

November 18, 2009

To: Bishops of synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Vice Presidents of synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Secretaries of synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Members of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Members of the Cabinet of Executives
Regional Coordinators

FROM: Secretary David D. Swartling

SUBJECT: Report of Actions of the Church Council (November 13–15, 2009)

The Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) met at the Lutheran Center, Chicago, Illinois, on November 13–15, 2009. A variety of matters received attention. Here is a summary of particular actions along with background and explanatory information.

1. CHARTER FOR ECOLOGY STUDY DESIGN GROUP	PAGE 1
2. 2010 CURRENT FUND AND WORLD HUNGER SPENDING AUTHORIZATIONS	PAGE 4
3. REVISIONS TO SYNODICAL MISSION-SUPPORT PLANS	PAGE 5
4. PROTOCOL FOR REVISIONS TO MINISTRY POLICIES	PAGE 5
5. REVISIONS TO THE POLICY ON REINSTATEMENT TO THE ROSTER	PAGE 7
6. SOCIAL POLICY RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION	PAGE 9
7. ADDITIONAL VOTING MEMBERS FOR THE 2011 CHURCHWIDE ASSEMBLY	PAGE 14
8. MEMBERSHIP IN ACTION FOR CHURCHES TOGETHER ALLIANCE	PAGE 14
9. ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF PROGRAM UNITS	PAGE 15
10. ELECTIONS OF THE EDITOR OF <i>THE LUTHERAN MAGAZINE</i>	PAGE 15
11. OTHER ELECTIONS	PAGE 15

1. ECOLOGY STUDY DESIGN GROUP CHARTER

Background:

At its March 2009 meeting, the Executive Committee recommended the following action, which was approved by the Church Council [CC09.03.04]:

To acknowledge that the principles of organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America call us to be one church consisting of “interdependent partners sharing responsibly in God’s mission” in which this church is called to be in relationship with institutions and agencies, including seminaries,

colleges, and universities, as well as other partners, so that together we can build capacity for evangelical witness and service in the world;

To recognize that more than 20 years have passed since the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America came into existence, that the relationships among this church and partner institutions and agencies have evolved substantially, and that assumptions that undergirded the original organization, governance, and interrelationships of this church may no longer apply or apply in a

different way in the 21st century;

To recognize further that significant societal and economic changes have taken place that raise profound issues regarding the organization and governance of this church, its interrelationships with partner institutions and agencies, and the ways in which ministry can be accomplished most effectively;

To acknowledge the desire by this Church Council to address these difficult and complex issues by beginning a process to evaluate the organization and governance of this church and the interrelationships among its expressions and partner agencies and institutions for the purpose of bringing a comprehensive report and recommendations to the 2011 Churchwide Assembly;

To authorize the Presiding Bishop, in collaboration with the Executive Committee of the Church Council and the Conference of Bishops, to appoint a study group for the purpose of formulating a plan to undertake such an evaluation; and

To request that the study group bring a report and possible recommendations through the Executive Committee in consultation with the Planning and Evaluation Committee for the April 2010 meeting of the ELCA Church Council and such report include the membership of a task force to conduct the evaluation, an outline of potential topics to address, a timetable, budget implications, and such other issues as the study group believes will facilitate the evaluation.

Church Council Action:

To approve the charter for the Ecology Study Design Group [as printed below]:

**Living into the Future Together:
Renewing the Ecology¹ of the Evangelical Lutheran
Church in America² (ELCA)
October 28, 2009**

PURPOSE

The purpose of the ELCA Ecology Study Task Force study is to recognize the evolving societal and economic changes of the twenty years since the formation of this church, and to evaluate the organization, governance, and interrelationships among this church's expressions in the light of those changes. The intended result of the Ecology Study Task Force's work is a report and recommendations that will position this church for the future and explore new possibilities for participating in God's mission.

HISTORY

At its March 2009 meeting, the ELCA Church Council authorized Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson in collaboration with the Executive Committee of the Church Council and the Conference of Bishops to appoint a study design group. The task of the study design group was to design a charter for a task force "... to evaluate the organization and governance of this church and the interrelationships among its expressions and partner agencies and institutions for the purpose of bringing a comprehensive report and recommendations to the 2011 Churchwide Assembly."³ The report of the task force first will be received by the ELCA Church Council.

The study design group was formed and met on June 15-16, 2009. The group met via a conference call on August 4 and then in a face-to-face meeting on September 15-16, 2009. In fulfillment of the ELCA Church Council's assignment, the study design group submits the charter below. The charter contains the context, scope, membership, budget, timeline, and process for the work of the proposed ELCA Ecology Study Task Force.

CONTEXT

"The Church is a people created by God in Christ, empowered by the Holy Spirit, called and sent to bear witness to God's creative, redeeming, and sanctifying

¹ Ecology is the science of the relationship and interdependence between living beings and their environments. It is also a study of the relationship between parts and the whole, in this case among the ELCA's various constituencies.

² In the remainder of the charter, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America normally will be referred to as "this church."

³ CC09.03.04, ELCA Church Council Meeting, March 27-30, 2009.

activity in the world.”⁴ In light of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America’s calling to participate in God’s mission, this church is engaging in an evaluation and reimagining of its ecology and related ecosystems.

The Church, the body of Christ, is a living entity that must be mindful of and attentive to its relationships and to its contexts. The ELCA, part of the body of Christ, celebrates that an important part of the ELCA identity is its relationship with its partners in ministry. While each partner occupies an ecosystem of its own, the three expressions of this church (congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization), along with its agencies and institutions, live together as they seek to participate in carrying out God’s mission in the world.

In the 20 years since the ELCA was created, the environment has changed dramatically in ways not imagined when the ELCA was formed. There has been an explosion of knowledge. New developments in technology, particularly related to electronic communication, have altered the way people understand and relate to one another. Globalization and mobility have produced new levels of religious, ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity within American society.

Many churches in the United States have struggled to negotiate these changes positively. The trends in membership and giving within the ELCA—back to its predecessor bodies—reflect the challenge of envisioning these changes as rich opportunities.

- In 2008, the baptized membership of the ELCA was 4.7 million while the population of the United States was 304 million. In 1970, the baptized membership of the ELCA was 5.7 million while the population of the United States was 203 million.
- The number of those attending worship in a typical ELCA congregation has declined from about 148 in 1990 to about 128 in 2008.
- The ELCA has been unable to achieve the goal it set for itself in 1988 of a 10 percent baptized membership of persons of color or language other than English. While these groups represent 32 percent of the population in the United States, they comprise only three percent of the baptized membership of the ELCA.
- The membership of the ELCA is considerably older than the population of the United States. The average age of a baptized member of the ELCA is about 56. This compares to an age of about 40 for the general population.
- In 2008, undesignated and designated giving to ELCA congregations declined for the first time since the beginning of the ELCA. When adjusted for

inflation, undesignated and designated giving to congregations in the ELCA has risen only slightly since the beginning of the ELCA.

- Congregations consistently have lowered the amount they share with their synods and the churchwide organization as a percent of undesignated and designated giving. In 1990, congregations remitted about 10 percent of their undesignated and designated giving to their synod and the churchwide organization. In 2008, congregations sent about six percent.
- Mission support passed on from synods to the churchwide organization has remained at about \$65 million since the beginning of the ELCA. Adjusting for inflation, the churchwide organization is operating with half the financial resources available in 1990.
- The American economy, which is now clearly global in its scope, has most recently slipped into a recession that has impacted the financial capacities of the various expressions of this church and its partners.
- The structure and governance practices of the ELCA (i.e., the Churchwide Assembly, the Church Council, the Conference of Bishops, Synod Councils, the churchwide organization) have not been evaluated as a whole in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, and cost.

At the same time, in this changing, exciting, and sometimes overwhelming environment, God has continued to bless this church with abundant gifts. The ELCA has a long history of service through its congregations, synods, the churchwide organization, seminaries, campus ministries, outdoor ministries, colleges and universities, social ministry organizations, global companions, and other partners. Because of the faithful commitment of the members of this church, the ELCA continues to accomplish its purposes to proclaim God’s saving Gospel, to carry out Christ’s Great Commission, to serve in response to God’s love to meet human needs, to worship God, to nurture members in the Word of God, and to manifest unity.⁵

The ELCA gathers together 4.7 million baptized members in over 10,000 congregations. In 2008, 1.3 million people attended worship each week, 62,000 children were baptized, and \$1.9 billion was given by its members to support the mission and ministry of the ELCA. This mission and ministry grow out of a theological heritage that believes the Good News of Jesus Christ speaks to all people and all places. Its confessional

⁴ ELCA Constitution 4.01.

⁵ ELCA Constitution 4.02

documents recognize that unity is in the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.⁶

Over the decades, this ecology has been shaped by the Lutheran capacity for broad theological reflection, dialog, and conversation. Opportunities abound for participating in God's mission in creative new ways. As we live into the future together, how can this church in its various expressions participate most effectively in carrying out God's mission in the world?

SCOPE

Recognizing these significant environmental changes, the ELCA Ecology Study Task Force will be led by these overarching questions:

What is God calling this church to be and to do in the future?

What changes are in order to help us respond most faithfully?

Specific questions to be addressed are:

1. What unique gifts does our theological, confessional, and liturgical identity bring to this environment and to this time of change?
2. How is God surprising and leading us in the midst of change and uncertainty to new and distinctive opportunities?
3. What are the key changes, internal and external, that have most impacted the relationships and interdependence within and among the congregations, synods, the churchwide organization, and related organizations, agencies, entities, and partners including, but not limited to, seminaries, campus ministries, outdoor ministries, colleges and universities, social ministry organizations, ecumenical partners, global companions, and others?
4. Given the importance of congregations in the ELCA, how has the changing environment impacted their mission and relationships? How might this church through its congregations, in partnership with synods and the churchwide organization, engage in ministry with evangelical missional imagination for the sake of the world?
5. How can the ELCA's relationships with its full communion and global mission partners strengthen and extend this church's mission and ministries? How can we learn from and partner with ministries and organizations accomplishing God's work beyond this church?
6. How can this church most effectively and efficiently steward and deploy the funds available for its

mission? What are the current patterns and what are their implications for future funding patterns?

7. How can the governing documents in the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions* provide structures and governance mechanisms that strengthen identity and faithfully and effectively facilitate mission and ministry?

MEMBERSHIP

The twelve to fifteen members of the ELCA Ecology Study Task Force will reflect a variety of perspectives and backgrounds representative of the expressions of this church. The study will engage additional resource people throughout the process.

BUDGET

The estimated expense for the ELCA Ecology Study Task Force's work for 2009–2011 is \$170,000. This includes expenses for staff support, travel, task force meetings, and limited research and consultation services.

2009: \$35,000

2010: \$90,000

2011: \$45,000

TIMELINE

The ELCA Ecology Study Task Force will report regularly to the Conference of Bishops and Church Council for the purpose of preparing a report and recommendations for action at the August 2011 Churchwide Assembly.

PROCESS

The methodology with which the study proceeds will be critical and will be the first order of business. The ELCA Ecology Study Task Force will carry out its work with transparency and regular communication with the various constituencies of the ELCA. It will seek wisdom from existing research and input from the expressions of this church and its institutions, agencies, and partners.

2. REVISION OF 2010 SPENDING AUTHORIZATION

Background:

Income estimates have been revised since the August 2009 Churchwide Assembly. Current income is projected to be \$69,022,800, a decrease of \$7,669,200 or ten percent from the budget approved by the 2009 Churchwide Assembly.

Mission support is anticipated to decrease from the assembly-approved income budget of \$62,250,000 to \$55,100,000, a decrease of \$7,150,000 or 11.5 percent. This mission support income estimate is based on early,

⁶ *The Book of Concord*, The Augsburg Confession, Article VII.

rough estimates from ELCA synods and will be revisited in February 2010.

Investment income estimates have been adjusted downward by \$400,000 since the April income estimates. This is due primarily to lower investment account balances than previously estimated and anticipated market value losses caused by higher interest rates. Other unrestricted income is projected to decrease by \$67,650, primarily due to the potential for a reduction in income from congregational stewardship programs and special gifts through synods. Temporarily restricted endowment distributions are reduced by \$51,550 due to the final distribution of funds from a bequest that had been invested as an endowment.

The World Hunger Appeal estimate is unchanged.

Church Council Action:

To approve an initial 2010 fiscal year current fund spending authorization of \$69,022,800; and

To approve an initial 2010 fiscal year World Hunger spending authorization of \$18,700,000.

3. REVISION TO SYNODICAL MISSION-SUPPORT PLANS

Background:

The ELCA Church Council has responsibility for reviewing and approving or withholding approval for synod mission-support plans. Since the March 2009 Church Council meeting, revisions for 2009 mission support plans have been received from 15 synods.

Church Council Action:

To affirm with sincere appreciation the increases in the percentage for the sharing of 2009 mission-support contributions by congregations for synodical and churchwide ministries of the following synods: Alaska, Arkansas-Oklahoma, Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast, North/West Lower Michigan, and Slovak Zion synods;

To affirm the revised 2009 mission-support dollar estimates for the sharing of mission support contributions for synodical and churchwide ministries by congregations of the following synods: Rocky Mountain, Metropolitan Chicago, Northern Illinois, and Southern Ohio synods; and

To acknowledge the percentage change in mission-support resulting from revised estimates of congregational mission support for the following synods: Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, Greater Milwaukee, Southeast Michigan, Northeastern Ohio, Allegheny, and South Carolina synods.

Background:

Since the March 2009 Church Council meeting, original plans or revisions for 2010 mission-support plans have been received from 17 synods.

Church Council Action:

To affirm with sincere appreciation the increases in the percentage for the sharing of 2010 mission-support contributions by congregations for synodical and churchwide ministries of the following synods: Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana, Northeastern Iowa, Southeast Michigan, Upstate New York, and Allegheny synods;

To affirm the revised 2010 mission-support dollar estimates for the sharing of mission support contributions for synodical and churchwide ministries by congregations of the following synods: Alaska, Rocky Mountain, Eastern North Dakota, Central States, Metropolitan Chicago, Northern Illinois, Greater Milwaukee, Indiana-Kentucky, Slovak Zion, Northwestern Pennsylvania, and Upper Susquehanna synods; and

To acknowledge the percentage change in mission-support resulting from revised estimates of congregational mission support for the following synod: New England.

4. PROTOCOL FOR REVISIONS TO MINISTRY POLICIES

Background:

The 2009 Churchwide Assembly took action to allow service in rostered ministry by people who are in publicly accountable, lifelong, monogamous, same-gender relationships. The assembly directed that necessary changes in policy be made and that any additional guidelines necessary be developed. It further directed that provision be made within this church to respect diverse, faith-based commitments on this matter.

At its November 2009 meeting, the Executive Committee considered a recommendation from the Administrative Team for a protocol to guide consideration by the Church Council of proposed revisions to ELCA ministry policies in response to the assembly's actions.

Church Council Action:

To approve the "Proposed Protocol for Revisions to Ministry Policies (October 2009-April 2010)" [as printed below]; and

To anticipate consideration by the ELCA Church Council at its April 2010 meeting on revisions to "Vision and Expectations," "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline," the Candidacy Manual, and

other policies as needed.

Protocol for Revisions to Ministry Policies October 2009–April 2010

October–November 2009 Executive Committee

- Executive Committee appoints an *Ad Hoc* Committee to:
 1. Develop a process and timeline for Church Council members to receive, review, and provide response to proposed revisions to ministry policies documents.
 2. Receive and review responses from Church Council members.
 3. Prepare a report and recommendations for Church Council consideration at its April 2010 meeting.
- *Ad Hoc* Committee participants:
Church Council members: Mark Helmke and Lynette Reitz (Legal and Constitutional Review Committee); Steve Loy, Sandra Schlesinger, and Judith Barlow-Roberts (Program and Services Committee)
Conference of Bishops: Bishop Martin D. Wells and Bishop Marie Jerge
Committee on Appeals: Donald Main, chair
Churchwide staff: Stanley Olson (Vocation and Education unit), David Swartling (Office of the Secretary), Myrna Sheie (Office of the Presiding Bishop), Ruth Hamilton, recorder (Office of the Secretary).

November 2009 Church Council meeting

- **Friday, November 13:** Introduction to ELCA ministry policies: process, time frame, and content
 1. Participants: Stanley Olson (Vocation and Education); Allan Bjornberg (Conference of Bishops); David Swartling (Office of the Secretary)
 2. Primer on Call Process and Candidacy (Exhibit O, Part 5)
 3. Preliminary documents for review in November 2009:
 - a. Possible revisions to “Vision and Expectations” (VE) (Exhibit O, Part 1a)
 - b. Possible revisions to “Candidacy Process and Manual” (VE) (Exhibit O, Part 1b)
 - c. Possible revisions to “Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline” (Committee on Appeals) (Exhibit G, Part 1)
 4. Document for consideration and approval in November 2009
 - a. “Reinstatement to the Rosters of the

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” (OS) (Exhibit G, Part 2)

- **Saturday, November 14:** Café Conversations for Church Council, liaison bishops, and advisory members
- **Plenary consideration of proposed documents**
 1. Planning and Evaluation Committee: presentation of “Proposed Protocol for Revisions to Ministry Policies (October 2009–April 2010)” (Exhibit D, Part 1).
 2. Legal and Constitutional Committee: presentation of “Reinstatement to the Rosters of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” (Exhibit G, Part 2).

March 2010 Conference of Bishops meeting

(March 4-9, 2010; Chicago)

- Chairs of Legal and Constitutional Review and Program and Services committees (or designees) are present for Conference of Bishops discussion and deliberation related to revisions of ministry policies
- [date TBD]: *Ad Hoc* Committee conference call

Preparation for April 2010 Church Council meeting

- [date TBD]: Conference call to develop process for Church Council members to identify significant issues related to proposed revisions to ministry policies
- [date TBD]: Church Council members receive final proposed revisions to ministry policies
- [date TBD]: comments due to *Ad Hoc* Committee
- [date TBD]: *Ad Hoc* Committee conference call to prepare report and possible recommendations
- [date TBD]: Joint meeting of LCR and PS committees to prepare a report and recommendations to the Church Council related to revisions to ministry policies

April 2010 Church Council meeting: April 9–12, 2010

- Report and recommendations distributed to ELCA Church Council
- Joint presentation of recommended revisions to ministry policies by Legal and Constitutional Review and Program and Services committees
- ELCA Church Council considers revisions

5. REVISIONS TO THE POLICY ON REINSTATEMENT TO THE ROSTERS

Background:

The “Manual of Policies and Procedures for Management of the Rosters of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” (Roster Manual) contains the roster policies derived from and provided for in the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions* of this church. The process for approval of these policies is that they are developed by the relevant unit, in consultation with the Conference of Bishops, and approved by the Church Council.

Church Council Action:

To approve the proposed revisions to “Reinstatement to the Rosters of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” [as printed below]:

I. REINSTATEMENT PROCESS

- A. Reinstatement to the rosters of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) is the responsibility of the Candidacy Committee of the synod where the applicant was last rostered as an ordained minister, associate in ministry, deaconess, or diaconal minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.⁷
- B. In the case of an applicant whose rostered ministry was last in one of the ELCA predecessor churches, the successor ELCA synod has the responsibility. In every case, the process begins in the synod from which the applicant left the roster or its successor.
- C. For a period of two years, from January 1, 2010, until December 31, 2011, Candidacy Committees may begin to consider, without waiting for five years to elapse, applications from those whose removal or resignation from the roster was solely the result of being in a lifelong, monogamous, same-gender relationship.
- D. Except as provided in paragraph I.C. above, in the case of an applicant whose removal from the roster was the result of either:
 - 1) the official disciplinary process of this church, or
 - 2) resignation or removal from the roster in lieu of the disciplinary process, or

⁷Any person removed from a lay roster that existed on December 31, 1987, who seeks to return to active lay roster status, must apply for acceptance to a roster of this church under the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures that apply to the roster of associates in ministry, as identified in ELCA churchwide bylaw 7.52.13. This requirement shall apply to those certified during the period of January 1, 1988, through September 1, 1993, as associates in ministry of this church.

- 3) application of ELCA churchwide bylaw 7.31.16., where the person was on leave or without call after conduct or allegations that could lead to disciplinary charges, then a minimum of five consecutive years without call must elapse before an application for reinstatement may be considered. The passage of five years without call does not guarantee reconsideration.

II. APPLICATION

- A. The applicant provides the completed “Application for Reinstatement” to the appropriate roster of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to the synod, and the synod sends a copy to the Vocation and Education unit for information.
- B. Upon receipt of the application, the synodical bishop will notify the Office of the Secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and request any pertinent information the churchwide office may have concerning the applicant.
- C. With the approval of the ELCA secretary, the reinstatement process may be transferred from the synod of previous roster to the synod of current residence, upon the written concurrence of both candidacy committees and both synodical bishops. The original synod will provide the receiving synod with all information and documentation concerning the applicant.
- D. The bishop of the synod in which the reinstatement application will be considered arranges an interview with the applicant. The purpose of this interview is to determine the applicant’s eligibility to be a candidate in the synod for ministry. The bishop also determines whether the application is timely under paragraph I.C. or premature under paragraph I.D. above.
- E. In the case of an applicant where inappropriate conduct or allegations of misconduct led to resignation or removal from the roster, the synodical bishop examines the applicant for indications of repentance and amendment of life as well as indication of or attempts at reconciliation with those injured by the conduct, and documents the corrective actions that have occurred before proceeding with the reinstatement process. The bishop should invite comments from those directly affected by the applicant’s inappropriate conduct or alleged misconduct.

- F. The applicant is considered for reinstatement by the Candidacy Committee when the application is forwarded to the committee by the bishop. The bishop may, in his or her sole discretion, decline to forward the application to the Candidacy Committee or may forward the application to the Candidacy Committee with a written statement of the bishop's opinion of the application.

III. CANDIDACY COMMITTEE

- A. The synod Candidacy Committee will receive and review the registration by the pastor and Congregation Council of the congregation of which the applicant is a member in good standing. The registration attests that the applicant is an active member of an ELCA congregation.
- B. The committee shall determine that it has received all records and information concerning the applicant, including verification of synodical records concerning the reason for removal from the roster. If synodical records are incomplete, this verification may include conferring with the former bishop, synod staff, or with the churchwide office.
- C. The committee may request any additional information from any source that it deems necessary in order to determine the applicant's readiness for ministry and suitability for reinstatement to the roster.
- D. The applicant must prepare an approval essay and submit it to the Candidacy Committee.
- E. In the case of any applicant who has been off the roster or without call for more than five years, the Candidacy Committee will require the applicant to participate in the Psychological Evaluation and Career Consultation according to the policies of the Vocation and Education unit. The expense of this evaluation is the responsibility of the applicant.
- F. The Candidacy Committee follows the Candidacy Manual standards and procedures for new applicants as its guide in considering a request for reinstatement. The Candidacy Committee interviews the applicant to explore all concerns related to reinstatement, including but not limited to:
 - 1) the circumstances surrounding the removal of the applicant from the roster, including the applicant's reason(s) for leaving the roster;
 - 2) the applicant's reason(s) for requesting

reinstatement to the roster with a special focus upon what has changed in the person's life, faith, attitudes, and circumstances since the time of removal;

- 3) discussion of the applicant's understanding of ordained, commissioned, or consecrated ministry in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and the applicant's willingness to serve in response to the needs of this church; and
 - 4) discussion of "Vision and Expectations," and the applicant's commitment to live according to the expectations of this church.
- G. The Candidacy Committee may request the Vocation and Education unit to convene a Review Panel to determine the applicant's theological readiness for ordained ministry. The Review Panel will make a recommendation to the committee following the procedures developed by the Vocation and Education unit.

IV. DECISION

- A. The Candidacy Committee will decide the applicant's suitability to serve as a rostered minister of this church. This decision is one of the following:
 - 1) approval of the candidate for reinstatement upon receipt and acceptance of a letter of call;
 - 2) postponement of approval with specific recommendations for remedial or developmental work before further consideration for reinstatement; or
 - 3) denial of approval for reinstatement.
- B. If the decision of the Candidacy Committee is to deny an applicant reinstatement, that decision is final. Any such applicant who desires reconsideration must begin the process again by applying under II.A. above.
- C. If an applicant who was removed from the roster under the circumstances described in paragraph I.D. above is approved for reinstatement by the Candidacy Committee, such approval is not effective unless affirmed by a two-thirds majority vote of the total membership of the Executive Committee of the Synod Council. After the Candidacy Committee reports its approval and the reasons for that approval to the Executive Committee of the Synod Council, the Executive Committee may obtain whatever additional information or advice, including legal advice, it deems necessary before reviewing the decision of the Candidacy Committee.

V. APPROVAL

- A. If approved, the candidate will complete the normal assignment paperwork and will participate in the churchwide assignment process through the Vocation and Education unit.
- B. If after consultation with the synodical bishop, the Vocation and Education unit determines that the process for reinstatement described herein has not been fully or properly completed, then the Vocation and Education unit shall postpone the candidate's participation in the assignment process until all requirements are met.
- C. An approved candidate is eligible for a call for a period of one year after approval by the synod. Any delay occasioned by a postponement under V.B. above is not counted toward that one-year period of eligibility.
- D. The process for renewal of approval, as defined by the Vocation and Education unit ("Candidacy Manual"), is the same as that for other candidates for rostered ministry.
- E. Upon receipt and acceptance of a properly issued and duly attested letter of call, the candidate is reinstated to the appropriate roster of this church.

6. REVISED SOCIAL POLICY DOCUMENT ON IMMIGRATION

Background:

At its November 2006 meeting, the Church Council considered resolutions from four synods that requested the development of a new message on immigration. Since that time, additional requests have been received, both as resolutions from synods and as memorials from synod assemblies. The Church in Society program unit, in cooperation with Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, has worked closely with the Program and Services Committee to consider the appropriate response.

In recent months, the Church in Society unit has reviewed the ELCA's 1998 message on immigration and determined that the message provides a sufficient basis for ongoing theological reflection and deliberation within this church. As stated in "Policies and Procedures of the ELCA for Addressing Social Concerns," messages are "a particular means to encourage learning and moral discourse." At the same time, those involved in the consultation process underscored the need for specific policy language that would address the contemporary situation and have encouraged the development of a social policy resolution rather than a revised message. Social policy resolutions refer to actions, other than social statements, of the Churchwide Assembly or Church

Council on matters of social concern.

Church Council Action:

To approve the revised social policy document on immigration [as printed below]:

Toward Compassionate, Just, and Wise Immigration Reform

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) has a long history of helping immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers settle in the United States and supporting fair and generous immigration policies.⁸ Social conditions and historical events in this decade call for renewed attention to immigration. One factor is the estimated 12 million unauthorized immigrants (close to one-half of unauthorized-immigrant households are couples with children⁹) residing in the United States—living in the shadows, vulnerable to injustice and mistreatment, and representing a mass violation of the rule of law. Other factors include: the 2006 immigration demonstrations across the nation; and the emphasis on national security and immigration enforcement following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. The ELCA recommits itself to join with others in seeking compassionate, just, and wise immigration reform through this social policy resolution.

Theological Commitments

In 1998, the ELCA adopted a message on immigration that reiterated long-standing Lutheran commitments to both newcomers and just laws that serve the common good.¹⁰ Its core conviction was that "hospitality for the uprooted is a way to live out the biblical call to love the neighbor in response to God's love in Jesus Christ."¹¹ Two biblical references guided the message's direction: 1) "The stranger who resides with you shall be to you as the citizen among you; you shall love the stranger as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God" (Leviticus 19:34) and 2) "I was a stranger and you welcomed me" (Matthew 25:35). In Jesus of Nazareth, the God who commands us to care for the vulnerable identifies with the human stranger—the person unknown and regarded with

⁸ Cf. *Immigration* (Chicago: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 1998).

<http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID+107>. See also Jeffery S. Passel and D'Vera Cohn, "A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States," (Washington DC: Pew Research Center, 2009).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

suspicion who stands on the receiving end of both welcome and hospitality and rejection and resentment.¹² Not cited in the 1998 message but also relevant is Romans 13:1-7 and related Lutheran interpretations of the role and authority of government.

Created in the image of God

“Human beings are created ‘in God’s image’ (Genesis 1:27) as social beings whose dignity, worth, and value are conferred by God.”¹³ We are created to live together with God and one another in love and freedom, reflecting or imaging God’s perfect love and freedom.¹⁴ Therefore, this church seeks to oppose anything that disables or destroys a person’s capacity to relate to God and others in this way. With respect to work, the honoring of God’s image involves advocating for a “sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all,” while recognizing that individuals amount to significantly more than their capacity for labor.¹⁵ Further, “through our work we should be able to express this God-given dignity as [people] of integrity, worth, and meaning.”¹⁶ Thus, “[n]o one should be coerced to work under conditions that violate their dignity or freedom, jeopardize their health or safety, result in neglect of their family’s well-being, or provide unjust compensation for their labor.”¹⁷

¹² “Jesus characterizes ... hospitality in part as the exemplary recipient of hospitality. From his conception in Mary’s womb by the power of the Holy Spirit to his birth in a manger through to his burial (in a tomb of Joseph of Arimathea), Jesus was dependent on the welcome of others.” Amos Yong, *Hospitality and the Other: Pentecost, Christian Practices, and the Neighbor* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2008) 101. Cf. Luke’s account (24:13-35) of Jesus appearing as a stranger on the road to Emmaus.

¹³ *Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All* (Chicago: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 1999) 9.

¹⁴ One of the ELCA’s ecumenical partners articulates this point: “In the mystery of the one God, the three divine persons—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—live in, with and for one another eternally in perfect love and freedom.” *The Study Catechism*, The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 1998.

¹⁵ Cf. *Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All*, 9. The language of “work” as opposed to “labor” is preferable when considering matters of employment. “Work, for example, a good gift from God and an expression of a person’s intellectual and physical powers, is spoken of by the negative term ‘labor’ in order to represent the relation of worker and employer as an exchange rather than a partnership.” Oliver O’Donovan, *The Ways of Judgment* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005) 36.

¹⁶ *Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All*, 9.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 9.

A just government that serves the common good

God appoints and authorizes governments to preserve the created order and serve the common good, primarily through the exercise of judgment between right and wrong, good and bad.¹⁸ The ELCA further specifies that governments are to serve the *global* common good, for example, through fair trade policies or refugee assistance.¹⁹ Governing authorities are to seek justice, foster peace, protect people, and support their well-being.²⁰ This church therefore acknowledges the rule of law and the role of government in facilitating orderly migration and integration, and preventing migration that might be dangerous or harmful to host communities.²¹ The law must be just, governance must be good, and enforcement must be humane. It should also be recognized that just as there are legitimate grounds for the use of force, there are also legitimate grounds for showing restraint.²² The fairness of laws and the practices of governance and enforcement require constant evaluation

¹⁸ Cf. Romans 13:1-7. “[A]ll political authority, orderly government, laws, and good order in the world are created and instituted by God ...” Article 16 (German text), “The Augsburg Confession,” *The Book of Concord*, eds. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000) 48.

¹⁹ *For Peace in God’s World* (Chicago: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 1995) 5.

²⁰ Cf. Luther’s discussion on the relationship between the practices of government and the well-being of society embedded in his commentary on the daily bread petition of the Lord’s Prayer. See Martin Luther, *The Large Catechism in The Book of Concord*, 449ff.

²¹ The ELCA message on terrorism adds a word of caution to national security concerns. “Governments often abuse and violate their authority under the guise of seeking security. They may deny the rightful aspirations of an oppressed group, violate human rights, or inflict their own unjustifiable violence on people in the name of fighting terrorism.” *Living in a Time of Terrorism*, p. 5. The message also shows a sober awareness of the limits of such interests. “The security that governments—including that of the United States—can provide from the threats of terrorism has limits. Human beings, finite creatures that we are, are always vulnerable; eliminating vulnerability would also do away with freedom. Governments cannot provide perfect or total security; when they claim to do so, they become agents of arrogant pride and the injustice and insecurity that flow from pride. If they are to secure freedom for vulnerable people, governments must recognize their limits in providing security.” p. 6.

²² Cf. George W. Forell and James F. McCue, “Political Order and Vocation in the Augsburg Confession,” in *Confessing One Faith: A Joint Commentary on the Augsburg Confession by Lutheran and Catholic Theologians*, eds. idem (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982) 330f.

in light of the Christian doctrine of sin. The ELCA's posture toward governing authorities is one of critical respect—respectful of their role to serve the common good, yet critical of unjust and harmful ideologies, structures, and processes.

A Broken Immigration System

Families separated, people marginalized, and communities at risk

Because of overstaying their work, student, or tourist visas or crossing the border illegally, an estimated 12 million immigrants live in the United States without legal status.²³ Backlogs for family preference visas result in people waiting up to 15 years or more to be reunited with loved ones. Many without legal status, desperate to survive and provide for their families, consistently risk dangerous border crossings and abrupt, forced separation from their families after they arrive. These alternatives are considered better than the socio-economic pressures they face in their home countries.

Although laws prohibit employers from hiring unauthorized workers, many employers, for a variety of reasons, are not in compliance. Numerous major industries (e.g., agriculture, construction, and hospitality), small businesses, and family households across America find such workers indispensable. Many employers turn to the undocumented workforce for flexible, industrious, and low-cost labor to do work United States citizens often will not do. The cost savings, however, are realized at the expense of unauthorized workers and the wider community when employers pay lower wages, evade state and federal taxes, and withhold payment for benefits such as health and disability insurance. Fearing immigration officials, detention, and deportation because of their unauthorized status, undocumented workers are vulnerable to exploitation. Consequently, unfair and unsafe work conditions often go unchecked, illnesses and injuries go untreated, crimes and abuse go unreported, and this country's labor laws often go unenforced.

The "new security paradigm" and enforcement-only approaches

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States renewed the federal government's policy emphasis on national security, focusing particular attention on border control and interior enforcement. One fear was that lax immigration controls and the non-enforcement of existing laws would allow terrorists to cross borders illegally, remain here indefinitely, and move about inconspicuously. Other concerns related to drug

²³ Jeffery S. Passel and D'Vera Cohn, "A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States," i.

trafficking, the entry of criminals, and connections with increasing gang-related activity in the United States. As federal immigration responsibilities migrated from the Department of Labor to the Department of Homeland Security, immigration issues have increasingly been viewed through the lens of national security. The blurring of the distinction between anti-terrorism efforts and the prosecution of routine worksite immigration violations—both responsibilities of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—has resulted in false characterizations of unauthorized immigrants.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's budget has grown by 80 percent from \$6 billion in 2004 to over \$10 billion in 2009, with resources being directed primarily toward expanding its security personnel and infrastructure (e.g., physical and virtual fencing, and enforcement).²⁴ Increased patrolling and fencing along the southern border of the United States have made attempts to cross the border illegally more difficult. Yet many continue to opt for more remote locations, more hazardous conditions, and more expensive traffickers (who are often connected to organized crime). As a result, deaths in the desert average more than one a day.²⁵ Fence building has also been fraught with controversy because of: impacts on border communities and United States-Mexico relations; environmental and private property concerns; and exceptionally high costs and mismanaged construction.²⁶ Immigration raids, round-ups, and crackdowns conducted like military operations on businesses and homes have had negative side effects. They have heightened fear and mistrust among unauthorized and authorized immigrants, and separated and traumatized families and communities across America.²⁷

Further, the practice of detaining immigrants is skyrocketing, even while alternatives have proved more humane, less costly, and more effective.²⁸ The federal government detains more than 300,000 immigrants and refugees every year in a nationwide immigration detention system, much of it operated by for-profit corporations.²⁹ Vulnerable people such as families with children, torture

²⁴ Doris Meissner and Donald Kerwin, *DHS and Immigration: Taking Stock and Correcting Course* (Migration Policy Institute, February 2009) 9.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 15.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 11ff.

²⁷ See Randy Capps, Rosa Maria Castaneda, Ajay Chaudry, and Robert Santos, *Paying the Price: The Impact of Immigration Raids on America's Children*, a report by The Urban Institute for the National Council of La Raza, 2007.

²⁸ *DHS and Immigration*, 50ff.

²⁹ See "The History of Immigration Detention in the United States," Detention Watch Network www.detentionwatchnetwork.org/node/2381.

survivors, asylum seekers, trafficking victims, and those with serious medical conditions such as HIV and AIDS are detained pending court hearings for civil immigration violations. They are jailed in remote federal prisons and detention centers, contract prison facilities, and rented space in local jails and state prisons, and are often mixed in with criminal populations. Most detainees lack legal counsel and many suffer from overcrowding, inadequate medical and mental health care, vulnerability to physical and sexual abuse, and neglect leading in some cases to death. Detention also imposes heavy financial and emotional costs on families living without the support of the detained person. Finally, many of those deported are removed without attorney involvement or a hearing before a judge, even when their deportation may mean significant danger and deprivations, including lifelong exile from their family.³⁰

The massive number of unauthorized immigrants residing in the United States has also cast doubt on the federal government's competence to carry out its immigration responsibilities. Such doubt follows from unresolved congressional debate, an overwhelmed and under-resourced immigration system, and obvious violations of immigration law on a vast scale. Meanwhile, some state and local governments have expanded their authority and dramatically increased their legislative activity concerning immigration, with some taking over enforcement responsibilities.³¹ While states with the largest foreign-born populations (i.e., traditional immigrant-receiving states) tend to propose bills that expand immigrants' rights, states newly experiencing

³⁰ See generally INA s. 292, 8 U.S.C. s. 1362 (non-citizens removed have the privilege of being represented by counsel, but at no expense to the government); Department of Justice, Executive Office for Immigration Review, FY 2007 Statistical Yearbook (Apr. 2008), p. G1 (in 2007, approximately 58 percent of non-citizens in removal proceedings were not represented by counsel); INA s. 235(b)(1)(B)(iii), 8 U.S.C. s. 1225(b)(1)(B)(iii) (non-citizens who are considered "arriving aliens" under the law, and who are not determined by an Asylum Officer to have a credible fear of persecution, are removed from the United States under a process called expedited removal, without hearing or review); Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General, *Removals Involving Illegal Alien Parents of United States Citizen Children*, p. 5 (Jan. 19, 2009) (Between 1998 and 2007, more than 100,000 non-citizen parents of United States citizen children were removed from the United States.)

³¹ See "Regulating Immigration at the State Level: Highlights from the Database of 2007 State Immigration Legislation and the Methodology," Laureen Laglagaron et al. (Migration Policy Institute, October 2008). In 2007, 1059 immigration-related bills were introduced by state legislators.

rapid immigration growth (i.e., new destination states) tend to propose bills that contract immigrants' rights, such as imposing certain prohibitions on the receipt of state public benefits and services.³² Racism, prejudice, and negative stereotyping have been a part of these debates as well.³³

Refugees struggling to rebuild their lives in the United States

Refugees are among the most vulnerable people in the world.³⁴ Their stories are often filled with fear, pain, and loss because of the forced separation of families, persecution, war, and genocide. Many have been warehoused in camps for up to a decade or more in dangerous conditions and with limited support, where neither repatriation nor integration into the camp's host country is feasible. Even when individuals are resettled, their family members often are not, causing further sorrow. The United States has been a world leader in providing protection and assistance to refugees both internationally through humanitarian assistance and domestically by resettling refugees and integrating them into our communities. However, resettlement agencies complain of chronic underfunding—with some viewing this as inconsistent with this nation's humanitarian intentions and federally-mandated resettlement programs. Current economic conditions have made it difficult for resettled refugees to find the security and stability to rebuild their lives. Agencies supporting such integration are in critical need of further resources to provide the basic services refugees need to survive in this country. These organizations currently rely on private sources of funding to help underwrite the cost of services and to compensate for a lack of sufficient federal support. These private sources have declined because of the weakened economy.

³² Ibid, p. 3f., 27.

³³ "Policies, practices, and attitudes that are hostile to immigrants living in the United States and that unduly curtail the legal arrival of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers fail to live up to our country's tradition of welcoming newcomers in a fair and generous way." *Living in a Time of Terrorism* (Chicago: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 2004) 6.

³⁴ Refugees are defined as individuals who have "a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion" according to the United Nations' 1951 "Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees," which was adopted by the United States in the Refugee Act of 1980. Cited in *Immigration*, 10.

Resolutions

In light of current immigration laws, practices, and policy debates; their impact on immigrant communities and this country as a whole; and existing ELCA theological and moral commitments, this church commits itself to the following actions, balancing humanitarian, labor, and security issues:

1) Reunite families and integrate the marginalized

This church urges the United States government to prioritize family reunification. Many refugee and immigrant families, including “mixed families” (families composed of United States citizens, often children, and/or legal permanent residents), are separated with no viable means of timely reunification. It calls for Congress and the Executive Branch of the government to address statutory and administrative factors and the lack of humanitarian waivers that contribute to barriers and backlogs separating families and the systematic marginalization of human beings. The ELCA also advocates for the welcome and care of unaccompanied children who have lost or are separated from their families. It again calls for “flexible and humane ways for undocumented [individuals] who have been in this country for a specified amount of time to be able to adjust their legal status.”³⁵ They should be permitted to come out of the shadows and have immediate family members join them on a path to earned legalization.

2) Protect the rights of people at work

New legislation should facilitate an orderly, regulated future flow of workers, consistent with America’s labor needs and obligations, to contribute to the global common good. Legal pathways for entry to work in the United States ought to correspond to the annual need for foreign workers. Migrant workers should be permitted to have immediate family members join them and together be offered a path to permanent residency. They should also be free to travel within and outside the United States. Worksites must provide: fair wages, benefits that do not undercut domestic workers, and conditions and protections comparable to domestic expectations (e.g., legal recourse for exploitation, freedom to change employers). A secure, efficient, mandatory, and enforceable means of verifying a job applicant’s eligibility to work in the United States should be implemented.³⁶

3) Establish just and humane enforcement

This church believes that governing authorities have the responsibility to protect the nation’s borders and maintain its security. It supports the establishment of clear protocols and safeguards for raids on worksites that ensure immigrant families and local communities are not harmed. It is troubled by the use of criminal charges in routine immigration-status violations and advocates against this approach. The ELCA also supports increasing the use of more humane, less costly, and more effective alternatives to detention, such as supervised release programs. When detention is necessary, compliance with humane standards and access to vital services must be ensured at every facility housing detainees. Families with children should never be detained in penal settings. Children should be united with family members whenever possible, or provided with guardianship if needed. Immigrant children in federal custody ought to be treated in accordance with child welfare principles consistent with their best interests. This church advocates for a fair deportation process consistent with American values, including, for example, the right to appointed legal representation and a hearing before a judge. It supports the right to judicial review and advocates for increased access to legal counsel for immigrants to seek opportunities for relief from detention and deportation. Finally, the ELCA calls for a moratorium on and a comprehensive assessment of fence building along the United States-Mexican border, noting especially its impact on local communities.

4) Revitalize refugee protection and integration

This church calls for reform of the United States refugee resettlement system in order to address the growing demand for resettlement worldwide and to facilitate refugee integration within this country. The United States government should continue to use refugee resettlement strategically as part of a larger protection response, seek to end the warehousing of refugees, and find sustainable solutions for refugees who are unable to return home. Special attention must be paid to protecting and integrating refugees created by actions of the United States that contribute to refugee flows in the world. The ELCA also calls for renewed commitment to family unity and family reunification as a basic human right and integral to long term integration. Finally, increased federal support of local agencies and organizations that welcome refugees and assist them in rebuilding their lives is urgently needed.

³⁵ *Immigration*, 8.

³⁶ *DHS and Immigration*, 28.

5) Address root causes of forced migration

Immigration and refugee laws and their reform should not be considered in isolation from United States foreign policy and globalization issues. In particular, this church acknowledges the obligation of the United States to serve the common global good. This includes the need for better economic and trade policies designed, for example, to strengthen Mexican and Central American economies and create job opportunities with family-sustaining wages for would-be migrants. In general, the United States, in concert with other nations, must address through policy and action the root causes of forced migration, such as extreme poverty, unemployment, political persecution, armed conflicts, genocide, environmental degradation, religious intolerance, trade policies, and other forms of injustice. The aim is for would-be migrants to be free to remain in their homeland, support their families, and contribute to their communities. This church supports the ratification of international legal instruments that defend the rights of migrants, refugees (including unaccompanied children), and asylum seekers. The ELCA advocates especially for the right to migrate to support oneself or one's family, the right not to be forced to migrate, the right to be reunited with family, and the right to just working conditions.

7. ADDITIONAL VOTING MEMBERS FOR THE 2011 CHURCHWIDE ASSEMBLY

Background:

For each Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, provision for additional voting members has been made for certain synods. This has been done in keeping with this church's "Principles of Organization." Under those principles, the Church Council is assigned responsibility for ensuring that at least 60 percent of the members of assemblies shall be lay persons and that at least 10 percent of such voting members shall be people of color or people whose primary language is other than English (provision 5.01.f.).

Experience in the registration process for assemblies has demonstrated the need for allocation of additional positions to help ensure fulfillment of the organizational principles and also to provide for broader representation in synods (for example, the Caribbean Synod) that normally would be entitled to only two voting members, one of whom would be the synodical bishop.

Church Council Action:

To allocate for the 2011 Churchwide Assembly two additional voting-member positions to the Caribbean Synod (9F), making a total of 4, with the provision that these additional voting members shall be people of color or people whose primary language

is other than English;

To allocate for the 2011 Churchwide Assembly one additional voting-member position to the Alaska Synod (1A), making a total of four voting members, with the provision that the position shall be filled by an Alaska Native person;

To allocate for the 2011 Churchwide Assembly one additional voting-member position each to the Arkansas-Oklahoma Synod (4C), making a total of four voting members, and the West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod (8H), making a total of five voting members, for an individual of color or an individual whose primary language is other than English; and

To allocate for the 2011 Churchwide Assembly one additional voting-member position for a lay member of the Slovak Zion Synod (7G); the total number of voting members is three.

8. MEMBERSHIP IN ACTION BY CHURCHES TOGETHER ALLIANCE

Background:

Established on August 25, 1995, Action by Churches Together (ACT) International is a global alliance of churches and related agencies—all members of the Lutheran World Federation and the World Council of Churches—that responds collaboratively to global emergencies. The ELCA has been an active member of ACT International since its inception.

Over the past two years, discussion has taken place regarding the unification of ACT International and ACT Development, an alliance established in 2007 to eradicate poverty, injustice, and the abuse of human rights through long-term development. ACT Development builds on the emergency response work already undertaken by ACT International. In early 2009, both entities passed motions to unify ACT International and ACT Development to form the ACT Alliance, which legally commences on January 1, 2010. Renewal of membership requires the approval by the governance body of each organization.

As the unit responsible for the ELCA's mission abroad, Global Mission is called to carry out specified functions, including the stewardship of member and church resources in mission abroad involving "...justice, relief, and development..." (ELCA 16.31.C87.). According to established guidelines directing ELCA Disaster Response, "ELCA International Disaster Funds normally shall be channeled to Action by Churches Together (ACT), which coordinates ecumenical response to emergencies."

Church Council Action:

To approve membership by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in the unified Action by Churches Together (ACT) Alliance as requested by the Global Mission program unit.

9. ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF CHURCHWIDE ORGANIZATION PROGRAM UNITS

Background:

According to bylaw 14.21.21. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the ELCA:*

Unless otherwise specified in this constitution and bylaws, the Church Council shall elect the executive director for each churchwide program unit to a four-year term in consultation with and with the approval of the presiding bishop of this church. Nomination of a candidate for election shall be made by the presiding bishop after consultation with the appropriate program committee for each position. . . .

The Church Council met in executive session to receive recommendations from Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson for executive directors for the following churchwide program units: Multicultural Ministries and Vocation and Education. The nominations by Presiding Bishop Hanson come following consultation with representatives of the program committees.

Church Council Action:

To re-elect the Rev. Sherman G. Hicks to a four-year term as executive director of the program unit for Multicultural Ministries beginning January 17, 2010.

Church Council Action:

To re-elect the Rev. Stanley N. Olson as executive director of the Vocation and Education program unit for a four-year term beginning January 1, 2010.

10. ELECTION OF THE EDITOR OF THE LUTHERAN MAGAZINE

Background:

According to bylaw 17.31.01. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions* of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, "An advisory committee for *The Lutheran* shall have the responsibility for the church periodical. The advisory committee, in consultation with the presiding bishop of this church, shall nominate the editor for the church periodical..." Further, bylaw 17.31.02. indicates that "The Church Council shall elect the editor of the church periodical by a two-thirds vote."

The nomination comes from the advisory committee for the magazine in consultation with Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson.

Church Council Action (two-thirds vote required):

To re-elect Daniel J. Lehmann as editor of *The Lutheran* magazine for a four-year term beginning January 1, 2010.

11. OTHER ELECTIONS

Background:

Between meetings of the Churchwide Assembly, the Church Council has the responsibility of electing people to fill terms on churchwide boards, steering committees of churchwide commissions, and certain advisory committees.

Church Council Action:

To declare elected the following:

Advisory Committee for *The Lutheran*

Clergy [Term 2015]

Pr. Jennifer M. Ginn, Salisbury, N.C. (9B)

Lay Female [Term 2015]

Ms. Judy R. Korn, Morris, Minn. (3F)

Lay Male [Term 2015]

Mr. John A. Wagner, Toledo, Ohio (6D)

Board of Trustees of the ELCA Foundation

Clergy [Term 2015]

Pr. Susan J. Crowell, Greenville, S.C. (9C)

Lay Female [Term 2015]

Ms. Teresa Chow, Hoffman Estates, Ill. (5A)

Lay Male [Term 2015]

Mr. James E. Willis, Rockwell City, Iowa (5E)

Committee of Hearing Officers

Clergy [Term 2015]

Pr. Gerald R. Kliner, Jr., Hurricane, W. Va. (8H)

Lay Female [Term 2015]

Ms. Leslie M. Frost, Saint Paul, Minn. (3G)

Lay Male [Term 2015]

Mr. William R. Lloyd, Jr., Somerset, Penn. (8C)

Board of Pensions Trustees

Lay Male [Term 2013] – *to fill unexpired term of Kelly L. Birch*
Mr. Cecil D. Bykerk, Omaha, Neb. (4A)

Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, S.C., to three-year terms expiring in 2012: Dr. Richard Conn, Dr. Miriam David-Brown, and Mr. Kenneth Childs.

SOCIAL MINISTRY ORGANIZATIONS

Background:

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America serves as a corporate member of certain inter-Lutheran organizations and affiliated social ministry organizations. The role of corporate members includes the responsibility to elect ELCA representatives to the organization's board of directors as prescribed in the organization's governing documents. The relationship of the ELCA to certain inter-Lutheran organizations and affiliated social ministry organizations is expressed through the Church in Society unit.

The ELCA serves as a corporate member of Lutheran Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York; the Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society, Sioux Falls, S.D.; Lutheran Services in America, Baltimore, Md.; Mosaic, Inc., Omaha, Neb.; and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Baltimore, Md. In the case of Lutheran Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York, the ELCA's annual election of board members complies with their constitutional requirement that this action constitute an annual meeting of the corporate member. The Church in Society program unit has forwarded to the Church Council the following nominations for positions on the boards of these organizations.

Church Council Action:

To elect to the board of trustees of Lutheran Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York as members-at-large: Bp. Robert Rimbo to a one-year term expiring in 2010; Ms. Angela Martinez to a three-year term expiring in 2012; and Ms. Wendy Goldstein (*ex officio*) to a term simultaneous with her position as president and chief executive officer.

BOARD OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SOUTHERN SEMINARY

Background:

Bylaw 8.31.02. outlines basic parameters for the election of members to the boards of ELCA seminaries. Subsection 8.31.02.a. provides for churchwide representation: "At least one-fifth nominated, in consultation with the seminaries, by the appropriate churchwide unit and elected by the Church Council."

Church Council Action:

To elect to the board of directors of Lutheran