midkentuckypresbytery.org)

**Rev. Jerry Van Marter**  
Stated Clerk  
502-565-6757  
[jerry@midkentuckypresbytery.org](mailto:jerry@midkentuckypresbytery.org)

**Rev. Andrew Hartmans**  
Director of Cedar Ridge Camp  
Recording Clerk  
502-267-5848  
[andrew@midkentuckypresbytery.org](mailto:andrew@midkentuckypresbytery.org)

**Mr. Michael Purinton**  
Treasurer  
502-550-9504  
[michael@midkentuckypresbytery.org](mailto:michael@midkentuckypresbytery.org)

**Mrs. Mary Kutter**  
Office Manager  
502-896-8159  
[office@midkentuckypresbytery.org](mailto:office@midkentuckypresbytery.org)

***Drawn together,  
connecting communities  
witnessing to God's  
love and justice:  
Mid-Kentucky Presbytery***

January 30, 2024

Dear members and friends of Covenant Community Church,

As many of you know, Mid-Kentucky Presbytery, at the request of the session of CCC, has formed an administrative commission to seek a complete understanding of the truth surrounding reported misconduct by former pastor Jud Hendrix. We recognize that this has been a difficult season in CCC's life and in the lives of individuals as narratives of misconduct by Jud have been given voice, and as the congregation has processed these hurtful revelations.

As one step along CCC's and the presbytery's journey toward healing and justice, the commission now invites any and all individuals to come forth who would like to share with us their experiences involving their interactions with Jud, including any episodes relating to Jud's experiences and to document patterns of misconduct in order to prevent future harm, as much as it is in the presbytery's power to do so. We welcome anyone who was affected by spiritual leader misconduct during Jud Hendrix's pastorate to share your story, and we promise to honor your testimony as well as the courage it takes to share.

Interviews will be conducted in a trauma-sensitive way, with a goal to discern the truth without pressuring or retraumatizing those who share. Those who agree to be interviewed may share as much or as little as they feel led, answer or decline questions at their comfort level, and end the interview at any time. The identity of those who share will be kept confidential within the commission (named below, plus presbytery staff Jerry Van Marter and John Odom) unless the safety of an individual is in question. Any details of interviews will be summarized and made anonymous in our final report to the presbytery. If you have questions about this process, you are welcome to reach out to Jennifer Gingerich (CCC liaison to the commission, 502-645-4578, [jgingerich6@gmail.com](mailto:jgingerich6@gmail.com)) or Linda Reichenbecher, contact information listed below.

*Those who would like to share with the commission may contact* Rev. Linda Reichenbecher at [ljr920@gmail.com](mailto:ljr920@gmail.com) or 502-802-1908 (talk/text) to schedule a meeting. Individuals are welcome to bring a support person (friend, loved one, pastor, etc.) with them as they meet with two members of the commission.

Ordinarily, all interviews will be conducted with two interviewers. There are five persons of varying backgrounds on our commission, listed below. If you would like, you may indicate two persons with whom you think you might be most comfortable.

- o Rev. Annica Gage (she/her/hers), physical rehabilitation chaplain
- o Rev. Jennifer Gingerich (she/her/hers), senior community chaplain
- o Austin Green (he/him/his), attorney with experience with cases of abuse
- o Rev. Linda Reichenbecher (she/her/hers), retired minister
- o Sara Sutphin (she/her/hers), licensed psychological practitioner

Also, it would be helpful in scheduling, if you could indicate general times when you are most likely to be available.

- o Daytime – weekdays
- o Evenings – weekdays
- o Daytime – weekends
- o Evenings – weekends

We hope to conduct these meetings between now and the end of February, though you are welcome to reach out at any time while the commission continues its work.

We thank you in advance for allowing us to journey with you in this difficult time.

The CCC Administrative Commission

**APPENDIX B**

**CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT  
OF ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION**

The Mid-Kentucky Presbytery has impaneled an Administrative Commission to fully review, understand, and report the pastoral misconduct and abuses that occurred at Covenant Community Church. The goal of the commission is to provide an environment where you have the ability to share your truth.

Some members of the commission have backgrounds as attorneys, therapists, and clergy. We must communicate to you that your interview does not confer an attorney-client relationship, therapist-client relationship, or clergy-penitent relationship between the interviewer and you. It is the goal of the interviewers to conduct this discussion and build rapport in the most trauma informed and sensitive way possible. In conjunction with that, the Commission needs to describe and explain how the information you share will be used and the confidentiality the Commission will operate under.

The Administrative Commission will prepare and submit a report to the Mid-Kentucky Presbytery detailing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission. The Commission report will not include the names of any victims or witnesses. In preparation of the report should a need arise to include information gathered from our interview, the Commission will make every effort to remove any and all identifying information. Commission interview notes, drafts, and any raw material gathered during the investigation will be digitally stored and only accessible to Commission members. At the conclusion of the Commission's work all materials will be turned over to the Stated Clerk of Mid-Kentucky Presbytery for safe storage.

There are certain situations in which the Commission may be morally, ethically, and legally obligated to break confidentiality. This would include if we believe that a child or vulnerable adult is the victim of abuse, neglect, or human trafficking. If we believe that you may harm yourself or are threatening seriously bodily harm to another person, we may be required to break confidentiality.

This written statement seeks to address and explain the guidelines and confidentiality that the Commission will operate under. If you have any specific concerns and questions, please address those with the Commission. Your trust and confidentiality are of the utmost importance to the Administrative Commission.