Agenda Exhibits

EXHIBIT A  REPORTS OF THE OFFICERS
   Part 1:  Report of the Presiding Bishop
          Part 1a:  Summary of Section Activities
   Part 2:  Report of the Vice President
   Part 3:  Report of the Secretary
   Part 4:  Report of the Treasurer
          Part 4a:  Summary of Information Technology and Management Services Sections
   Part 5:  Report of the Conference of Bishops

EXHIBIT B  CHURCH COUNCIL ITEMS
   Part 1:  Synodical Resolutions Directed to the Church Council
          Part 1b:  Proposed Responses: Synodical Resolutions Previously Referred to Churchwide Units
          Part 2b:  Proposed Responses to Churchwide Assembly actions

EXHIBIT C  NOMINATIONS
   Part 1:  Elections to Boards, Committees, and Church Council
   Part 2:  Nominations Vitae

EXHIBIT D  CHURCH COUNCIL ITEMS
   Part 1:  Summary of Synod Visits by Church Council Members
   Part 2:  Draft Schedule for Church Council Retreat
   Part 3:  Church Council Committee Charters
   Part 4:  Church Council Committee Evaluation

EXHIBIT E  ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
   Part 1:  Report of the Executive for Administration

EXHIBIT F  BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
          Part 2a:  2007 Operating Results Summary
          Part 2b:  Current Operating Fund Results
          Part 2c:  World Hunger
          Part 2d:  Statement of Financial Position
   Part 3:  2008 Current Income and Expenditure Authorization
          Part 3a:  Revised 2008 Income Estimates
          Part 3b:  Revised 2008 Expense Proposal
   Part 4:  Church Council Designated Funds
          Part 4a:  Church Council Designated Funds Functioning as Endowment
          Part 4b:  Church Council Designated Funds Summary
          Part 4c:  Second Mile Ministry
          Part 4d:  ELCA Studies on Sexuality
          Part 4e:  Culture-specific Resource Development
          Part 4f:  Introduction of New Primary Worship Resource
          Part 4g:  Leadership Development Initiative
          Part 4h:  Ministry Among People Living in Poverty
          Part 4i:  Churchwide Strategy for Engagement in Israel and Palestine
   Part 5:  Mission Support Plans by Synod
   Part 6:  Pooled Trust Fund A of the ELCA Endowment Fund
EXHIBIT G    LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW
Part 1: Revision to Lutheran Medical Center bylaws

EXHIBIT H    PLANNING AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Part 1: Planning and Evaluation Committee report

EXHIBIT I    PROGRAM AND SERVICES COMMITTEE
Part 1: Program and Services committee report

EXHIBIT J    ONGOING REVIEW OF CHURCHWIDE UNITS AND REGIONS
Part 1: Summary of activities of churchwide units
Part 1a: Summary of board actions

EXHIBIT K    CHURCH IN SOCIETY
Part 1: Task Force for ELCA Studies on Sexuality update
Part 2: Justice for Women Report
Part 3: ELCA Boycott Policy and Procedures
Part 3a: Issue paper 5: Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All
Part 3b: Issue paper 6: For Peace in God’s World: Human Rights
Part 3c: Issue paper 7: For Peace in God’s World: Violence in Our World

EXHIBIT L    EVANGELICAL OUTREACH AND CONGREGATIONAL MISSION

EXHIBIT M    GLOBAL MISSION
Part 1: Global Mission Personnel

EXHIBIT N    MULTICULTURAL MINISTRIES
Part 1: Multicultural Ministries Report

EXHIBIT O    VOCATION AND EDUCATION

EXHIBIT P    BOARD OF PENSIONS

EXHIBIT Q    OTHER UNITS
Part 1: United Methodist Church Full Communion Agreement
Part 2: Lutheran Malaria Initiative
Part 2a: Lutheran Malaria Initiative Budget
Part 3: Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding Update

EXHIBIT R    OTHER BUSINESS
Part 1: 2011 Churchwide Assembly Site Selection
Report of the Presiding Bishop

And now the Lord says, who formed me in the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob back to him, and that Israel might be gathered to him, for I am honoured in the sight of the Lord, and my God has become my strength—he says, ‘It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.’ (Isaiah 49:5-6)

The Isaiah passage was a reminder to Israel and to us that God’s vision for the work to which God calls us is often far more bold than our own. Even when we might feel burdened by the weight of our responsibilities, God declares, “It is too light a thing…” and then reminds us that God’s purpose is for God’s salvation to “reach to the end of the earth.”

Even as I report to you on recent progress in our implementation the ELCA Plan for Mission, I do so with appreciation for the immerging conversations about mission in our changing context. This is a time to deepen our engagement with the Word of God, expand our understanding of our context, and prayerfully discern and imagine the work to which God is calling this church.

Much has happened since we last met in the areas of this church’s five strategic directions.

Support congregations in their call to be faithful, welcoming, and generous, sharing the mind of Christ.

It has been a joy to see how faithfully and imaginatively congregations are engaging in ministry in often radically changing contexts. In January I participated with Bishop Ray Tiemann in the Southwestern Texas Synod’s Victoria Conference “Equipping of the Saints” event. Having the opportunity also to preach in open country and small town congregations that are part of a Tri-County Cooperative Ministries renewed my appreciation for the many ways ELCA congregations are adapting to the significant changes in rural America.

I experienced similar gifted leaders in the gathering of congregational church councils and rostered leaders in the Southeastern Minnesota Synod. They have a wonderful tradition of convening council members shortly after most congregations hold their annual meetings. What a great opportunity to share the stories of what God is doing throughout this interdependent church. It was fascinating that the discussions were all about mission in the question and answer hour—mission with young adults, returning military veterans, new immigrants, confirmands. I experienced a group of hundreds of ELCA leaders whose anxieties over church controversies seemed low and whose expectations of the Holy Spirit seemed high!

In late April the U.S. Congregational Life Survey will be distributed to about 500 randomly selected ELCA congregations. This survey is subsidized by the Lilly Foundation and will be managed by the Presbyterian Church (USA). The participating congregations will have agreed to distribute the survey immediately before or after all worship services to all those 15 years of age and older during a designated week. Because the same questions were used in 2001, we can track changes in participation, levels of commitment, religious beliefs and practices, and social and political views. Pastors are being asked to complete an extensive questionnaire that assesses their leadership style and practices. The survey’s goal is to learn more about how different leadership styles impact the beliefs and practices of the parishioner. We also have the opportunity to supplement the basic questionnaire with a set of our own questions that will be specific to issues facing the ELCA. Our portion of the funding for the study is being provided by Research and Evaluation, Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission, and the Leadership Grant program. We expect the first reports from the data to be available in the fall of this year.
Assist members, congregations, synods, and institutions and agencies of this church to grow in evangelical outreach.

Last month I sent an e-letter to rostered leaders regarding this church’s commitment to being an evangelizing church. The responses were very positive with rostered leaders agreeing this must be our priority. The research by the Pew Forum on Religious and Public Life substantiates the significant changes we have been witnessing in recent years. It is obvious that neither the culture nor Lutherans are “producing” Lutherans for us. As I have said often, at age 20 it is time we as the ELCA starting acting our name: we are evangelicals. Let us affirm that by proclaiming the good news of God in Christ through word and deed rather than simply saying “but we are not like those other evangelicals.”

The ELCA commitment to be an evangelizing church has been undergirded by a 1.5 million dollar grant from the Mission Investment Fund to the Fund for Leaders in Mission. Recipients will be seminarians preparing to develop new mission starts. The previous requirement that mission developers first must have three years of parish experience has been waived.

Another example of evangelical outreach is the ministry of our military chaplains. It was a privilege for Kathie Bender Schwich and me to meet with our Federal chaplains at their seminar earlier this month. They shared powerful stories of their ministry of Word and Sacrament and pastoral care in often very difficult and dangerous contexts. They are appreciative of the prayers and support of this church, especially our renewed commitment to work with returning veterans.

Step forward as a public church that witnesses boldly to God’s love for all that God has created:

ELCA members in Ridgefield, Conn., gathered with our full communion partners in the Episcopal Church to discuss what it means to be a public church. Again we affirmed that public church begins when we gather as the Body of Christ for public worship. It includes the baptized living out their varied callings in daily life. Being public church also calls us to lives of service, to work for justice and peace, and to be communities of discernment, repentance, lament and celebration.

While immigration currently is not a “front and center” issue legislatively, I strongly believe that we are called to make it so. Rallie Deffenbaugh’s presence at the Bishops’ Academy in January was evidence of the priority we place on this issue. In late January, Bishop Katharine Jefferts Schori, presiding bishop of The Episcopal Church, and I were part of an evening gathering held at the Episcopal Church of the Atonement in Chicago. The purpose of the gathering was to highlight the ministry of Interfaith Refugee and Immigration Ministries (IRIM) of Chicago and was a wonderful example of this church’s ecumenical and interfaith involvement. Our visit gave rise to a joint statement on immigration, which can be found at http://www.elca.org/bishop/messages/MSH_JeffertsSchor.pdf. The March 2008 issue of the Lutheran magazine focuses on this topic as well.

In February I was in Brooklyn joining in the 125th anniversary of Lutheran Health Care. Founded by Deaconess Sister Elisabeth Fedde to serve Norwegian immigrants, Lutheran Health Care through its medical center, Lutheran Community Services, Augustana, and senior housing, now serves a diverse population that speaks some 120 languages. What a marvelous story of “God’s work….Our hands.” It is truly an example of that for which our social statement on health calls and to which we as the ELCA are committed:

*Health is central to our well-being, vital to relationships, and helps us to live out our vocations in family, work and community. Caring for one’s own health is a matter of human necessity and good stewardship. Caring for the health of others experiences both love for our neighbor and responsibility for a just society. As a personal and social responsibility, health care is a shared endeavor.*
Deepen and extend our global, ecumenical, and interfaith relationships for the sake of God’s mission:

United Methodists will vote on full communion with the ELCA on April 29 at the United Methodist General Conference meeting in Fort Worth, Tex.. The recommendation has been finalized. There will be one vote to accept or reject, without separate amendment, resolutions to establish a relationship of full communion. The basic agreement cites that “there are no church-dividing differences precluding full communion between the ELCA and the United Methodist Church.”

Churches Uniting in Christ met in January. We are a Partner in Mission in Dialogue with CUIC, not a full member. We have provided leadership for the ministry task force and the racial justice task force. CUIC is currently undergoing some major analysis and consideration.

Christian Churches Together (CCT) also met in January. CCT brings together a wide range of Christians from pentecostal, evangelical, Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and main line churches. The meeting’s highlights and direction included sharing faith stories and a common hope to find unity in witness, and in addressing poverty.

A consultation on the future of the ELCA’s ecumenical and inter-religious relations was held February 15-16, 2008, at the Lutheran Center in Chicago. Twenty-five members from throughout this church, including bishops, lay people, young adults, and seminary presidents met for this intensive conversation about how Lutherans seek visible Christian unity in the world. Attention was paid to this church’s unique leadership responsibilities in both the North American and global contexts, as well as how the ELCA exemplifies its strategic goals to “extend and deepen ecumenical and inter-religious relationships in the life of this church.” The group assessed issues of ecumenical reception, financial resources, recommendations about councils (e.g., LWF, NCC, WCC), and inter-religious goals for the coming years. In the coming months, a commensurate strategic plan for ecumenical and inter-religious relations will be reconfigured to reflect the consultation.

Pr. Donald McCoid recently participated in the annual conversation between leaders of the Lutheran World Federation and the International Lutheran Council held in Johannesburg, South Africa. It is vitally important that we have these discussions in the context of our global relationships and that differences on issues such as the ordination of women and human sexuality not be used as grounds for intrusion and fostering dissension in the life of member churches. The communiqué from the meeting is available through Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations.

On January 30 the National Interreligious Leadership Initiative for Peace in the Middle East (NILI) issued a letter to President George W. Bush expressing its support for his active leadership for Arab-Israeli-Palestinian peace. From its founding in 2003, NILI, which represented more than thirty Jewish, Christian and Muslim religious leaders—including heads of twenty-five national organizations—has advocated both that our nation has an inescapable responsibility and an indispensable role to play in achieving peace and that achieving Arab-Israeli-Palestinian peace will have very important positive reverberations in the region and worldwide.

Under the theme “Unbinding Each Other: New Possibilities in Mennonite-Lutheran Relations,” delegations of pastors, theologians, church leaders, seminary students, and others met in Elkhart, Ind. to explore implications of “right remembering” in light of the Church Council message of November 2006, “Declaration of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America on the Condemnation of Anabaptists.” It became clear during the consultation that the members of the Mennonite Church U.S.A. were profoundly moved by adoption of this message. This expression of regret has been heard as a profound act of repentance and acceptance of responsibility for the use of violence to resolve religious disputes in the sixteenth century, and a key to deepening and
“unbinding” our relationship for the future. I am grateful to pastors Donald McCoid and Paul Schreck for their participation in this meeting.

The Lutheran-Muslim Consultative Panel met March 6-8. In October of this year, there will be a meeting in the United States of Christian-Jewish and Christian-Muslim leaders that involves our full communion and ecumenical partners. The ELCA is a key leader in these new conversations.

**Assist this church to bring forth and support faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God's mission in a pluralistic world.**

It was good to take part in the annual retreat with our eight seminary presidents and colleagues from the Vocation and Education program unit. We had a thoughtful and spirited conversation about the shared commitment to prepare leaders for a church engaged in mission. I appreciate the commitment to collaboration between our seminaries and churchwide staff.

For more than 25 years, the “diaspora gathering” annually has brought together Lutheran seminarians attending Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Union in New York, and some other schools. In February I was asked to talk with the group about the “state of the ELCA.” We had a spirited conversation about the opportunities and challenges facing us. On the second day of the event, Stan Olson had an hour for conversation and told the students he was there to recruit them for the institutional church so that “diaspora” did not become a step to departure. He invited the students to realize how effectively God uses our flawed institutions for God’s mission in the world.

Within the churchwide organization, I am emphasizing our shared leadership as churchwide staff relate to synods and the leaders who serve there. I am encouraging churchwide leaders to let bishops know when they are present in synods and am encouraging bishops to look for opportunities for conversation between churchwide staff and leaders in the synod in order to build relationships that are so vital to our shared mission.

Recently I participated in the installation of Ann Svennungsen as president of Texas Lutheran University. The event was a celebration of that university and President Svennungsen’s gifts. For me, it served as a re-affirmation of this church’s commitment to our 28 colleges and universities. I did there as I always seek to do: have open conversations with faculty and staff, and informal conversation with students. In conversation with the faculty and staff I had the opportunity to talk about why our commitment to education is so foundational to us as Lutherans, how Lutheranism emphasizes faith seeking understanding, and how our commitment to excellence in education is being lived out through our new social statement on education.

Kristen Glass, the ELCA’s director for young adult ministries, on behalf of the young adult ministry alliance, made a most helpful presentation to the churchwide Cabinet of Executives on ministry with young adults. It is clear that there are distinctive groups within the broad category “young adults.” Rather than constantly dwelling on the absence of young adults in this church, let us receive the wisdom and gifts of those who are present and be transformed by their passion to make a difference in the world.

I always enjoy spending time in conversation with the students of our colleges and universities. These young people have a passion for being part of a church that is making a difference in the world. I am excited about the opportunities we have to engage the gifts and energies of these young leaders and will continue to challenge this church to do so.

Much also is happening with regard to this church’s commitments for implementation.
Encourage, welcome, and depend upon the lively and creative exchange of resources and ideas throughout the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

In early February I convened the second consultation on seminarian student debt, gathering twenty-four leaders from synods, seminaries, colleges, the ELCA Foundation, the Mission Investment Fund, Vocation and Education, Research and Evaluation, my office, and an observer from the Lilly Endowment. There we celebrated a $1.5 million gift from MIF to the Fund for Leaders in Mission that will launch a new matching gift program to provide $4.5 million for seminary scholarships to future mission developers. We also celebrated the new energy and imagination stirred up by the conversation between the Conference of Bishops and the seminary presidents on seminarian student debt last October. It has moved us toward a widely shared understanding that we need to tend to this issue both locally and as a whole church.

The group realizes that we need to mobilize more partners with a common message that clearly articulates not only the needs but also the promise of healthy and connected leaders. The consultation participants volunteered to bring this conversation to their various tables in the next few months. As I continue to convene and engage this table, a small group has been tasked with sharpening the common message and developing an action plan. The guest from the Lilly Endowment stressed that many, indeed nearly all, church bodies recognize this as a crucial issue. What makes the ELCA distinctive and promising is the way we are working to address it together.

Recognize and encourage the vital contributions and deepening relationship with institutions and agencies of this church and with Lutheran, ecumenical, and interfaith partners.

The social statement, “Our Calling in Education,” is being implemented across the ELCA. Within the churchwide organization, one area of intense activity is the Vocation and Education unit. Staff convened leaders from colleges and universities, schools and early childhood education centers, and campus ministries to do initial brainstorming and planning for consultations across this church about these areas of our work as a church. Three lively conversations promise good ideas and increased commitment for and from the consultations over the next two years.

The Lutheran Education Conference of North America (LECNA) had its annual gathering of ELCA and LCMS college presidents in February. Special focus this year has involved the evolving role of college boards, expanding diversity and, as always, the vocation of a Lutheran college and president’s role. Four from the Vocation and Education staff took part—Arne Selbyg, Marilyn Olson, Mark Wilhelm, and Stan Olson. This is a good occasion for enhancing the mutual and respective ministries of the colleges and universities and this church.

Confront the scandalous realities…

The current presidential campaign and the commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. have challenged us to renew our commitment as a church body and individuals to continue to address the reality of racism and work for racial justice. As one whose understanding of the reality of racism began in the tumultuous years of the 1960s, I believe it is very important that we not regard racism as a past issue, but rather, a present reality. From whom do we hear God’s prophetic word of judgment and hope today?

At an all staff convocation at the Lutheran Center in mid-January, we reviewed the findings of a diversity audit, looking carefully at the recommendations resulting from those findings. There I pledged that the churchwide organization would regularly undertake diversity audits and would offer anti-racism training in which all churchwide staff, including deployed staff, would be
expected to participate. The first two-day training for 2008 was held in January. Nearly 60
churchwide staff participated. Three identical training sessions will be held throughout 2008. Shenandoah Gale and Christine May, both of whom have worked to facilitate these trainings, are available to provide ideas and resources to synods as they also seek to be anti-racist.

Pursue ardently the ELCA’s commitment to becoming more diverse, multicultural, and multigenerational…

At the October 2007 meeting of the Conference of Bishops, Multicultural Ministries and Research and Evaluation distributed a short survey asking about the processes synods were using to make the voting membership of their synod assembly and the memberships of synod councils and committees 10 percent or more persons of color or those whose primary language is other than English. At the Conference of Bishops meeting last month, bishops received information about what all synods are doing in this regard. These ideas can be used by synodical leaders to improve what their synods currently are doing to become more inclusive. The report is printed in Exhibit N, Part 1.

Other news and thoughts…

We are moving forward with a feasibility study for a possible churchwide campaign to be held in conjunction with the 25th anniversary of the ELCA in 2012. This anniversary date coincides well with the time required for a feasibility study in 2008, consideration of the campaign by the 2009 Churchwide Assembly, and, if approved by the assembly, organization of the campaign.

Working with Development Services, I am in the process of calling together a steering committee to oversee the study process. The time period for the study is estimated at four to six months. The study will explore this church’s readiness and current capacity to conduct a comprehensive campaign that will benefit both synodical and churchwide ministries, including the elements of the Lutheran Malaria Initiative and the HIV and AIDS strategy.

I look forward to our conversations as a Church Council and advisors on the draft of the social statement on human sexuality. Whatever might be our varied responses to specific parts of the draft, I believe we owe a profound debt of gratitude to the task force, advisors and staff for a most thoughtful and helpful draft.

Please join me in welcoming Pr. Marcus Kunz to the staff of the Office of the Presiding Bishop. He brings to this call experience as a parish pastor, synod staff member, mission developer, and interim pastor. He is a graduate of Valparaiso University, Luther Seminary, and holds a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago.

In these great 50 days of Easter we join in proclaiming Christ is risen. Christ is risen indeed. Alleluia.

Mark S. Hanson
Presiding Bishop
Easter 2008
Summary of Section Activities

Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations
Submitted by: Pr. Donald J. McCoid

Responsibility for ecumenical and inter-religious relations shall be exercised by the Office of the Presiding Bishop. An executive for ecumenical and inter-religious relations, appointed by the presiding bishop, shall coordinate the ecumenical, inter-Lutheran, and inter-religious activities of this church, and shall recommend, through the presiding bishop, policies relative thereto to the Church Council and the Churchwide Assembly (15.11.B05.).

This report of the activities of the Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations section of the Office of the Presiding Bishop is organized around the various spheres of the section’s responsibilities.

Ecumenical Consultation

A consultation on the future of ecumenical and inter-religious labors in the ELCA was held February 15-16, 2008, at the churchwide office in Chicago. From bishops to lay-people, young adult to seminary president—twenty-five members from throughout the ELCA met for this intensive conversation about how Lutherans seek visible Christian unity in the world. Attention was paid to this church’s unique leadership responsibilities in both the North American and global contexts, as well as how the ELCA exemplifies its strategic goals to “extend and deepen ecumenical and inter-religious relationships” in the life of this church. Issues of ecumenical reception, financial resources, and inter-religious goals for the forthcoming years were assessed. A commensurate strategic plan for ecumenical and inter-religious relations will be reconfigured to reflect the consultation in the coming months.

Full Communion Relationships

Reformed
(Presbyterian Church USA, Reformed Church in America, United Church of Christ)

The Lutheran-Reformed Coordinating Committee, the four churches sharing a relationship of full communion through A Formula of Agreement will meet March 25-26, 2008 at McCormick Seminary in Chicago. Updates from each church body, consideration of “reception” and how to make it more effective, and consideration of ways to observe the tenth anniversary of the adoption of A Formula of Agreement will be agenda items.

Moravian
(Northern and Southern Provinces, East West-Indies Province, Alaska Province)

The Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee will meet again in May 2008. The coordinating committee is working on several projects around issues of education, facilitating relationships between the Eastern West Indies Province and the ELCA, clergy exchange, mission starts, and the continued implementation of Sustaining Our Shepherds as a resource for maintaining healthy clergy. Members of the Coordinating Committee, along with staff in Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations, are working with Bishop Michael Keyes (Alaska Synod) in order to find ways toward enhancing relations with the Moravian Alaska Province.

The Episcopal Church USA

The Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee (LECC) met January 27-30 at St. Paul College, Washington D.C. The committee was instructed by local ecumenists on one of the most successful local partnerships under the Called to Common Mission full communion agreement. Participants said they hoped that in 2011 a tenth anniversary celebration for CCM will be held at the Washington Cathedral where the relationship was liturgically inaugurated in 2001. The committee also wrestled with the challenging issue of the ‘reception’ of full communion agreements, especially at the grassroots level.
Bilateral Dialogues, Discourses, and Cooperation

Roman Catholic (Bilateral)

The sixth meeting of Round XI of the Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue will meet on April 3-6, 2008. The theme of the round is “The Hope for Eternal Life.” Following the presentation of papers, the dialogue members will begin constructing and assessing the draft of documents to form the text for a common statement.

Orthodox (Bilateral)

Following the conclusion of the round on the Holy Trinity and the mystery of the church, an interim was planned, due to ELCA staff transitions. A meeting of co-chairs and ecumenical staff persons will be held sometime this year to decide upon the next topic, new members, and a timeline for future meetings.

United Methodist (Bilateral)

The ELCA-United Methodist Dialogue met December 6-8, 2007. The meeting centered on the Interim Eucharistic Sharing text, Confessing Our Faith Together (COFT), and preparation for the full communion vote by the United Methodist Church at its General Conference on April 29, 2008; a vote on full communion with the UMC is also planned at the ELCA Churchwide Assembly in August 2009. Feedback continues to be shared and an invitation for seminary faculty input was reinitiated. A new reception resource for ELCA-UMC relations also is currently under development.

African-Methodist Episcopal Zion (Discourse)

The ELCA-African Methodist Episcopal Zion (AMEZ) church discourse will meet on March 25, 2008. In this third discourse meeting the topic will assess in depth how each church is combating HIV/AIDS in North America and where areas of cooperation may be possible.

Mennonite Church U.S.A. (Discourse)

On February 21, 2008, representatives from the ELCA were invited to the Mennonite Church U.S.A. and the Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary to celebrate and assess central documents, and themes of historical trespass and reconciliation.

Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (Cooperation)

The Committee on Lutheran Cooperation will meet on November 3-4, 2008. The review of shared ministries will come from reports of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Lutheran Services in America, and Lutheran World Relief. The Lutheran discussion panel will meet on the first day to receive presentations from each church body on its current approach to “Gospel outreach in light of post-modern, pluralistic, and relativistic culture.”

Councilor Relationships

Lutheran World Federation (LWF)

The Rev. Teresita C. Valeriano has been appointed regional officer for the LWF in North America. Teresita began her call on March 1, 2008. She is an ordained pastor of the ELCA and has served as the Lutheran campus pastor at the University of Southern California since 2004. Prior to that time, Pastor Valeriano served from 2000-2004 as the executive secretary for youth (18-30 years old) in the Church and Society Desk, LWF Geneva. She succeeds Kathy Magnus, who served at the North America Regional Office since 2001. Pastor “Tita” will be responsible for working between member churches in North America, facilitating LWF activities in the region, and sharing information between LWF (Geneva) and the ELCIC and ELCA.
The LWF continues to plan for a restructuring and the 2010 General Assembly in Stuttgart, Germany. The LWF Council will meet June 25-July 1 in Tanzania. Ecology and global warming will be the major theme for the council meeting.

World Council of Churches (WCC)

The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches met in Geneva from February 13-20, 2008. Ms. Kathryn Lohre and Mr. Carlos Pena represented the ELCA at the meeting. In addition to reviewing programs and taking action on recommendations, the WCC celebrated its 60th Anniversary. The Canadian and U.S. member churches of the WCC held a joint meeting in Toronto, Canada on April 1-2, 2008.

Christian Churches Together (CCT)

Christians Churches Together met from January 8-11, 2008, for the second annual meeting since being launched in February 2007. CCT represents the broadest national table of conversation among Christian Churches in the U.S. The annual meeting provides an opportunity for the 43 participating churches and organizations to discern how to move forward together in confronting domestic poverty.

Churches Uniting in Christ (CUIC)

A plenary for Churches Uniting in Christ (CUIC) was held January 8-11, 2008. Heads of communion from the ten participating churches were present along with representatives from each church body. ELCA staff have participated on the CUIC taskforces for racial justice, ministry, and local-regional cooperation. The decision was made to suspend task force work and direct attention to internal reconciliation with two church bodies (AME and AMEZ), which were not present at the meeting. In the coming months a consultation about structure and purpose of CUIC will take place. A special group representing each of the church bodies will meet with the consultant and provide recommendations for the possibility of CUIC’s future.

Reception and Inter-Religious Relations

Phase II of the ecumenical and inter-religious strategy through ER includes a comprehensive communication strategy and Web development, resource development, the construction of a new ecumenical database with ecumenical partners, and an ongoing film project by and for young adults about Christian unity in the North American context. Encouragement is given to bishops and synodical staff to place an emphasis on ecumenism and leadership formation in their synods. One of the more recent outcomes of reception has been the construction of online congregational and synodical resources that are downloadable and free online. A second is the impetus of ecumenical formation in ELCA seminaries. Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Life, the semi-monthly online publication, is sent to thousands of individuals.

The first meetings of the Consultative Panel on Lutheran-Muslim Relations were convened in November 2007 and March 2008. The panel will address how Lutherans may assist Muslims in combating unjust stigmatization of Islam in North America. The Consultative Panel on Lutheran-Jewish Relations met in February 2008 and will meet again in September 2008. The September meeting (to be held at Trinity Seminary) will include further conversation with members of the UMC on issues of fair economic representation in Israel-Palestine.

Staff of Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations, along with Full Communion partners, are leading bi-annual conversations with Jewish and Muslim leaders in the North American context. These meetings cover issues from Palestinian liberation theology to how the ELCA understands its commitment to a model of accompaniment with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the Holy Land.
Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations, along with staff in Global Mission, continue to create inter-religious resources for this church. Please visit www.elca.org/ecumenical for a full listing of these resources, including resources from multiple ecumenical partners. Of note is the resource titled *Windows for Understanding: Jewish-Muslim-Lutheran Relations*, which is designed specifically to help Lutheran congregations and synods understand their relationship to other Abrahamic faiths in this twenty-first century, North American context. A new pamphlet on “Your Guide to Inter-Religious Relations in the ELCA” is now available.

**Human Resources**

**Submitted by: Ms. Else B. Thompson**

Responsibility for human resources shall be exercised by the Office of the Presiding Bishop to provide management of the personnel policies for the churchwide organization, except as otherwise determined, including equal-employment opportunity and affirmative action, recruitment, interview, and selection, compensation and benefits, fair-employment practices, staff position description, performance evaluation, and training.

Human Resources, (HR) a section of the Office of the Presiding Bishop, includes staffing, compensation and benefits, training and development, employee relations, volunteer coordination, and art management.

Human Resources is committed to serving the mission of the churchwide organization by serving its people—those here, those deployed, and those who formerly served. The section accomplishes its goals by working with other units in staffing positions, by meeting needs for training and development, through fair compensation and benefit systems, and by promoting positive relationships. The HR web site can be found at www.elca.org/humanresources

**Staffing**

In 2007, Human Resources received 1306 applications and resumes. Forty-two posted positions were filled. The ELCA continues to be committed to hiring qualified persons of diverse backgrounds. Fourteen of the 42 posted positions were filled by people of color. As of December 2007, the churchwide organization staff was approximately 66 percent Caucasian and 34 percent people of color.

Positions filled in 2007 included the Executive for Administration/Assistant to the Presiding Bishop, the Executive Director for Development Services, the Executive for Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations, and many other positions key to churchwide operations. Positions filled early in 2008 include the Executive Director for Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission and an assistant to the bishop, the Executive for Discernment of Contextual and Theological Issues.

In addition to posted positions, the search for a new Executive for Information Technology began March 1. HR is also working to fill 10 summer internship positions.

In 2007, HR processed 308 independent and term contracts, approximately 15 relocations, 33 promotions (employees moving to a higher grade level because of changed duties or by taking another position within the organization), and 156 requests for withdrawals from continuing education funds.

**Compensation and Benefits**

At the end of the year there were 209 employees enrolled in the flexible spending account, 29 waiving Board of Pensions insurance, 28 enrolled in the transit benefit, and 359 participating in continuing education.

Efforts in 2008 will focus on implementing a new performance management system, completing a compensation study, and reviewing and updating all position descriptions.
Training and Development Opportunities

Throughout the year, various training and development opportunities were made available on site to staff. Offerings in 2007 included preventing harassment (required for new hires) and day-long trainings on each of the following—leadership, coaching, listening skills, grammar, and motivating others for change.

In addition, HR offered an eight-day Professional Administrative Assistant Certificate program. Modules included professionalism, communication skills, advanced communication skills, business writing, customer service, managing conflict, organization and time management skills, and problem solving and decision making skills. Fifty-one administrative assistants participated; forty people completed at least six of the modules and received certificates from Rockhurst University.

In 2008, special emphasis will be given to supervisory skills training, including a supervisor’s role in preventing harassment, training in various aspects of project management, and the development of a series of modules for employees on Lutheranism.

Staff Events

The annual churchwide staff gathering held in December included singing carols and an Advent service coordinated and lead by Multicultural Ministries.

Following the service, a reception was held in the conference center where employees gathered to recognize and celebrate colleagues who had marked service anniversaries in 2007. Thirty-three employees celebrated five-year anniversaries; twenty-five employees celebrated 10-year anniversaries; six employees celebrated 15-year anniversaries and, for the first time ever, 20-year service anniversaries were recognized. Sixteen employees celebrated 20 years of service in 2007.

The staff participated in three service projects during December. Staff contributed money that was sent to the Curran Health Care Center and Hospital in Liberia; staff crocheted and knitted more than 60 prayer shawls as well as nearly two hundred chemo caps that were donated to Children’s Memorial Hospital and to Bethel New Life Ministry in Chicago; and staff donated personal grooming items and children’s book to Earth Angels Ministry of Helps “Christmas Cheer” project. Earth Angels is a not-for-profit organization that provides services to residents on the west side of Chicago.

Research and Evaluation

Submitted by: Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep

Responsibility for research and evaluation shall be exercised by the Office of the Presiding Bishop to provide reliable and valid research, relevant information, and appropriate evaluation related to the purposes of this church in order to assist the presiding bishop, other leaders, and staff of the churchwide organization to accomplish their duties.

The primary goal for the staff of Research and Evaluation is to provide decision-makers in this church with relevant and useful information through high-quality empirical research. Over the past several months the staff has been engaged in the following projects.

Considerable time has been devoted to working with Synodical Relations on synod ministry reviews. The reviews are typically conducted over a two or three day period and involve individual or group interviews about the ministry of the synod with clergy and lay persons in the synod. Reports of the findings are then provided to the synod bishop and the Synod Council. The staff has participated in reviews in the Southeastern Synod, the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod, the Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod, and the Metropolitan New York Synod.

Several presentations of information on the context for ministry and issues related to outreach also have been made to conferences of pastors in several synods, including the
Southeast Michigan Synod, the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod, and the Northeastern Iowa Synod.

A review of the Lutheran Seminary Program in the Southwest was conducted at the request of the program.

The year also has included considerable survey work. The surveys include a survey of the readers of The Lutheran magazine; a survey of the users of the youth ministry Web site; a survey of leaders and participants in the congregational units of the Women of the ELCA; a survey of congregations for the Foundation, the Board of Pensions, and the Mission Investment Fund; and a survey of individuals for the Foundation, the Board of Pensions, and the Mission Investment Fund. Surveys also have been conducted for two ELCA congregations. Two important survey projects have also begun with Faith Communities Today (Hartford Seminary, Hartford, Conn.) and U.S. Congregations (Lilly Foundation through the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)). The survey work with Faith Communities Today involves the ELCA in a cross-denominational survey project with congregations. U.S. Congregations, also a cross-denominational project, focuses on work with those who attend worship. Both these projects will provide new, comparative data for the whole church that will extend and deepen work first begun in 2000 and 2001.

The staff continues to invest considerable time in program and grant evaluation. At any particular time as many as eight to ten grants may be under evaluation. The staff will play a significant role in evaluating the success of the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding approved by the Church Council in April 2007.

The staff also has worked to prepare for responses to the draft social statement on human sexuality.

The staff continues to respond on a daily basis to requests from members, congregations, synods, and the churchwide staff for information about members, congregations, synods, and rostered leaders. The staff also respond daily to questions about the demographic context of the church.

Synodical Relations
Submitted by: Pr. Kathie Bender Schwich

Responsibility for synodical relations shall be exercised by the Office of the Presiding Bishop to coordinate the relationships between the churchwide organization and synods, develop and implement synodical-churchwide consultations and services, render support for synodical bishops and synodical staff, and provide staff services for the Conference of Bishops (15.11.G05.).

Conference of Bishops

The Conference of Bishops met March 6-11, 2008, in San Mateo, California. The meeting included time for members of the Conference to bid farewell to nine of their colleagues who are leaving office this spring due to term limitation, retirement, or the receipt of a new call. In addition to conversations around this church’s approach to new ministry starts, the agenda also included a retreat day, allowing the bishops opportunity to explore the question, “How Do We Lead?” through reflection on Scripture, small group conversation, and study. The bishops of Region 4 served as chaplains for this meeting.

Mission Support Consultations

We have completed all but six mission support consultations for the year. These consultations have focused on strengthening the relationship between synods and the churchwide organization, with the goal of increasing the capacity of this church for mission and ministry in the world. We have received very positive feedback from those who participated. Churchwide staff who led the consultations expressed gratitude for the opportunity to be in conversation with synodical leaders throughout this church.
Synodical Officers’ Regional Gatherings

We are in the process of preparing for synodical officers’ gatherings in regions in 2008-2009. Synodical bishops, vice presidents, secretaries, treasurers, and members of the Church Council will be invited to join with colleagues in their region and churchwide staff for a day that will provide opportunities for consultation, learning, and sharing. We hope that participants will see this as a time to build on the leadership gifts that already exist in their synod as well as to build on our interconnectedness as synods, regions, and the churchwide organization.

Care for Returning Veterans

Thanks to a grant from Thrivent Financial for Lutherans and collaboration with colleagues in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, SR is responding to a 2007 Churchwide Assembly memorial that calls this church to more actively care for returning veterans. Chaplain Darrell Morton, assistant to the presiding bishop for federal chaplaincy ministries is overseeing this work. We are grateful for the many parish pastors, institutional chaplains, social workers, and retired military chaplains who have expressed an interest in being part of our training and networking efforts as we prepare congregations and synods to care for veterans returning home to their congregations and communities.

Synod Ministry Reviews

Synodical Relations has been involved in several synod ministry reviews in the last few months and is in the process of scheduling several more. We are grateful for the partnership of our colleagues in Research and Evaluation in conducting these reviews, which are customized to explore specific ministry areas as determined by the bishop and synod council. Some synods that are facing an upcoming election of a new bishop have chosen to use this process to assist in creating a “synodical profile” similar to a congregational profile created by congregations in the call process. From this process we hope to create a template for a synodical profile form that could serve as a resource for all synods.

Synod Assembly Preparation

In consultation with Presiding Bishop Hanson, Synodical Relations has assigned and oriented churchwide representatives to all of this year’s synod assemblies. Churchwide representatives to synod assemblies are again asked to collaborate with Church Council members present at the assembly to lift up the interconnectedness that we share.

Fifteen synods will be holding elections for bishop this year; nine of those will not include the possibility of an incumbent’s re-election. In collaboration with Secretary David Swartling, Synodical Relations and the Office of the Secretary have developed materials to assist synods in the process of electing a bishop. These preparations also included phone conversations with synodical leaders in all fifteen synods holding elections this year. Worship and Liturgical Resources, Ecumenical and Interreligious Relations, and Synodical Relations have collaborated to develop a resource to assist synods as they plan for the installation of a new bishop.
Worship and Liturgical Resources
Submitted by: Pr. Michael L. Burk

Responsibility for leadership of the worship life of this church shall be exercised by the Office of the Presiding Bishop. In so doing, efforts shall be undertaken to support the worship ministry of this church, oversee the development and review of worship resources intended for use throughout this church, and recommend, through the presiding bishop, policies related to worship and sacramental practices to the Church Council and the Churchwide Assembly (15.11.H05.).

Worship and Liturgical Resources hosted a gathering of worship professors from the seminaries of the ELCA toward the goal of capitalizing on the momentum associated with the introduction of Evangelical Lutheran Worship. Together with the effort to meet with groups of preachers in several synods, this meeting contributes to the ongoing commitment to broaden and deepen the conversation about worship throughout this church.

Particular attention is being given to developing strategies and resources that may be used locally (e.g., in synods, with local leadership) to assist worshiping communities in becoming more familiar with the varied worship possibilities that come to expression in Evangelical Lutheran Worship and in the related worship resources that continue to emerge. The ongoing work of Web site revision within the context of the effort led throughout the organization by Communication Services (CO) increasingly contributes to these ongoing introductory efforts.

Working with the Program and Services Committee on the liturgical review of materials related to occasional services and on the revision of this church’s liturgical review policy will be high priorities through 2008 and into 2009.

Resources produced collaboratively with Augsburg Fortress
(November 2007-April 2008):

Evangelical Lutheran Worship Guitar Edition
Evangelical Lutheran Worship Pocket Gift Edition
Evangelical Lutheran Worship Enlarged Print Edition
Evangelical Lutheran Worship Festival Setting One
Evangelical Lutheran Worship Hymns Audio CD, vol. 2
The Sunday Assembly (Using Evangelical Lutheran Worship, vol. 1)
Evangelical Lutheran Worship Service and Certificate:
• Baptism
• Marriage
• Affirmation of Baptism
Introductions and Alternate Accompaniments for ELW Hymns – Organ, vol. 2 & 7
Introductions and Alternate Accompaniments for ELW Hymns – Piano, vol. 2 & 7
Augsburg Choral Hymn Series (based on Evangelical Lutheran Worship hymns)
Kids Celebrate Worship series (both pre-reader and young reader versions):
• Our Prayers
• The Bible
Sunday of the Passion offprint, Year A
Luther’s Small Catechism with Evangelical Lutheran Worship Texts (gift edition)

Other resources due in 2008:

Evangelical Lutheran Worship Electronic Braille Edition
Evangelical Lutheran Worship Pastoral Care: Readings, Prayers, and Occasional Services
The Christian Life (Using Evangelical Lutheran Worship, vol. 2)
Keeping Time (Using Evangelical Lutheran Worship, vol. 3)
Lectionary for Worship Year B, Evangelical Lutheran Worship (study and ritual editions)
Psalter for Worship Year B, Evangelical Lutheran Worship
Psalm Settings for the Church Year  
Vocal Descants for the Church Year (based on Evangelical Lutheran Worship hymns)  
Introductions and Alternate Accompaniments for ELW Hymns – Organ, vol. 3 & 4  
Introductions and Alternate Accompaniments for ELW Hymns – Piano, vol. 3 & 4  
Augsburg Choral Hymn Series (based on Evangelical Lutheran Worship hymns)  
Luther's Small Catechism with Evangelical Lutheran Worship Texts (study, pocket editions)

Worship and Liturgical Resources provided collaborative leadership, together with Synodical Relations and Ecumenical and Inter-religious Relations, in the development of a comprehensive packet to assist synods with the tasks associated with the installation of a new synodical bishop.

The executive for worship and liturgical resources and Augsburg Fortress’ worship and music publisher met with federal and military chaplains toward the goal of developing a worship resource suitable for use for active duty both locally and when deployed.
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Greetings to all of you! I am humbled to introduce myself as the new regional officer for the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) in North America. I started this new call on March 1, 2008. Prior to that, I served in a very dynamic and challenging inner city Lutheran Campus Ministry at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles where ecumenical relations and partnerships and work related to peace and justice issues were at the core of our ministry and mission. I had served previously at the LWF as the secretary for youth in church and society (now known as LWF Youth), but am excited now to serve our member churches here in North America with humility, creativity, and boldness. I hope that learning more about our Lutheran global communion will deepen our faith and widen our mission together.

60 years and beyond

Last year was a significant one for the LWF. It was LWF’s 60th anniversary and congregations were encouraged to celebrate it through prayers, learning more about what it means to be a part of a communion, and raising awareness about the work of LWF throughout the world. As the world continues to face various challenges that affect humanity and the creation, including globalization, the HIV and AIDS pandemic, increased immigration and the debates surrounding it, the widening disparity of rich and poor, and intensified ecumenical and inter-faith relations or conflict, we as a Lutheran communion continue to redefine our role as a faith community towards reconciliation, transformation, and the healing of the world.

With this in mind, I would like to share with you my own reflection of why it is vital for you as church leaders to be informed about and involved in the Lutheran World Federation.

Belonging to a communion of churches: a gift of relationship

When you hear “Lutheran World Federation,” what comes first to your mind? A young mother arriving at a refugee camp with her children? A farming community in Cambodia benefitting from a LWF-drilled deep well? Do you feel an urge to respond by sending help to those who are suffering in different parts of the world?

All of these are stories are indeed part of the work of the LWF. We are all a part of LWF and are truly living up to the phrase “68 million Lutherans do make a difference.” But we also all know that LWF is more than this amidst our violent and broken world.

Being in communion is a gift

Our unity is a gift from God that we celebrate. The visible unity of 140 member churches in 78 countries does not only make a difference in the lives of those who are marginalized: the refugees and those in war and conflict, those infected and affected by HIV and AIDS, those who live in poverty, the indigenous people, and women and youth. All of us are transformed by this gift of relationship. All of us receive this gift.

North America is unique in the LWF because it has the smallest number of member churches regionally (e.g., the ELCA, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada (ELCIC), and Estonian Lutheran Church Abroad). It also has unique gifts to offer and open hearts to receive from others. As I write this report, the LWF North America Regional Committee has just concluded a conference call where we shared regional and global information and discussed pertinent issues, themes, and possible partnerships for our mission together. Another very important gathering also is happening in Latin America, where church leaders of member churches discuss, pray, and act to address the challenge of sustainability with the LWF General Secretary, Ishmael Noko. Meanwhile, LWF services for short-term relief and
long-term development work continue in various parts of world. You are there because you are LWF.

Being in communion is a vision

Relationships evolve and grow. When LWF started in 1948, its main goal was to attend to the needs of refugees, primarily in Europe, with a handful of Lutheran churches in the Northern hemisphere. Toward the end of the 20th century, the federation’s relationship deepened as it included the voices of the churches from the South and the journey from federation to communion began. We continue in this walk, finding ways to work together beyond relief and development and centering on our faith, living and expressing it in altar and pulpit relationship and in actively addressing those ever-changing challenges locally, regionally, and globally.

The LWF is going through a renewal process where member churches are invited to share their vision and ideas for LWF. Within the ELCA, the Ecumenical and Inter-faith Relations section will gather input to be communicated to the LWF renewal committee.

The deepening of relationships does not only happen in the local community. The LWF is a communion governed by a Council whose next meeting will be in June 2008 in Arusha, Tanzania. The central theme will be the issue of climate change. The North American region is represented at this decision-making body by seven people led by the ELCA Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson, who is also the president of LWF, and ELCIC National Bishop Susan Johnson.

In order to ensure the LWF work in the future, LWF established an endowment fund lodged within and facilitated by the ELCA Foundation. The ELCIC also has a system to facilitate this fund.

Living as a communion is transforming and empowering

Experiencing this gift of relationship is the most exciting part of being in communion. Though separated as faith communities by distance, diversity of culture, and historical background, we know who we are and what this gift of loving God and others empowers us to do. The sharing of member churches in the United States and Canada inspires them to work together in areas of ministry and advocacy and sometimes benefits from shared resources.

As I begin my new call as the LWF Regional Officer here in North America, I hope that you—both as leaders in the Church Council—will participate actively in living out this gift of relationship and become instruments for others to know about the LWF. Here are some ways to get involved:

• Be and stay informed.
• Share and learn. Give and receive. And tell your stories.
• Pray for the LWF as a whole and for its member churches, their leaders, and their ministries.
• Celebrate our diversity and what holds us together in unity. The first Sunday in October is designated as LWF Sunday.
• Connect people and create a space in your local congregation and community where empowerment for global communion happens.

Being a part of and living as a communion of churches is an exciting experience in our faith journey. I am honored to serve you all as lives are changed and visions are reached. I invite you to be a part of making our communion alive and in embodying this gift of relationship.

Submitted by Teresita “Tita” Valeriano
LWF Regional Officer for North America
Report of the Vice President

As we celebrate Easter, I am reminded that there’s peace in the promise that life is everlasting; this year, that message has been even more meaningful to me and my family. As many of you know, the day after I returned from attending the World Council of Churches meeting in Geneva, Diane’s mom passed away. On behalf of our extended family, I want to thank all of you who sent condolences through such comforting thoughts and prayers. Every card and note was read by Diane’s family. They all drew strength from your words.

Though it was unexpected, we knew that Joann was a good Christian woman, with plenty of love and care for her family, church, and all people. Having lived her life as an obedient servant of Christ, she set a fine example for our family, especially her grandchildren. Her passing at Easter time was like one more lesson she tried to teach them: though the earthly body is shed, the perfect part of us lives on.

Since my last report to Church Council, I have had the opportunity to represent our church in four ways. My visits took me from Geneva, Switzerland, to Seguin, Texas, not far from my own home.

On February 1, 2008, I attended the installation ceremony for the new president of Texas Lutheran University in Seguin, Texas. The Reverend Ann Svennungen is the new president of TLU and was welcomed to her new position by fellow members of academia from across the country, esteemed members of the TLU faculty, boards and the community of Seguin, a delegation from the student body, Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson, synodical bishops Ray Tiemann, Mike Rinehart, and Kevin Kanouse, along with hundreds of people that came to celebrate this wonderful event.

Not long after that, I met with the Women’s Coastal Cluster at First Lutheran Church in Galveston. I told them how all of us together make up the ELCA. We had a lively question and answer session. Topics we discussed ranged from the duties of the vice president to the plight of our brothers and sisters in the West Bank. I feel that my time with the group was well-spent, and many were enlightened about the work of our church.

On February 11, I traveled to Geneva, Switzerland, for a meeting of the World Council of Churches. For 10 days, I was involved in meetings with representatives of Christian churches from all over the world. For those unfamiliar with this organization, the WCC is the broadest and most inclusive among the organizations of the ecumenical movement, with a goal of Christian unity. Its members, representing over 560 million Christians, are made up of 349 churches, denominations, and church fellowships in more than 110 countries throughout the world. Its members include Orthodox churches, as well as many denominations of the Protestant Reformation such as Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, and others, as well as many united and independent churches. Kathryn Lohre, who lives in Boston, and I were elected at the last WCC Assembly (2006 in Porto Alegre, Brazil) as members of the WCC Central Committee. The Central Committee, comprised of 145 members, acts as the board of directors of the WCC between assemblies (sound familiar?). The committee is a great opportunity for Kathryn and me to participate in discussing issues that are on the agendas of our fellow Christians from throughout the world who represent many cultures and viewpoints.

The 60th anniversary of the WCC is being celebrated this year under the theme “Making a difference together.” A festive celebration was held at Geneva’s St. Pierre Cathedral with His Holiness, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, delivering the message. He reminded us the WCC has provided “an ideal platform” for churches to engage in dialogue and promote Christian unity, as well as respond to the needs of society.

A gathering of people from so many varied cultures and church traditions is a unique experience. For me, the highlight of the meeting is the opportunity it offers to meet people from all over the world, sharing stories and a common witness and experiencing God’s gift of
diversity. We also accomplished much work, including approving four public statements and
three minute statements. Statements are one way the WCC responds to critical issues on the
international agenda, while minutes are internal statements intended more for member churches
that uphold existing policy. These statements are:

• **Statement on democratic electoral processes**, calling on churches to be involved in civil
political engagement and education;

• **Statement on the crisis in Kenya and the churches’ response**, addressing the violence that
followed the recent presidential election;

• **Statement on the crisis in Pakistan.** Calling the outcome of the last election “hopeful”, it
asks for churches to continue to pray for peace and reconciliation in Pakistan;

• **Statement on cluster munitions.** Calls for condemning their use and lifts up the “Oslo
Process” for negotiating a treaty against cluster weapons;

• **Minute on the humanitarian situation in the Gaza Strip**, calling on member churches to pray
for the people of Gaza and to speak out on the situation;

• **Minute on our religious imperative to foster sensitivity and reconciliation in a shifting
society**, calling on mutual respect among people of different faiths; and

• **Minute on global warming and climate change**, recognizing climate change effects are being
experienced in many parts of the world and now is the time to take action.

The full text of these and other actions taken by the Central Committee can be read on the
WCC website www.oikoumene.org. As you see, much was accomplished during our time
together. However, what was to be a celebratory mood throughout the week was overshadowed
by WCC’s General Secretary Dr. Samuel Kobia’s decision not to seek a second term in office for
personal reasons. The Central Committee appointed a search committee in order to fill the
position at its next meeting in September 2009. I will give you further updates on the WCC’s
work in future reports.

In March, I attended the Conference of Bishops in San Mateo, California. I gave my report
of my activities and was grateful to be able to sit in on their meetings. As always, I enjoy the
opportunity to sit and listen to the discussions and deliberations of this group of learned and
dedicated leaders that guides our church. While we had many fine presentations and updates, we
had an excellent presentation on Christian Zionism by Robert Smith of the Global Mission
Program unit. He stated that often we are compromised in our discussions with Israelis by
Martin Luther’s writings or by Lutheran “quietism.” He said, however, that we must speak up on
behalf of justice. We are called to be peacemakers; thus, we are “pro-justice,” not
pro-Palestinian or pro-Israel.

I admit, the scenery of the San Francisco area was not bad, either! While there, we
worshipped at St. Mark’s Lutheran Church in downtown San Francisco. What a wonderful
congregation and a beautiful service. Also while in San Francisco, the conference honored nine
retiring bishops. I am profoundly grateful for all they do in their calling to serve God. These
nine will be missed.

I was scheduled for another visit last December, but, that trip unfortunately was postponed.
Last winter, I was presented with an opportunity to visit Indonesia along with Raphael Malpica-
Padilla and Kathleen Kastilahn of *The Lutheran*. The purpose of this visit was to celebrate the
completion of the ELCA-funded rebuilding of 118 houses in Kuala Bubon, in northwest Sumatra,
a fishing town that was completely wiped out by the tsunami. While the death toll was not high,
the town was demolished. The ELCA was the most significant supporter of the project with $1
million in contributions. It is a remarkable story of collaboration among many players. It is a
story of how contributions from our members were used faithfully and wisely—and made a
difference. Unfortunately, we were forced to postpone our trip due to bad weather and a late
flight connection in Los Angeles. (No surprise these days!) This trip has been rescheduled for
November 2008; and hopefully we will be able to make it this time!
I greatly appreciate the opportunity to represent the ELCA and to talk about its many ministries to our members. It is a task that I have greatly enjoyed. I thank God for the opportunity to serve.
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Report of the Secretary

Acclimatization

Having now been secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for five months, I remain energized—although disappointed at my rate of ascent up the learning curve. However, this disappointment is more than offset by the joy of working with Presiding Bishop Hanson and the dedicated employees of the churchwide organization in general and the Office of the Secretary in particular. In addition, I have thoroughly enjoyed traveling to synods to talk about ministry, and I hope that I soon have the opportunity to meet you on your home territory!

On a personal note, we have emptied most of the moving boxes, and our house in Park Ridge is becoming transformed into a home. Although Barbara and I continue to grieve for friends, colleagues, and beach home in the Seattle area, after a quick trip in February to honor a retiring law partner, we were anxious to return to Chicago.

In many ways, I write this report as I leave the eye of a hurricane. After a post-Christmas respite, meetings abound. The Conference of Bishops has met, the flurry of synod assemblies has begun, and we are now in the midst of the spring Church Council meeting. In my inaugural year, I will serve as the churchwide representative at seven synod assemblies. In addition, I have agreed to speak at a number of synodical and regional events, the first of which already was held in Madison, Wisconsin, in late February. As many of you know, I am interested in energizing leadership—both rostered and lay leaders—and this will be a recurring theme in my years as secretary.

In this report, I want to review a number of matters that the staff of the Office of the Secretary and I have addressed since the last Church Council meeting, provide you some information regarding roster and other transactional issues, motivate you to begin to think about Synod Assemblies and the 2009 and 2011 Churchwide Assemblies, and describe briefly some of my plans for the Office of the Secretary in the next year.

Office of the Secretary Activities

In General

I remain awed by the level of diverse activity in the Office of the Secretary. At the risk of oversimplification, let me briefly describe its constituent elements.

First, the Office of the Secretary maintains the rosters for congregations and rostered leaders. This involves careful management of a number of databases and the work of several staff persons. Most days I receive several letters or e-mails addressing changes in roster status in some way, and staff processes dozens that I do not see. We estimate that we process approximately 7,500 such requests annually. Deborah Myers, as Director for Official Roster Records, has principal responsibility for maintaining the rosters, and Marie Fellows manages the database for churchwide leaders. The complete rosters of leaders in each expression of this church is published each year in a yearbook. In addition, the yearbook contains other useful information on a wide variety of subjects, including the following: agencies, institutions, and schools of the ELCA; ecumenical and interchurch organizations and full-communion partners; independent Lutheran organizations; and Lutheran church bodies in the United States and Canada. Thom Ehlen is the managing editor of the yearbook and also assists with rosters and databases.

Second, the Office of the Secretary fields questions from churchwide staff, synods, congregations, and individuals regarding constitutional, policy, procedural, and organizational issues. In an average week, responses are provided to dozens of inquiries. The entire office responds to these inquiries, but principal responsibility for difficult issues rests with executive assistants Ruth Hamilton and Paul Schreck, who also staff Office of the Secretary administrative responsibilities at the Churchwide Assembly.

Third, representatives of the Office of the Secretary prepare and publish minutes of Church Council meetings, Conference of Bishops meetings, Cabinet of Executives meetings, and the
Churchwide Assembly. In addition, minutes templates are provided to program units and others, and their minutes are permanently maintained. These can amount to several hundred pages of minutes in non-churchwide assembly years and thousands of pages in assembly years.

Several members of the Office of the Secretary oversee meeting planning for the churchwide organization. Of course, the most complex task of meeting preparation involves the Churchwide Assembly, but there are dozens of other events that also require planning. (In fact, the meeting planners write contracts for approximately 180 meetings each year.) In addition, they oversee the booking of almost 11,000 airplane trips per year, representing over 17 million miles of travel! Mary Beth Nowak is the executive assistant for meeting planning, and Gail Schroeder also works in this area. In addition, a new meetings registrar, Ana Diaz, recently was hired.

The Office of the Secretary also oversees the library at the Lutheran Center as well as provides information regarding records management. (If you have not done so yet, check out the valuable policies and procedures available to congregations on the ELCA Web site at www.elca.org/secretary/records.) There are thousands of pages of substantive documents available on the Web site for the Office of the Secretary. In addition, the library at the Lutheran Center has more than 17,000 publications and, as a member of the Online Computer Library Center, has access to 57,000 libraries and over one billion holdings. Be sure and visit Claire Buettner on the first floor of the Lutheran Center and ask about the library and records management services.

The ELCA maintains archives at 321 Bonnie Lane in Elk Grove, IL. Joel Thoreson, Elisabeth Wittman, and Catherine Lundeen are the chief archivists, and they are assisted by Russell Deloney and Lauren Gioe. The archives contain more than 12,650 linear feet of records, including microfilmed records of more than 4,000 congregations, the oldest of which date to 1812! The archives also receive and respond to approximately 2,000 reference inquiries annually.

And, of course, Phil Harris and Dave Ullrich provide invaluable legal assistance. They are ably assisted by Loraine Shields. In addition, Rob Thoma works for the ELCA on contract to support its risk management and insurance functions. (More on this later!)

Recent Activities

The Office of the Secretary has been involved in a number of significant projects since the last Church Council meeting. Some of these will have ongoing importance.

First, we have been part of the team that participates in consultations with synods regarding mission-support funding. Paul Schreck has participated in the process, and I have traveled to a number of synods to dialogue with them about shared ministry, stewardship, and mission support. As you know, several of the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding (BRCMF) address modeling leadership in the area of stewardship. In response to the mandate of the BRCMF to engage in one-on-one discussions with leaders, beginning with the Conference of Bishops, Bishop Hanson inaugurated discussions with bishops at their academy in January. Bishop Hanson, Kathie Bender Schwich, and I have met in individual sessions with almost all of the synodical bishops to discuss stewardship and estate planning. In addition, the BRCMF report contains the following recommendation: “Beginning immediately, the churchwide organization will incorporate the same model with the ELCA Church Council, encouraging church Council members to challenge each other to tithe and then publicly witness to those gifts.” In response to this goal, Bishop Hanson, Christina Jackson-Skelton, and I began conversations with the Executive Committee at its meeting in February. One of the issues that we will discuss at this meeting is how to proceed with these discussions with you at the Church Council retreat this July.

Second, following up on discussions with the Conference of Bishops, a recommendation regarding background checks for synodical officers, staff, and nominees was distributed to synods shortly before the end of 2007. This recommendation is consistent with the practice at the
churchwide organization. A draft continuing resolution to implement the practice, for potential adoption by synod councils, was included in the information.

Third, “Guidelines for Synod Bishop Elections” were distributed in late January to all synods. This document represents the collaboration of Synodical Relations and the Office of the Secretary. The guidelines provide a comprehensive review of policies, procedures, and recommendations for synods relating to elections of synodical bishops, regardless of the method of election under the applicable governing documents. In addition, Synodical Relations and the Office of the Secretary have participated in conference calls with each of the synods holding elections for bishop in 2008. We hope to facilitate smooth nomination and election processes in each of these synods. The synods holding elections for bishop this year are as follows: Eastern North Dakota (4/5/08–4/6/08); Sierra Pacific (4/25/08–4/27/08); Northeastern Minnesota (5/2/08–5/4/08); Metropolitan New York (5/15/08–5/17/08); South Carolina (5/16/08–5/18/08); Southeastern Iowa (5/16/08–5/18/08); Northeastern Pennsylvania (5/29/08–5/31/08); Southern Ohio (5/29/08–5/31/08); Greater Milwaukee (5/29/08–5/31/08); Saint Paul Area (5/30/08–5/31/08); La Crosse Area (6/5/08–6/7/08); Western North Dakota (6/6/08–6/7/08); Upstate New York (6/8/08–6/10/08); Northeastern Iowa (6/13/08–6/15/08); and Slovak Zion (6/27/08–6/29/08).

On the Horizon

In addition to ongoing activities, a number of projects are beginning or are on the horizon.

First, planning is beginning for the 2009 Churchwide Assembly in Minneapolis. The management team, consisting of key executives, has begun to meet. One of the many responsibilities of the Office of the Secretary involves assembly budget preparation and management. The management team has committed to a transparent budgeting practice, and we will attempt to capture all the expenses of the churchwide organization in putting on the assembly. We also are working on standardizing cost accounting procedures to facilitate more careful tracking of expenses at future assemblies. In addition, we are beginning to work on the “greening” of the Churchwide Assembly as mandated by an assembly action in 2007.

Second, the Office of the Secretary has put together a Thrivent grant proposal to begin work on preparation of an oral history of the ELCA in anticipation of the 25th anniversary in 2012. Because all our presiding bishops and the former secretary are alive, as well as other key leaders, we have the unique opportunity to create an oral history that will endure for generations. The first phase of the project will be organizational and involve obtaining interviews of ELCA leaders. A second phase will involve creating a video production that can be used at churchwide and synod assemblies as well as congregational and other gatherings.

Third, a comprehensive evaluation of the ELCA’s endorsed insurance program for congregations is underway. A task force has been meeting with this church’s insurance broker and is poised to make a recommendation regarding a new direction for the program. In addition, Rob Thoma has begun to work four days a week instead of three, and we hope to become more active in assisting synods and congregations in risk management issues.

Fourth, following synod assemblies in 2008, the Office of the Secretary will review rules of organization and procedure and standing rules to provide synods with suggestions and “best practices.” In addition, we will reconnoiter following the bishops’ elections and evaluate the processes. Again, if we can develop “best practices,” we will share them with synods.

Fifth, we in the Office of the Secretary are working diligently to assist other units in ongoing ministry projects. For example, considerable time and effort have been devoted to the Lutheran Malaria Initiative, and we look forward to facilitating the translation of this proposal into reality.

Sixth, the Office of the Secretary reviewed the history of the discussions regarding the size of the Church Council, beginning with the Commission for a New Lutheran Church through the present. The result of that review is the memorandum contained in Exhibit A, Part 3, Appendix 1.
Finally, in my role as secretary, I am working with Synodical Relations to participate in as many synodical and regional events as possible. These visits take many forms: I have served as a keynote speaker at a lay leadership event, participated in mission-support consultations, and visited with synod staff. Before we meet again, I will serve as the churchwide representative at seven synod assemblies and will participate in a number of synodical and regional gatherings. If you attend any of these events, you will hear three recurring themes: first, the importance of interdependence and shared ministry; second, the importance of sharing ministry stories; and third, the importance of synergistic leadership, shared between clergy and lay.

Planning for Synod Assemblies

It’s that time of year again!

The first and most significant subject for me to address with respect to Synod Assemblies is the importance of electing thoughtful, intelligent, hard-working, compassionate, and concerned individuals as voting members to the Churchwide Assembly in 2009. Similarly, careful and prayerful consideration must be undertaken in nominating persons to serve on the Church Council and churchwide boards and committees. These nominations are not a matter of filling slots but of identifying and developing the brightest and best among our members.

I became involved in Synod Assemblies, first as a member of the Reference and Counsel Committee and later as parliamentarian, because of concern about poorly crafted actions and wasted time and resources devoted to them. As a stewardship issue, we need to preserve volunteer time and monetary resources for ministry! And we do an incredible disservice to all expressions of the ELCA by passing memorials and resolutions that create unfunded mandates or that require substantial staff time to address.

Memorials or Resolutions?

As a preliminary matter, confusion exists in places about what may be addressed more appropriately in resolutions to the Church Council rather than memorials to the Churchwide Assembly. Whatever you can do to educate synods about this distinction will be appreciated.

Here is the basic background information regarding resolutions and memorials. The Church Council voted in November 1988 “that future communications from synods will be dealt with according to ELCA constitutional and bylaw provisions 12.21.c., 12.51.21., 14.21.11., and 14.41.11.”1 The following principles are based on those constitutional provisions.

Synod Assemblies address the Churchwide Assembly through memorials. A memorial adopted by a Synod Assembly is submitted to the Churchwide Assembly with a recommendation for action from the Memorials Committee of the Churchwide Assembly. Memorials should be reserved for broad policy issues that belong in the Churchwide Assembly.

Synod Councils address the Church Council through resolutions, including forwarding actions of the Synod Assembly. In the final “resolved” of such an assembly action should be this provision:

---

1 Synod Assemblies pass Memorials to the Churchwide Assembly. This is in keeping with ELCA 12.21.c., which declares: “The Churchwide Assembly shall . . . receive and consider proposals from synod assemblies.” In preparation for the Churchwide Assembly, “a Memorials Committee, appointed by the Church Council, shall receive memorials from synod assemblies and make appropriate recommendations for assembly action” (ELCA 12.51.21.).

Synod Councils may pass Resolutions to the Church Council. “The Church Council shall act on resolutions from synod councils,” according to ELCA 14.21.11. Synod Councils also may seek to address churchwide units through resolutions. These must be submitted to the Church Council’s Executive Committee for appropriate referral, according to ELCA 14.41.11., which specifies that the council’s Executive Committee “shall transmit resolutions from synods to boards of the churchwide organization.” Synods also may forward resolutions emerging from the Synod Council for attention by the Church Council or referral to churchwide units by the Church Council’s Executive Committee.
RESOLVED, that the _____________ Synod Assembly direct the ________ Synod Council to forward this resolution to the Church Council for consideration and possible action.

Synod Councils address churchwide units through resolutions directed to the Church Council’s Executive Committee, including forwarding actions of the Synod Assembly. In the final “resolved” of such an assembly action should be this provision:

RESOLVED, that the _____________ Synod Assembly direct the _____________ Synod Council to forward this resolution to the Church Council’s Executive Committee for proper referral and disposition under the bylaws and continuing resolutions of this church.

Please encourage your assembly’s Committee of Reference and Counsel or Resolutions Committee to use resolutions in preference to memorials. Resolutions follow a more direct route than memorials, which must go to the Churchwide Assembly and await the assembly’s response.

Please also remind them that a resolution and a memorial may not be combined in one action. That is, the Church Council and the Churchwide Assembly may not be addressed in the same resolution. Neither should a synod address both the Church Council and the Churchwide Assembly on the same subject.

Writing memorials and resolutions
To prepare or edit the texts of resolutions and memorials, an assembly’s Committee of Reference and Counsel or Resolutions Committee will find some basic information on proper language in Robert’s Rules of Order. Here are a few fundamentals.

Normally, the “whereas” clauses describe the issue, concern, problem, and basis for or need of the resolution. They state the case but technically are not part of the resolution. They should be accurate and factual and should not misrepresent the issue being addressed or offer a false foundation for the proposed action.

“Resolved” clauses point to proposed solutions and define requested action. “Resolved” clauses should define clearly the following: To whom is the request for action addressed? What should be done? What may the action cost and how is it to be funded? When should the action be done? To whom should the results be reported?

Clarity in the text of any resolution or memorial is important. A good test is, “Is this statement clear? Will the resolution make sense to someone who was not present at the assembly?”

Obviously, a resolution of a Synod Council cannot direct the Church Council to take a specific action. Likewise, a memorial from a Synod Assembly cannot order that the Churchwide Assembly vote in a particular way. A memorial, by definition, is a proposal appealing for action.

Filing Memorials and Resolutions with the Office of the Secretary
Immediately after Synod Assemblies or Synod Council meetings, electronic copies of resolutions and memorials should be sent to Ruth.Hamilton@elca.org in the Office of the Secretary. She will send an acknowledgment that they have been received and indicate when they will be considered.

Site for the 2011 Churchwide Assembly
Mary Beth Nowak has been busy investigating potential sites for future Churchwide Assemblies. At this meeting, I will bring forward a recommendation for a site for the 2011 Churchwide Assembly.
Travel Costs and Savings

Diligent efforts continue for control of travel costs. Close monitoring is practiced. The changing practices, policies, and fares of airlines affect directly the overall cost of travel for Church Council members, board and committee members, members of the Conference of Bishops, and staff serving through the churchwide organization and synods.

The chart does not include international travel by staff of the Global Mission program unit on tickets issued by Menno Travel of Columbia Heights, Minnesota. Such tickets are issued by Menno because of that agency’s experience with international travel arrangements, especially to areas of Africa and Asia. Menno Travel, however, does not have the computer software that would enable us to obtain the comprehensive reports that are received from Best Travel.

The following chart provides a summary of 2007 travel costs and savings through use of Best Travel, the contracted travel vendor for the churchwide office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of tickets</th>
<th>Savings off coach</th>
<th>Total spent</th>
<th>Average domestic ticket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10,661</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>$3,250,892.00</td>
<td>$298.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>$3,208,111.00</td>
<td>$309.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11,891</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>$3,560,437.00</td>
<td>$299.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>$2,783,658.00</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11,531</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>$3,566,928.00</td>
<td>$301.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11,774</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>$3,188,783.00</td>
<td>$264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13,176</td>
<td>80.66%</td>
<td>$3,309,590.00</td>
<td>$244.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,839</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>$3,242,561.46</td>
<td>$266.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10,095</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
<td>$2,951,527.00</td>
<td>$292.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8,563</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>$2,552,481.00</td>
<td>$291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7,882</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>$2,314,912.00</td>
<td>$294.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8,412</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>$2,414,320.00</td>
<td>$283.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>8,067</td>
<td>73.61%</td>
<td>$2,384,816.00</td>
<td>$295.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>75.78%</td>
<td>$2,099,053.00</td>
<td>$268.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>73.25%</td>
<td>$2,269,850.00</td>
<td>$296.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7,514</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
<td>$2,256,850.00</td>
<td>$296.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>$2,272,000.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>$2,602,891.00</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>9,548</td>
<td>51.50%</td>
<td>$2,870,164.00</td>
<td>$301.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8,272</td>
<td>51.91%</td>
<td>$2,380,103.00</td>
<td>$288.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Congregational Changes in 2007

Congregations Received in 2007

Nineteen congregations were recognized and received into the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in 2007. According to reports provided to the Office of the Secretary by synods, newly received congregations were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYNOD</th>
<th>CONGREGATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Eagle Rock</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Living Springs</td>
<td>June 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Desert Streams</td>
<td>June 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Risen Lord</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G</td>
<td>Northeast Community</td>
<td>April 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Living Water</td>
<td>June 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Joyful Life Church</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>United Mission of Christ</td>
<td>May 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>United</td>
<td>April 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>United</td>
<td>June 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Advent</td>
<td>May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Resurrection</td>
<td>February 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Grace and Peace</td>
<td>September 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Bridge of Peace Community Church</td>
<td>May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Imanuel Indonesian</td>
<td>May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Penn-Zion’s</td>
<td>January 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C</td>
<td>Good Shepherd</td>
<td>January 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>Emmanuel Evangelical</td>
<td>March 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congregations that Withdrew in 2007

Five congregations have been reported by synods as having withdrawn from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in 2007. They represented a combined membership of 807.

- In 2006, 18 congregations withdrew with a combined baptized membership of 7,669.
- In 2005, 21 congregations withdrew with a combined baptized membership of 14,005.
- In 2004, 26 congregations withdrew with a combined baptized membership of 9,816.
- In 2003, eight congregations with a total baptized membership of 3,654 withdrew.
- In 2002, 18 congregations with a total baptized membership of 16,689 withdrew.
- In 2001, six congregations with a total baptized membership of 2,876 withdrew.

The list of congregations that withdrew in 2007 is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 WITHDRAWING CONGREGATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Primer on Disbanding, Merging, and Consolidating

From time to time, the Office of the Secretary receives inquiries about the “closing” of congregations. Congregations that “close” fall into three categories:

- **DISBANDED, DISSOLVED**—nothing remains. Disposition of the property has been completed. Baptized members disperse to neighboring congregations.
• **MERGED**—a smaller, non-viable congregation joins its assets, liabilities, and members with a larger, viable congregation, and the small congregation gives up its identity to become part of the larger congregation.

• **CONSOLIDATED**—two or more congregations come together to form a new entity. The old congregations no longer exist, but a new congregation comes into being out of their consolidation.

Among the reasons cited for such changes are dwindling members and insufficient money to support leadership, a church building, and program.

### DISBANDING, MERGING, AND CONSOLIDATING CONGREGATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DISBANDING</th>
<th>MERGING</th>
<th>CONSOLIDATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'93</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'96</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'97</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'98</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'01</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'03</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'06</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roster Developments

The average age of ordinands in 2007 was just above 40 years of age, up from the average age of 29.5 in 1980 and 32.4 in 1985. The following charts provide a statistical summary of roster developments.

#### Average age of ordinands, 1990 to 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of ordinations, 1990 to 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinations</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentages of pastors who are women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of pastors who were recorded as having been granted retired status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of clergy on leave from call by year and on leave from call for study by year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On leave</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For study</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For study</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of pastors on leave from call who are women, 1990-2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On leave</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of clergywomen on leave for study, 1990-2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For study</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of pastors of color or whose primary language is other than English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC/L</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of roster counts between September 1, 1998, and September 1, 2007 reveals the following:

Roster of Ordained Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active/Not Active</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active: Call-Congregations</td>
<td>9,723</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>9,525</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>9,225</td>
<td>9,192</td>
<td>9,105</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>8,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call-Synod Councils</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call-Church Council</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On leave from call</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On leave for study</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Active: Continuing disability</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired: Call to congregations</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>5,369</td>
<td>5,551</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>5,488</td>
<td>5,753</td>
<td>5,789</td>
<td>5,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>17,579</td>
<td>17,581</td>
<td>17,631</td>
<td>17,697</td>
<td>17,725</td>
<td>17,666</td>
<td>17,388</td>
<td>17,694</td>
<td>17,655</td>
<td>17,619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women pastors</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>3,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call to congregations</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors of color</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women pastors of color</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lay Rosters (Associates in Ministry, Deaconesses, and Diaconal Ministers)

### Active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call-Congregations</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call-Synod Councils</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call-Church Council</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On leave from call</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On leave for study</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,216</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,204</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,187</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,191</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,272</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Not Active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing disability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,216</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,204</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,187</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,191</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,272</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lay rostered women 957 948 933 938 951 993 1,006 1,019 1,018 1,035

Lay persons of color 13 12 12 14 16 17 18 18 18 19

### Diaconal Ministers

Diaconal Ministers were first rostered in 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roster Status of 338 Clergy Ordained in 1995, as of March 15, 2008

The following is a snapshot of the status of those clergy ordained in 1995.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Clergy</th>
<th>In a Call</th>
<th>Removed/Resigned</th>
<th>On Leave</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Continuing Disability</th>
<th>Deceased</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>246 (72.6%)</td>
<td>101 (71.1%)</td>
<td>17 (12.0%)</td>
<td>10 (7.0%)</td>
<td>3 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>145 (73.6%)</td>
<td>26 (13.2%)</td>
<td>21 (10.7%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 15, 2008 Roster Status of 339 ELCA Clergy Ordained in 1995
**Church Council Calls**

On an annual basis, the secretary reports the list of Letters of Call issued on behalf of the Church Council to those who serve in various churchwide ministries.

**ORDAINED MINISTERS 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Synod</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Effective Call</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVANGELICAL OUTREACH AND CONGREGATIONAL MISSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Buba, Gemechis D.  
director for African national ministries | 7-F | 4.7 | 11/1/07 | 10/2/07 |
| Frances, Mary C.  
assistant director for development  
of new congregations | 5-B | 4.7 | 1/1/07 | 10/2/07 |
| Hinojosa, Arnold R. ("Ernie")  
mission director | 4-E | 4.7 | 11/16/07 | 10/2/07 |
| LaRiviere-Mestre, Ivis  
assistant director for evangelism and  
director for Latino evangelism and  
multilingual programs | 9-F | 4.7 | 1/17/08 | 1/15/08 |
| **GLOBAL MISSION** |
| Anspach-Nelson, Eric  
pastor in the Evangelical  
Lutheran Church in Japan | 3-F | 11.1 | 7/15/07 | 7/22/06 |
| Haug, Arden D.  
regional representative for Europe | 3-H | 11.1 | 7/15/07 | 8/22/07 |
| Hansen, Gary L.  
associate for Global Mission Partnerships | 6-B | 4.7 | 9/1/07 | 5/22/07 |
| Holman, Mark K.  
pastor of the Lutheran Church of the  
Redeemer in Jerusalem | 3-G | 11.1 | 7/16/07 | 6/5/07 |
| Jacobson, Kevin L.  
pastor in the Evangelical Lutheran Church  
in Suriname | 5-L | 11.1 | 10/1/07 | 10/22/07 |
| Mundt, Randall A.  
pastor of the Vienna Community Church  
in Vienna, Austria | 2-C | 11.1 | 7/15/07 | 8/22/07 |
| Nelson, Dana K.  
pastor in the Iglesia Luterana Evangelica  
Peruana, Lima, Peru | 3-H | 11.1 | 7/16/07 | 5/22/07 |
Shellhamer, Ronald E. 8-E 11.1 7/15/07 5/22/07
theological professor and instructor in the
Lutheran Church in Liberia

Smith, Robert O. 5-A 4.7 7/2/07 6/5/07
director for the continental desk for
Europe and the Middle East

Strasser, Arden C. 2-A 11.1 7/16/07 8/22/07
pastor for leadership development with
the Evangelical Lutheran Church in
Zambia

**VOCATION AND EDUCATION**

Baglyos, Paul A. 8-A 10.1 8/1/07 12/4/07
assistant professor of rural ministry and
director for the center for theology and
land at Wartburg Theological Seminary

Chung, Paul S. 2-A 10.1 7/1/06 9/22/07
assistant professor of Lutheran witness and
world community at Wartburg Theological
Seminary

Gauche, Nancy Lee 3-H 10.1 8/1/06 3/19/07
coordinator for the youth and family
program at Luther Seminary

Granquist, Mark A. 3-I 10.1 7/1/07 8/22/07
associate professor of church history at
Luther Seminary

Haggmark, Steven A. 3-H 10.1 7-1-07 6-22-07
associate professor of Islamic studies and
Christian mission and world religions at
Luther Seminary

Lampe, Frederick P. 4-A 10.1 6/16/06 9/22/07
assistant professor of community
development and witness and director of
the master of arts program at Wartburg
Theological Seminary

Lewis, Karoline M. 3-G 10.1 7/1/07 10/22/07
assistant professor of preaching at
Luther Seminary

Reed, Kathleen O. 7-B 10.1 3/15/07 3/19/07
director for advancement in the
Lutheran Theological Seminary at
Gettysburg
Schifferdecker, Kathryn M.  
assistant professor of Old Testament at  
Luther Seminary  

Vigen, James B.  
director of the Luther Institute at the  
Lutheran Theological Seminary at  
Gettysburg  

Weidman, Frederick W.  
director for the Center for Church Life  
and professor of Biblical studies at  
Auburn Theological Seminary in New York  

CHURCH IN SOCIETY  

Engh, Susan L.  
director for congregation-based  
organizations  

Snyder, William C.  
vice president for system leadership  
in Lutheran Services in America,  
Baltimore, Maryland  

PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA  

Fox Leslie J.  
representative for congregational field  
sales at Augsburg Fortress, Publishers  

Tunseth, Scott A.  
member of the staff of the Publishing  
House of the Evangelical Lutheran Church  
in America  

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  

Hanson, Paul N.  
director for the Fund for Leaders in  
Mission of the Evangelical Lutheran  
Church in America  

ELCA FOUNDATION  

Scott, Mark A.  
regional gift planner  

Summer, Paul H.  
regional gift planner  

Zulick, Thomas H.  
regional gift planner
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
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ELCA BOARD OF PENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berg, Robert D.</td>
<td>5-H</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8/1/07</td>
<td>4/9/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistant to the president for church relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malotky, Charlotte A.</td>
<td>3-G</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2/25/05</td>
<td>1/31/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retirement planning manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUREAU FOR FEDERAL CHAPLAINCY MINISTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingol, Thomas A.</td>
<td>9-E</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1/1/08</td>
<td>1/31/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain in the U. S. Navy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedman, Douglas V.</td>
<td>5-I</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9/17/07</td>
<td>10/17/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain in the National Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muschinske, Peter K.</td>
<td>5-H</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5/24/07</td>
<td>5/9/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain in the U. S. Navy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solheim, Jeffrey C.</td>
<td>2-D</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10/22/07</td>
<td>10/2/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain in the U. S. Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spies, Daniel R.</td>
<td>5-H</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4/23/07</td>
<td>10/2/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain in the U. S. Navy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stull, Arthur R.</td>
<td>4-B</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3/8/07</td>
<td>4/19/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain in the U. S. Army Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltz, Kathleen M.</td>
<td>5-C</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9/18/07</td>
<td>8/28/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain in the Veterans Administration, assigned to the Medical Center in Portland, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDING BISHOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullock, M. Wyvetta.</td>
<td>5-A</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11/1/07</td>
<td>10/2/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive for administration in the Office of the Presiding Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouman, Stephen P.</td>
<td>7-C</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1/1/08</td>
<td>12/5/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive director of the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus R. Kunz</td>
<td>5-F</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2/11/08</td>
<td>1/29/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive for discernment of contextual and theological issues in the Office of the Presiding Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCoid, Donald J.</td>
<td>8-B</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11/1/07</td>
<td>10/29/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive for ecumenical and inter-religious relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollikainen, Jennifer Phelps</td>
<td>7-F</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7/16/07</td>
<td>7/16/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associate for worship resources in the Worship and Liturgical Resources section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approvals on Real Estate and Securities Transactions

The following is a report of resolutions that have been approved, pursuant to Church Council authorization, by special committees acting on behalf of the Council. Photocopies of the signed original minutes for each of these approvals is attached to the protocol copy of the minutes of this meeting. The signed original minutes are maintained in the corporate files in the Office of the Secretary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th>Subject of Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC90.4.31</td>
<td>2/1/07</td>
<td>Jackson-Skelton/Almen</td>
<td>Sale of Real Estate: Ocean Summit Condominium, 4010 Galt Ocean Dr., Apt. 703, Ft. Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida, to Construction Acct. Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CC90.4.31 2/2/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: Lot 77, Block 530 of Rio Ranchettes Unit No. 18, Santa Cruz County, Arizona, to Mark and Virginia Blosser

CC90.4.31 4/10/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: 40% interest in Parcel B-2, Section 19, Township 33 North, Range 6 West, Township of Eveline, Charlevoix County, Michigan, to Frank Saroki

CC90.4.31 5/29/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: Lots No. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and the 16-foot wide alley between Lots Nos. 16 and 17 in Block H and 3, Southern Pines, Moore County, North Carolina, to L E S Contractors

CC90.4.31 7/23/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: South ½ NW 1/4 and North 1,558 feet of the West 1,789 feet of the SE 1/4 and North 118 feet of the East 851 feet of the SE 1/4 of Sec. 8, T106N, R78W, Lyman County, South Dakota, to Timothy and Janet Larson

CC90.4.31 7/23/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: Lots 5 & 6 and N ½ NW 1/4, less county road, in Sec. 4, T106N, R78W, Lyman County, South Dakota, to David Kahler

CC90.4.31 7/25/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: NE 1/4 of Sec. 31, T98R, except Lot H-1, Lincoln County, South Dakota, to Paul and Gail Sletten Living Trust

CC90.4.31 7/30/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  S ½ SW 1/4 Sec. 3, Lots 1 & 2 Sec. 10, Lots 4 & 5 Sec. 9 and part NE 1/4 NE 1/4 Sec. 9, except church lot of Our Saviors Lutheran Church, all T96N, R57W, Yankton County, South Dakota, to Curtis and Barbara Ulmer

CC90.4.31 9/10/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: Lot 76, Subdivision of Bellfarm, 5424 Silbert Rd., Norfold, Virginia

CC90.4.31 9/10/07 Jackson-Skelton/Almen  Sale of Real Estate: Lot 16, Mystic Harbor Section 1, 2 Cutlass Dr., Ocean City, Worcester County, Maryland

CC90.4.31 9/11/07 Mark S. Hanson  Consent to Sale Release & Reverter West ½ of the NE 1/4 of Section 9, Township 27 North, Range 11 East, Shawano County, Wisconsin, to LSS of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan
Prior Reports of Approvals


A Word on Personal Goals

Although the OS Management Team has only begun to meet recently and we are just beginning to think about strategic planning, I have worked on a set of personal goals as secretary, and I will be reviewing them with Presiding Bishop Hanson and the Executive Committee. I thought that it would be useful for me to share them with you.

• Set a positive tone for the Office of the Secretary and emphasize personal contact and accountability.
• Continue to provide accurate and timely assistance to individuals, congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization. (This encompasses providing assistance both in terms of responding timely to questions and proactively addressing issues such as the Guidelines for Synod Bishop Elections.)
• Address personnel and organizational issues.
• Begin to prepare for 2009 Churchwide Assembly.
• Work on leadership development. (This includes eliciting from synods high quality nominees for churchwide positions as well as engaging in public speaking opportunities relating to leadership issues.)
• Work on “greening” the Office of the Secretary, the churchwide organization, the Churchwide Assembly, and other meetings.
• Evaluate processes for preparation of and content in minutes.
• Embark on oral history project for the ELCA.
• Identify and work on special projects.
• Engage in strategic planning for the Office of the Secretary.

In conclusion, I thank God every day for the opportunity to serve this church as its secretary, and I pray for wisdom and patience in all that I do.
Discussion on the Composition and Size of the Church Council

Commission for a New Lutheran Church

Discussion of the composition and size of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America predates the formation of this church, and few topics have been as frequently revisited. At least as early as February 1985 the Commission for a New Lutheran Church (CNLC) recommended a composition of representatives from each synod, elected by the Churchwide Assembly:

A church council, which shall meet at least three times each year, shall serve as the interim legislative authority between meetings of the churchwide delegate assembly. The church council shall be elected by the churchwide delegate assembly and shall be composed of the four officers of the churchwide expression and one representative from each synod of the church. The representatives from the synods shall be elected to four-year terms and shall be eligible for one consecutive re-election (Progress Report #5).

The September 1985 meeting, however, saw the beginning of what would become an ongoing debate about how council members would be elected. The dispute arose largely in light of the experience of existing churches: “In the LCA the Executive Council was composed of 30 members elected by the churchwide convention. The procedure was in keeping with the LCA’s view of the church: members represented the church, not the individual synods. The ALC Church Council was composed of two members elected by each district, with district bishops as advisers. This arrangement reflected the ALC’s self-understanding as a union of congregations.”

The CNLC Design Committee proposed that council members be elected by Synod Assembly actions, and the proposal was supported by commissioners who argued that it had been a positive experience in their church, that the new synods would know best which people could fulfill the responsibilities, and that the practice would provide direct participation by members of synods. Opponents of the proposal countered that the Church Council needed to represent this whole church and synodical representatives would be more sensitive to their areas to the detriment of the wider perspective. Commissioners already had received a sense motion from the LCA seeking a reduction in the size of the council to 30, but by the end of the meeting, by a vote of 49-16, the CNLC adjusted the process for election by individual Synod Assemblies, and lengthened the term from four to six years:

The church council shall consist of the four officers of the churchwide organization and one person from each of the synods of the church elected by the synodical assemblies. The persons from the synods shall be elected to one six-year term and shall not be eligible for consecutive reelection (Progress Report #6).

This pattern, reflecting the existing polity in The American Lutheran Church, was retained as the CNLC began to frame its recommendations in the form of constitutional provisions and bylaws in February 1986:

14.30. Composition of the Church Council
14.31. The voting members of the church council shall consist of the four churchwide officers and one person, elected by the synod assembly, from each of the synods of the church.
14.31.01. Church council members elected by the synods shall be elected to one six-year term and shall not be eligible for consecutive reelection (Progress Report #7).

1Anatomy of a Merger, p.160.
The matter was by no means concluded, and became one of the “big three” issues—along with the site of the churchwide organization and the percentage for pension contributions—to cause considerable disagreement between members of the CNLC and, later, the church-body conventions that were to consider the commission’s final recommendations. In June 1986, as the CNLC worked to fine-tune its recommendations in response to numerous responses by church-body conventions, district and synod conventions, and district and synod councils. This period of final formation was rich with creative ideas about how this new church should govern its life. One proposal not taken up by the CNLC would have expanded the number of Church Council members beyond 69 by providing that:

In addition, a caucus of the delegates at the Churchwide Assembly who are persons of color or whose primary language is other than English and those delegates elected to represent persons of color or whose primary language is other than English, shall elect 7 members of the church council, one-third in each biennium.

How this proposal would be implemented never was discussed, but is a good example of the options considered. Finally, a commissioner moved to reduce the size of the council to one-half the number of synods (still to be determined), to be elected by the Churchwide Assembly:

To amend 14.31. as follows:

The voting members of the church council shall consist of the four church wide officers and one person, elected by the synod assembly, from each of the synods of the church (one-half the number of synods) other persons elected by the churchwide assembly, not more than four being from any one region (CNLC86.06.1750).

The motion was adopted by a vote of Yes-39; No-22, which became the final recommendation of the commission:

15.30. Composition of Church Council
15.31. The voting members of the Church Council shall consist of the four churchwide officers and 33 other persons, elected by the Churchwide Assembly.

Although the “big three” points of tension tended to coalesce by church body (for example, The American Lutheran Church focus was on pension contributions; the Lutheran Church in America focus was on size of the Church Council), the final decision of commissioners was by no means a strict “party-line” vote but received enough support from ALC and AELC commissioners to prevail. Along with other ALC commissioners, Kathryn W. Baerwald indicated that she voted in favor of this reduction in size of the Church Council because,

“...we found that a group of 70 people is not real workable. . . . I think that the smaller size is essential. The ALC has got a church council that has 41 voting members, and about 23-24 advisory members who actually sit with the council. And then there are always about a hundred people in that room. And it’s a little convention every time. It’s not a meeting, it’s a convention. I just think there are too many people who are involved to really do things in any fashion other than kind of a dog and pony show. And so what it means is that small committees or other people--that the real power of decision-making is not in the council as a whole. They may be taking the votes, but that’s really not where the action is. . . . I think if you have a somewhat smaller council that there is a better chance that that’s where decisions are really going to be made, and with a council that meets more frequently.”

The composition and size of the Church Council would next be hotly debated by the respective church conventions, meeting concurrently in different locations. The discussion among conventions was facilitated by a 13-member Joint Convention Committee, which played a particularly determinative role in addressing issues that emerged during convention discussion. By mutual agreement, the final recommendations of the CNLC could only be revised if both the LCA and the ALC conventions agreed to the change. The ALC
convention, by a vote of 900-9, requested that the CNLC proposal on the size of the Church Council be changed to include the officers plus one person elected by each of the ELCA’s 65 synods, arguing that the council needed to be “answerable to a constituency.” The LCA convention, however, rejected this change by a 90 percent vote, arguing that the new church was “not to be a federation of synods.” Similarly, the ALC convention had declined the LCA proposal to increase the pension plan contribution rate to 12 percent. The Joint Convention Committee met late into the night, but was unable to formulate alternate proposals on the “big three” issues, so the CNLC recommendations remained unchanged as the basis upon which each convention would act.

“It is a bitter pill and very hard to swallow,” said Bishop Herbert Chilstrom of the LCA Minnesota Synod. “Are we willing to swallow the bitter pill for the sake of the larger question?” he asked. Similarly, George Forell urged LCA delegates “in our interest for unity of the church” to give in on the pension issue. “We have to recognize that we have some things precious to us and our partners have some things precious to them.” Eventually the LCA convention overwhelmingly approved the pension proposal as submitted by the CNLC. Likewise, following heated discussion, ALC delegates were reminded by the chair that, “They [the LCA] are being asked to swallow a pension plan they are overwhelmingly opposed to, and in the same way we are being asked to vote for a Church Council plan that does not meet our desires.” In the end, the plan for merger was approved by overwhelming votes of each convention.

1991 Churchwide Assembly

The matter emerged again at the 1991 Churchwide Assembly as voting members considered memorials from the Northeastern Iowa Synod and the Greater Milwaukee Synod:

WHEREAS, the recent “Focusing for Mission” restructuring process of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America included in its purpose statements the desire to “reflect a greater sense of partnership for congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization”; and

WHEREAS, a special subcommittee of that process was formed to make specific recommendations regarding more effective synod/churchwide relationships; and

WHEREAS, the Review Committee on Synod-Churchwide Relations identified the need “to develop and enhance among the members of the ELCA a common identity and a sense of connectedness, trust, and inter-relatedness . . .” and to that end the committee commends to the Program and Structure Committee the proposal that the Church Council be expanded to allow for election of one member from every synod; bishops would continue to serve in an advisory capacity on the council; and

WHEREAS, this recommendation grew out of a recognition of the critical need for a stronger sense of ownership of the whole of this church on the part of local congregations and synods; and

WHEREAS, synodical election of representatives to the Church Council would provide for representatives from every congregation to have a direct vote in selecting a representative to the chief policy-making unit of this church; and

WHEREAS, it is always difficult for any currently constituted body (such as the Church Council) to make objective judgments about matters which would involve its own going out of existence as currently constituted (for this reason the Review Committee on Synod-Churchwide Relations discussed the possibility of asking that the recommendation go directly to the Assembly rather than back to the Church Council); now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 1991 Churchwide Assembly be given opportunity, through consideration of this memorial, to express its judgment regarding the matter of the makeup of the Church Council; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that passage of this memorial by the Churchwide Assembly be regarded as a mandate that the delegates of the 1991 Churchwide Assembly hereby direct that the constitutional provisions be adopted that would provide for a Church Council to be made up of one representative from each synod, elected by that synod, with representation assigned on
a rotating basis to facilitate appropriate representation according to the principles of organization of this church (following the design originally put forward by the Commission for a New Lutheran Church).

In preparing the “Focusing for Mission” proposal for restructuring the churchwide organization, the Program and Structure Committee of the Church Council discussed at some length the suggestion that the council be expanded to allow for the election of one member from every synod. Concerns were raised about the increase in the size of the council under this proposal; including officers and advisory bishops, membership on the council would total 78 persons, up from the current 46 persons. Concerns regarding the ongoing cost of assembling such a group and the dynamics of decision-making in a group that size were raised. The Program and Structure Committee reported these concerns to the Church Council, which discussed at some length issues relating to its operations. The Church Council opted not to recommend to the Churchwide Assembly changes in the size or in the process for election of Church Council members, but instead recommended:

To express the judgment of this assembly that the current size and process for election of the Church Council be retained; and
To transmit this minute to the Northeastern Iowa Synod and Greater Milwaukee Synod.

During discussion, Bishop Peter Rogness (Greater Milwaukee Synod) moved:

To substitute the following for the recommendation of the Memorials Committee:

RESOLVED, that the 1991 Churchwide Assembly express its support for a Church Council composed of one representative from each synod, elected by that synod, plus four officers; and, be it further
RESOLVED, that this assembly (1) request the Church Council to prepare constitutional language to reflect this composition for consideration and action by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly; and, (2) request each synod at its 1992 Synod Assembly to express its sentiment on the proposal.

Bishop Rogness said, “This substitute motion has its roots in the ‘Focusing for Mission’ Review Committee on Synod-Churchwide Relations. That committee passed on to the Program and Structure Committee, the recommendation that the composition of the Church Council be changed in this way.” He observed within this church a perception that congregations relate well to synods, but “that relationships between synods and congregations to the churchwide work is not as strong [as in predecessor church bodies].... Outside of this assembly there is no place in the structure of this church where the synods come together to make decisions and shape the mission of the church.” He stated that the motion did not force the change, but allowed time for consideration and deliberation of the issue.

Vice President Christine H. Grumm spoke against the substitute motion, stressing that:
1) under the constitution of this church, there was a requirement that every synod be represented on at least one churchwide board which constituted nearly 200 positions for synodical representation; 2) size affected decision making in terms of representation; and 3) the cost would become a factor with the possibility that the Church Council might meet only once a year, instead of twice, with the result that the authority of the Church Council would be lodged in its Executive Committee, instead of the full council.

Others expressed concern over the danger that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America might become a confederation of synods, and a loss of the understanding that each member of the council is accountable to this whole church.

Speaking in support of the substitute motion, voting members stressed that increasing the size of the Church Council would provide for more effective leadership to emerge by the council addressing issues through working in committee, and would provide a greater sense of connection with the members of this church.

The motion to substitute, however, ultimately was defeated (Yes–400; No–454), and the assembly adopted the recommended response (CA91.07.42) by a vote of Yes–631; No–224.
November 1992 Church Council Meeting

The matter emerged again at the November 1992 meeting of the Church Council. Vice President Kathy J. Magnus observed that a continuing concern of this church was establishing a sense of connectedness between the churchwide organization, synods, and congregations. “We have been striving to find ways to do that—that is, to make the larger picture of this church more apparent to each of its three expressions, she said, and explained that one proposal provided for expansion of the Church Council to include one representative from each synod. The role of the Church Council member also would expand to include regular attendance and reporting to the meetings of the respective Synod Council.

J. David Ellwanger observed that addressing a 69-member council may be intimidating to speakers, and he calculated that if every member were to speak to an issue, assuming a one-minute limitation, debate of important matters would consume hours of the council’s time. He observed that at its heart the matter was effective governance rather than connectedness, and expressed concern that, were the Church Council to be expanded, its executive committee would become the decision-making body and the function of the full council would become largely ceremonial.

Althornia Steele observed that a proposed constitutional amendment would designate Church Council members as advisory members of their respective Synod Councils (†S10.01.a.), which would enhance connectedness.

James G. Cobb recounted the history of this debate in the Commission for a New Lutheran Church and the 1991 Churchwide Assembly. He further stated, “I do not feel that I represent the synod; I am not here from Virginia Synod; I am not here from Region 9; but I very much have a sense that I am called to be responsible for the sake of the whole church.” He concluded that enlarging the size of the council would obstruct its deliberations.

Others observed that, if the Church Council was to be expanded to include one representative from each synod, Synod Councils should likewise be expanded to include one representative from each congregation; connectedness could be enhanced throughout this church through the presence of a representative from the churchwide organization at Synod Council meetings; ELCA ecclesiology, while still developing, affirmed the unity of the Church rather than it being a federation of independent synods. Following debate, the Church Council voted (CC92.11.36):

To maintain the current number of voting members of the Church Council (33 plus the four officers);
To encourage greater involvement and interaction of council members, in consultation with the appropriate synodical bishops, Synod Councils and Synod Assemblies;
To urge that members of the Church Council, at the November 1992 meeting, discuss methods and means of more constructive interaction with synodical leadership and events;
To endorse informed and active participation, insofar as possible conveying the concerns of the Conference of Bishops, by the nine synodical bishops who serve as advisory members of the Church Council;
To explore further the concerns regarding synodical-churchwide connections and contacts, including methods to address such needs and possibilities; and
To endorse additional contact between officers and offices of the churchwide organization with synodical officers and synodical staff members.

1997 Churchwide Assembly

The matter of Church Council composition emerged at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly in a memorial submitted by the Slovak Zion Synod. The main focus of the memorial was the composition and responsibility of the Churchwide Assembly, but included one suggestion regarding the Church Council that had never-before appeared:

WHEREAS, 80 percent of the members of every ELCA Churchwide Assembly are people
who never attended an assembly before; and

WHEREAS, there is little continuity in the membership of successive assemblies; and

WHEREAS, the real power to set agendas and to present resolutions to the assembly resides with boards and divisions, which have little actual accountability to the Churchwide Assembly, which according to the constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is the highest authority in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Slovak Zion Synod in assembly memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America that the ELCA Churchwide Assembly be reduced to half its current size (to c.650); and be it further

RESOLVED, that voting members be elected to six years terms and be eligible to a second term; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ELCA Church Council be composed of members of the assembly;

and be it further

RESOLVED, that the divisions and boards of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America have their work reviewed by committees composed of assembly members.

The assembly voted (CA97.06.66) to refer the memorial of the Slovak Zion Synod to the Church Council with the request that the Church Council, following consultation with the Conference of Bishops, bring to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly a report and possible recommendations on this matter.

The Church Council, at its November 1997 meeting, voted to refer the matter to the Executive Committee with the request that the Executive Committee bring to the April 1998 Church Council meeting a report and possible recommendation for action on this matter. Subsequently, the Executive Committee met February 9-10, 1998. The committee’s response to this memorial, developed at that meeting, was shared at the March 1998 meeting of the Conference of Bishops, and finally considered at the April 18-20, 1998, Church Council meeting.

Unfortunately, the Church Council action (CC98.04.31) addressed only aspects related to the size and composition of the Churchwide Assembly and failed to address the recommendation regarding the composition of the Church Council, and no report or recommendations ever were made to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

2001 Churchwide Assembly

The matter of Church Council composition and size emerged yet again at the 2001 Churchwide Assembly in a memorial submitted by the Minneapolis Area Synod:

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) is experiencing the challenges of joint efforts and common ministry with other bodies which are also rich in theological and historical tradition, especially in the current differences over ecumenical agreements; and

WHEREAS, we have significant differences among us on how to address a variety of ethical issues which threaten to fracture our body; and

WHEREAS, these and other events in our new life together have decreased the level of trust, especially between regions of this church and also the various expressions of this church; and

WHEREAS, frustration over lack of representation and perceived difficulties in dealing with the church headquarters indicate a growing distance from some synods and congregations which threaten our future as a church; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA Church Council is now composed of members not elected at the local level and not representative of any constituencies in contrast to the Conference of Bishops; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Minneapolis Area Synod in Assembly memorialize the 2001 Churchwide Assembly to direct the ELCA Church Council to initiate revision of the current structure so that constitution and bylaws are amended to create a 69 member churchwide council composed of one member from each synod and the four officers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that such revision and amendments provide for synod assembly election or nomination of the respective Church Council members with subsequent ratification by the Churchwide Assembly [of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America].
The report of the Memorials Committee pointed out that, when a similar proposal to the one in this memorial was presented prior to the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, the Church Council devoted extensive study to the topic. The council voted at that time not to recommend to the Churchwide Assembly changes in the size and process for election of the council. The question of the size of the Church Council was the subject of considerable study and discussion in the Commission for a New Lutheran Church in the mid-1980s. The debate in the commission reflected viewpoints, on the one hand, of those who wanted a smaller, working Church Council for active oversight of the programs and policies of the churchwide organization and, on the other hand, of those who wanted a larger council with one member from each synod. In preparation for the ELCA’s formation, proponents of a smaller council (equivalent to about one for every two synods) expressed the belief that, if a larger council existed, the real power would be exercised by a small executive committee because a larger council would be able to meet only once a year. Those who urged creation of the present 37-member council also noted that the size of synods varies dramatically (from about 300 congregations to 30 congregations and from almost a quarter million members to 6,000 members). One council member per synod was not seen as providing appropriate regional representation based on baptized membership. The present Church Council meets three times a year as the board of directors of the churchwide organization. Its four committees—within their assigned areas of responsibilities (14.41.A91. through 14.41.D99.)—review carefully issues under consideration. The members discuss thoroughly proposed actions and offer their recommendations.

When a version of this memorial was considered by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, concern was voiced that an 80-member council (69 voting members, nine advisory bishops, and two youth advisory members) would not lend itself to thorough discussion of proposals. It also was noted that a large council meeting annually would result in substantial ongoing responsibility for governance shifting to the executive committee, instead of the full council—the same concern that had been voiced in the Commission for a New Lutheran Church. In addition, people from throughout the synods of this church also serve on the 21-member boards of the six divisions and the various other units, as well as the several advisory committees. The principles of representation apply to the boards. Geographical distributions requirements also apply to help ensure broad synodical representation on the various boards and committees, which present to the Church Council proposals and recommendations for the life and work of this church.

The recommendation of the Memorials Committee was:

To affirm the service of the members of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in their representative responsibilities for governance as the board of directors and in their informed oversight of the policies, programs, and directions of churchwide ministries carried out on behalf of and in support of the members, congregations, and synods of this church; and

To decline to request the development of amendments to alter the size and method of election of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as recommended by the memorial of the Minneapolis Area Synod.

Bishop David W. Olson [Minneapolis Area Synod] moved:

To substitute the following action for the recommendation of the Memorials Committee:

To refer the memorial [Category 13: Church Council Representation] to the Church Council and specifically to the Program and Services Committee along with recommendations of Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson and that a report and recommendations be made to the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.
Bp. Olson spoke of his conviction that there would be restructuring of this church in the future, so this debate was timely now. He stated that the response of the Memorials Committee focused on the issue of diversity, rather than representation from synods, and stressed that he saw this restructuring plan as a way to bring this church together and to empower the Church Council. He thought that restructuring would lead to a higher level of trust among expressions of this church.

Bishop Peter Rogness [Greater Milwaukee Synod] spoke in support of the motion to refer, pointing out that such a motion was different from voting to adopt the plan. All the motion to refer would do, he said, would keep the issue alive for discussion and study. He stated that the voting members had just completed what he described as “a most frustrating exercise: voting for people for committees and boards, most of whom were unknown to voting members and to the people who sent them.” He suggested that a restructured Church Council could bring unity to this church, while still recognizing its diversity, and he cited the effectiveness of the Conference of Bishops as a model. He concluded by saying that to refer this motion to the Church Council for further deliberation would be a wise course of action.

Mr. Nick Olsen [Minneapolis Area Synod] pointed out that a similar plan had been defeated at the 1991 Churchwide Assembly. He acknowledged that the Memorials Committee had some good points in response to that memorial. Still, he said, the Church Council should have voice from all synods. Referral would allow debate on the issue to start, he said.

It was reported that the proposed configuration for the Church Council would approximately double its present size; therefore, meeting costs also would double to approximately $50,000-$60,000 for per meeting.

Following debate the assembly voted (CA01.07.52) in favor of referral to the Program and Services Committee.

The November 9-11, 2001, Church Council meeting voted (CC01.11.83):
- To refer the action of the Churchwide Assembly related to Church Council Representation to the Office of the Presiding Bishop in consultation with the Office of the Secretary, the Conference of Bishops, and the Church Council;
- To receive the recommendations provided by Bishop Peter Rogness as information for the study;
- To request that a report and possible recommendations in concert with strategic planning for mission be brought to the Church Council through its Planning and Evaluation Committee, in consultation with the Program and Services Committee, at its April 2003 meeting; and
- To recommend that a final report be prepared for the 2003 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Subsequent to the referral of the Church Council, the Office of the Presiding Bishop requested that this action of the Churchwide Assembly be addressed as part of the strategic planning process then underway. In response to this request, the Church Council voted at its April 6-7, 2002, meeting (CC02.04.26.f):
- To authorize a delay in the response of the Church Council to the action of the 2001 Churchwide Assembly related to Church Council representation, but to request that the resolution and information provided by Bishop Peter Rogness on this issue be considered as part of the Churchwide Strategic Planning process currently underway in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
- To request that the strategic plan as approved by the Church Council at its August 2003 meeting be the response of this council to the action of the 2001 ELCA Churchwide Assembly.

**2003 Churchwide Assembly**

The Minneapolis Area Synod submitted to the 2003 Churchwide Assembly yet another memorial on the matter of Church Council composition:

**WHEREAS,** ELCA Lutherans are represented at Synod Assemblies by the people elected
from each congregation; and

WHEREAS, ELCA Lutherans from congregations are not represented on the ELCA’s Church Council because [members of the Church Council] are not elected from each Synod Assembly but instead are elected at the Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the governance of the ELCA would be much stronger, more democratic, and more representative if the ELCA’s Church Council members were directly elected at and from each of the 65 Synod Assemblies; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Minneapolis Area Synod in assembly memorialize the 2003 Churchwide Assembly to begin the process to amend the ELCA constitution to provide for the direct election of a Church Council member by each of the 65 synods.

**Background Information from the Synod**

An identical resolution was adopted at the annual meeting of the congregation that sponsored the synod memorial. The following is background provided by the congregation:

The members of the congregation at El Milagro/The Miracle believe that the authority of the ELCA churchwide organization comes from the people in each congregation. That is why they support and propose direct election of Synod Council members. That proposal is now under study by the synod.

Those members also believe that representatives of the congregations also should elect members of the ELCA Church Council through the Synod Assemblies. Therefore, the Synod Assemblies each could elect one member to Church Council, making the Council 65 members, plus the ELCA officers. Presently the Church Council is elected at the national Churchwide Assembly and is not accountable to the members of the congregations.

That is why the members of the congregation at El Milagro/The Miracle want to have the Minneapolis Area Synod Assembly take action asking that the constitution of the ELCA be changed to permit direct election of the Church Council through its congregational members who attend the Synod Assemblies.

The report of the Memorials Committee included much of the same background information that was provided to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly, and reported the actions and consultations that had subsequently occurred, including the request of the presiding bishop to address this concern as part of the strategic planning process.

During that strategic planning process, a wide variety of issues was examined in regard to churchwide governance, especially in view of the role of the Church Council as the board of directors of the churchwide organization. Consultation also was held with a vast array of individuals and groups.

Regarding the specific memorial concerning the size of the council, a special meeting was convened with the advisory bishops to the Church Council on January 5, 2003. Ms. Janet E. Thompson, chair of the Planning and Evaluation Committee, was present for the meeting, as were Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson, Secretary Lowell G. Almen, Executive for Administration Charles S. Miller, and Pr. Kathie Bender Schwich as director of the Department for Synodical Relations.

In addition to the advisory bishops and Bishop Donald J. McCoid as chair of the Conference of Bishops, Bishop Peter Rogness participated and provided an overview of his paper that had been distributed to the Conference of Bishops in October 2001 (and also was provided for information as Exhibit A, Part 5b, in the agenda of the November 9–11, 2001, Church Council meeting).

Reactions in the group were varied. Some favored a larger council, believing that would enhance the connection between synods and the churchwide organization. Others expressed grave concern about elimination of division boards. Still others underscored the importance of effective deliberation and an anxiety about a larger council leading to actual decision-making occurring in a small group, such as the Executive Committee. The complicated task of assigning on a rotation basis the representation categories to synods for elections also was
underscored.
The crucial role of the Conference of Bishops in reviewing significant issues and offering advice, especially to the council, was acknowledged.

Possible Steps into the Future
Steps to be undertaken in response to the concerns of the memorial might include:
1. Continue the current composition of the Church Council, including the pattern of distribution of voting members by regions in relation to the number of baptized members and congregations in each region.
2. Provide greater visibility of members of the Church Council in synodical assemblies, especially in those synods from which they come.
3. Assign two or three synods to each council member for ongoing contact with the synodical bishops and vice presidents, including a possible meeting of the assigned council members with the Synod Council once a year.
4. Refine further the definition and work of Church Council committees to enable the council to fulfill more effectively its role as the board of directors of the churchwide organization. Such refinement might include the creation of an additional committee to relate especially to the work of the divisions as the primary programmatic units.
5. Develop a pattern of closer connection between unit boards and council deliberations, including the presence of board chairs who would meet with the appropriate council committee and the whole council, especially when major issues are submitted by units for council decision-making, as required in the bylaws.
6. Establish a biennial meeting of all synodical officers for the exploration of mutual concerns of synods and discussion of churchwide directions and developments.
7. Seek more opportunities for full-time officers and executive directors of divisions, as well as other senior executive staff, to be present at synodical events as program participants and resource people to build relationships and foster greater mutual understanding.

Church Council Action
At its April 2003 meeting, the Church Council voted (CC03.04.21):
To acknowledge with gratitude the memorial received by the 2001 Churchwide Assembly from the Minneapolis Area Synod, and especially the synod’s expressed concern for building trust in and commitment to the global and domestic outreach efforts of this church;
To underscore the extensive study and deliberation on the size, nature, and role of the Church Council in the process that led to the formation of the ELCA and in the ongoing life of this church, including considerable consultation in response to the 2001 memorial of the Minneapolis Area Synod;
To affirm that the current model of the Church Council as the board of directors of the churchwide organization—with 37 voting members, including the four officers, plus nine advisory bishops and two youth advisors—provides an effective deliberative and decision-making body;
To ask planners of synodical assemblies to find ways to give greater visibility to members of the Church Council, especially in those synods from which council members come;
To request that the Planning and Evaluation Committee of the Church Council in consultation with the Department for Synodical Relations explore the possibility of:
   a. A systematic pattern for ongoing contact by council members with synodical bishops and vice presidents, including a possible meeting once a year with Synod Councils in assigned synods; and
   b. A plan for a biennial synodical-churchwide consultation of all officers—jointly planned by synodical and churchwide representatives—for exploration of developing issues and examination of current needs;
To direct that the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee examine the continuing resolutions related to council committees and propose changes that would foster greater understanding and appropriate involvement in decision-making on the overall program of the
churchwide organization; and

To encourage planners of synodical events to provide opportunities for full-time officers and executive directors of divisions, as well as other senior executive staff, to be present at synodical events as program participants and resource persons to build relationships and foster greater mutual understanding.

The recommendation of the Memorials Committee was:

To receive the memorial of the Minneapolis Area Synod regarding synodical election of Church Council members; and

To decline to begin the process to amend the ELCA constitution as requested by the synod but to affirm the action of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (CC03.04.21) related to this issue:

To acknowledge with gratitude the memorial received by the 2001 Churchwide Assembly from the Minneapolis Area Synod, and especially the synod’s expressed concern for building trust in and commitment to the global and domestic outreach efforts of this church;

To underscore the extensive study and deliberation on the size, nature, and role of the Church Council in the process that led to the formation of the ELCA, and in the ongoing life of this church, including considerable consultation in response to the 2001 memorial of the Minneapolis Area Synod;

To affirm that the current model of the Church Council as the board of directors of the churchwide organization—with 37 voting members, including the four officers, plus nine advisory bishops and two youth advisors—provides an effective deliberative and decision-making body;

To ask planners of synodical assemblies to find ways to give greater visibility to members of the Church Council, especially in those synods from which council members come;

To request that the Planning and Evaluation Committee of the Church Council in consultation with the Department for Synodical Relations explore the possibility of:

- A systematic pattern for ongoing contact by council members with synodical bishops and vice presidents, including a possible meeting once a year with Synod Councils in assigned synods; and
- A plan for a biennial synodical-churchwide consultation of all officers—jointly planned by synodical and churchwide representatives—for exploration of developing issues and examination of current needs;

To direct that the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee examine the continuing resolutions related to council committees and propose changes that would foster greater understanding and appropriate involvement in decision-making on the overall program of the churchwide organization; and

To encourage planners of synodical events to provide opportunities for full-time officers and executive directors of divisions, as well as other senior executive staff, to be present at synodical events as program participants and resource people to build relationships and foster greater mutual understanding.

Judy Biffle stated, “The Memorials Committee fully endorses a process that allows greater connection between Church Council and all 65 synods, but there is real concern that effective deliberations of a 65-plus member Church Council, a Church Council double the size of what it is now, that effective deliberations would be greatly diminished and ultimately decisions might be forced to occur in small groups, such as the Executive Committee.

“There is also no assurance that this 65-plus member structure would in any way automatically provide greater dialogue between synods and Church Council members. Some current Church Council members share concerns that even within their own synod, there is often little interest shown from their synod to be engaged in dialogue and sharing.

So the onus falls to all of us, Church Council members and synods alike, to reach out to each other and share the concerns and work of each other, and there are many ways in which this shared dialogue might happen, and a great number of them are under consideration.
within the new proposed strategic planning process.”

Bishop Peter Rogness [Saint Paul Area Synod] moved a substitute:

WHEREAS, the 2001 Churchwide Assembly, on its last day of deliberation, having pulled from en bloc recommendation for non-approval a resolution calling for the recomposition of the ELCA’s Church Council and specifically asked the Church Council to give it further consideration; and

WHEREAS, the 2001 assembly discussion expressed urgency over possibilities of improved connections between churchwide, synods, and congregations; and

WHEREAS, the January 5, 2003, consultation referred to in 2003 Churchwide Assembly materials (Section VI, page 72), amid a variety of views, expressed agreement that further action would best be considered following conclusions of the Strategic Planning process and its implications for structure and governance; and

WHEREAS, we stand today faced with the convergence of several factors calling for us to find ways to be efficient, connected, and interdependent, including:

- a strategic plan that anticipates clearer focus and internal restructuring around the five strategic directions;
- decreasing mission support;
- an assembly in 2005 at which time decisions around sexuality will surely test the strength of the unity of this church; and

WHEREAS, a church council composed of one member elected by each synod (plus the four officers), given the responsibility of oversight of the entire churchwide ministry in place of separate unit governance boards, would result in:

- substantial cost savings;
- a governance board selected by elections that would include participation by every clergy [under call] and congregation voting at synod assemblies;
- far closer coordination and accountability for the various programmatic and administrative units of the church;
- a much greater ability to be responsive to priorities and changes within the life of the church; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 2003 Churchwide Assembly reaffirm the request of the 2001 Churchwide Assembly that consideration be given to such a synodically-composed church council, including the council assuming oversight of the ministry of the churchwide units:

This assembly encourages Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson to consider the advantages of such governance adjustments as he brings recommendations this fall to the Church Council for the implementation of the strategic plans; and

This assembly directs the Church Council to prepare such a governance model for discussion and response by 2004 synod assemblies.

Speaking to his resolution, Bp. Rogness said “Through the lovely ordering of our discussion, I gave the opening salvo yesterday. This is built on the presumption that we need to work better at making connections between our church locally in congregations and in each of our rosters and what we do together as a whole churchwide body. The frustration of electing a governing structure that nobody knows reinforces the sense of being disconnected. We need to find ways to be around the table together as we make critical decisions in these coming years.

“Please note that this resolution does not seek to immediately enforce the changes at this point. It does two things that I think are eminently reasonable. One is, it encourages the presiding bishop to look at this kind of a governance model as a way of implementing our life together in the coming years as we focus on our strategic priorities; and secondly, and actually if it happens through that route, the second option may, in fact, be pre-empted by earlier action, but it suggests that consideration and debate over whether this is a better way
to be connected really ought to happen at synod assembly levels and that we ought to provide those synod assemblies the material to see what it is was discussed and let them advise us as a national gathering as to whether this would be a better way to govern our life together.”

Bishop Craig E. Johnson [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, “I speak in favor of this substitute motion as an improvement on our memorial. In our synod, we need important organic connections with [the] churchwide [organization]. This resolution is a great way to accomplish this by having one elected person from each synod identified as a leader of our church with a voice at the council. We need a person that can be on the territory and interpret for our synods, conferences, and ministerium the actions and emphases of the national church. We need a voice and a person elected by our synods that can be a representative and an interpreter from our synods and to our synods.

“We also see that enormous savings can be experienced if this substitute resolution is accepted by the assembly. I have seen large boards in our colleges work wonderfully. I also know that we have a brilliant group in Chicago that can figure out the demographics of this new proposal. This church needs a representative council, each person affirmed by each synod to further connect us to each other and to our leaders in Chicago.”

Bishop Gregory R. Pile [Allegheny Synod] said “I speak against the substitute motion for four reasons. First, a larger council will effectively centralize power and decision-making in a much smaller group, the Executive Committee, as stated by the Memorials Committee. Second, for 15 years the Allegheny Synod has not had anyone from our territory serve on the Church Council. But we believe we have been faithfully represented by 33 persons, each and every one of those years.

“Third, seeking to include every synod on the Church Council this year, we elected a person from our territory, the Allegheny Synod, to serve on all of our behalf. Knowing him, I believe he will use his gifts and talents wisely, effectively, and faithfully. And fourth, the feeling of disconnect hampers our work together. That’s been stated more than once. We need, then, to find additional ways to overcome that problem together. We need to find ways to communicate with leadership in our synod. I believe the Church Council can do that, has done that in the past, can use the phone to communicate to vice presidents, bishops, e-mail, to the whole of our synod councils, perhaps. Then we who are leaders in synods have the task of bridging and connecting all of us as a church together.”

Mr. David E. Laden [Saint Paul Area Synod] stated, “I speak in favor of the substitute resolution. Approval of the substitute will help us strengthen our connectedness as congregations, synods, and churchwide [organization]. I call your attention to paragraph 8.11. of our constitution: ‘This church shall seek to function as people of God through congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization, all of which shall be interdependent.’ And paragraph 8.15.: “Since congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization are partners that share in God’s mission, all share in the responsibility to develop, implement, and strengthen the financial support program of this church.

“As treasurer of the Saint Paul Area Synod, this is one of my concerns. Our shared responsibility for mission support, for synodical and churchwide ministries. This is a challenging task, especially when there is lack of connectedness between congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization. I see this substitute resolution as taking a step forward in strengthening this connection and interdependence.

“I have served on synod council both during a time when our synod has had a person serving on the Church Council and at a time when we have not. Having a member of our synod serve on Church Council helps us, as synod, understand the mission and ministry of the churchwide organization and to better articulate this work to our congregations in mission-support conversation. This model also provides a direct conduit back to [the] churchwide [organization] to express congregational and synodical concerns. I urge you to approve the substitute.”
The Rev. Wolfgang D. Herz-Lane [New Jersey Synod] said, “I also speak against this substitute. You know, when the ELCA was put together, it was put together very carefully when it came to the way this church governs itself. I think it’s one of the beauties of the ELCA, how we have managed to put that together where we have expressions that are each one the church but neither one of them is the whole church. And I cherish that kind of a structure. I haven’t, in 15 years, been convinced that that isn’t working somehow and that it needs to be changed.

“But I think even if we agreed that there is something wrong with it and that we should change it, the way to do that would be to look at the whole structure, at all expressions, how they related interdependently with one another, and then go about making changes. Doing this piecemeal makes no sense to me. We’ve already voted on an idea that congregations should ratify things. We’ve done the same with synods. This is another piece that’s kind of tinkering with a whole, and I’m not willing to do that. Please vote against this.”

Bishop Steven L. Ullestad [Northeastern Iowa Synod] said, “In northeastern Iowa we continue to celebrate the partnerships between congregation, synod, and churchwide ministries. One great example is the New Hope Mission Development in Farley, Iowa, that is getting started because of that partnership. Another great example is the fact that we have Sally Young, who has served on the Church Council for the past six years, that we’ve all had the opportunity to meet at this assembly. Because of Sally’s involvement in attendance at Church Council meetings and her attendance at our synod council meetings, we’ve had a marvelous connection of communication that when people had questions, Sally was there to respond immediately with what she understood the process to be, what information had been shared, and why and how the decisions had been made at the Church Council meetings. And on the other side of that equation Sally, then, hears our deliberations on issues about mission support and mission within the territory of northeastern Iowa and carries that with her in conversations to the Church Council.

“The resolved provides for a process for considering this possibility. Whether they are elected by the Churchwide Assembly or elected as synod assemblies matters less than the fact that we would have every synod at the table for the conversations, and the representative principles of this church could be put into the equation for that nomination and election process. So communication and stronger relationships are at the core of this proposal and that also carries into the second half of the resolution.

“We have a systemic problem, not a people problem, I believe, in our churchwide office. The people are there, committed, sacrificing hours and time and energy for the sake of the overall mission of the church. But sometimes the system gets in the way of them being able to communicate effectively among units, with Church Council, and then into synods and congregational ministries. The people are solid. They need a better means of communicating with one another and making decisions. There have been occasions when decisions have not been communicated effectively because there was no place within the system to do so. . . . I encourage your support.”

The Rev. Beth Ann L. Stone [Upper Susquehanna Synod] stated, “I rise to speak in opposition to the substitution and in support of the original memorial. I served several years ago as a member of the Board of Congregational Ministries for six years, which was a blessing to me, and was never asked once by anyone in my synod to share any of the work of the board. So I would suggest that perhaps we’re not making full use of the existing structure we have to support communication between the boards and council with our synods and congregations.”

Bishop Martin D. Wells [Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod] said he was “representing one of those synods that has come to this assembly with several items, hoping that we could go home with some signal to our folks that the communication between [the] churchwide [organization] and synods has been opened up in a more responsive way. This, as I understand it, is our last chance to go home with such a signal because the other two items for
consideration on ratification were defeated. This will give us an opportunity to take home a proposal that looks representative when the terminology of ‘voting member’ is still misunderstood and mistrusted. “I don’t believe that such a council would be too big. It’s not significantly larger than the Conference of Bishops, where our debate is still robust, open, and positive. We face a unique situation in the west where the distances make sharing Church Council members across those distances within the six synods of Region One more difficult than it is in other compressed geographic synods. As I understand this proposal, it is not a mandate. It simply gives us the possibility of keeping this idea alive, taking it back to synods for conversation. I think that’s good for us. I speak in favor.”

Mr. Jon W. Tehven [Northeastern Iowa Synod] asked whether the intent of [Bishop Rogness’s] resolution was to have the Church Council take the place of the division boards. Bishop Rogness said that it was, and pointed out the places where the resolution indicated that intent.

The Rev. Richard A. Cavens [Alaska Synod] “from the center of the mission universe, Alaska” said, “I need clarification from the writer of the resolution if he means to really cut mission funds, if I’m understanding that from what was there, and, if so, why?”

Bishop Rogness responded, “The figures in the footnote were not related to the cutting of mission funds. It was the reduction of the amount of money necessary to run this governance structure. In other words, right now, with the Church Council and the other unit governing boards and steering committees, it costs between $335,000 and $395,000 for the meeting expenses. The alternative that’s being proposed is estimated to cost $173,000. That frees up mission funds for other uses.”

Mr. Ronn Williamson [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, “I’m speaking in opposition of this proposed change primarily because it does seem kind of piecemeal at this point, that we’re being asked to look at this one part of the structure. Also, because it appears that we do have significant representation with the makeup now with 66 percent of the synods on the council.

“And, lastly, my concern is that we’ve heard a lot about the need for full representation, but the structure of the church seems to provide that through means such as this assembly. I also would interpret this proposed change to mean that this assembly would no longer be responsible for electing council members, but it would be done at the synod level. And I have a concern about that. Finally, if this idea of full representation really is valuable, then I would go back to our own Minneapolis Area Synod and suggest that instead of the representative 22 members on our synod council that we should have each congregation on the council and have a council of 179 representatives.” [Laughter]

Bishop Robert D. Berg [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I rise in support of the substitute. I also concur with the comments that have been made relative to representation as well as connectedness and the need for both, and so I don’t want to further belabor that. But I do want to say that I believe that a response relative to the fact that some persons on the council have not been utilized in the capacity to which we wish they would be in synods is that the role is not that clear. I believe that if we had a person from every synod and that person understood the role to be in communication with and working with representatives, leaders of the specific synod, that indeed that relationship would grow, and it would be a healthy role for a council member to fill.”

The Rev. Fred S. Opalinski, a member of the Church Council from Latrobe, Pennsylvania, said “As I complete a six-year term on the Church Council, I thank God for the privilege of representing and serving the whole ELCA. Throughout that time, I valued the opportunity to vote on particular items and issues prompted by prayer, deliberation, and conscience, not by what my home synod or bishop may have decided about the issue. I speak against the change to a representative structure of the Church Council because I think it would set up a structure of leadership based on our divisions rather than our unity. I believe
it would significantly change the ethos and perhaps focus of the Church Council, encouraging each member to serve his or her constituency rather than the whole church.”

Mr. John F. Gruber [Greater Milwaukee Synod] said, “I hope that we can support this resolution, the substitute motion, inasmuch as I think from time to time we need to review the governance that we have in any organization to see that it meets the needs of ourselves at the time in our history that we are at. Having the privilege of being a voting member for the third time, I find myself once again very frustrated to be asked to vote upon members of boards and commissions and activities for whom I have no knowledge and that no one in our group other than a very, very short while has the opportunity to examine. I would hope that we could at least ask that we take a look at our structures and re-visit how we do our business.”

Ms. Faith A. Ashton [North Carolina Synod] stated, “I have two concerns against the substitution, the first being that several of our boards require specific knowledge, certainly the Board of Pensions, the Foundation. I’m not sure that if we are electing people in synods, we would necessarily get the expertise that we need. My other concern is a little closer to my heart, as I come from what is the third from the bottom smallest synod of total numbers of Lutherans. I’m concerned about the voice of the regions of this church that do not have a million Lutherans. We come to this assembly as the highest legislative body of this church where membership for people to vote is based solely on numbers of Lutherans. When we come to the Church Council, though not even by region, there is more of a voice for those of us who come from the smaller regions.

“I come from a synod with a long and storied Lutheran history, from Frederick’s Lutheran in the Virgin Islands at 300 years old to many churches across our region that are greater than 250 years old, a region that also has a profound history of good stewardship to this church. I feel that the voice of those of us from smaller, less dense Lutherans [Laughter] will be diminished in this plan.”

Ms. Sheila M. Flucke [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I’m not sure that this is the best solution, but it’s clear to me, sitting throughout this assembly, that there is a level of discontent. And to continually ignore it and vote for the status quo isn’t going to make it go away. I also had grave concerns sitting and voting for the council members based, as the gentleman before me said, on a very short bio. Nobody in our group knew anything about them. And I would just suggest that voting for the substitute would cause us to look at reality and make some changes.”

Following debate, the motion to substitute failed (Yes-428; No-554), and discussion returned to the recommendation of the Memorials Committee.

The Rev. Bradley W. Miller [Southeastern Iowa Synod] said, “In my ministry, I’ve had the blessing and the burden to serve in a small congregation struggling to pay its bills that very unexpectedly received the gift of a million dollars from an estate. And in some cases that could be a great blessing. For that particular congregation, it was not. And I look back with much lament on my inability to provide the appropriate leadership and that congregation’s inability to provide the appropriate leadership. And I think, and I often lament, if we had only known what was coming, what could we have done if we had known that this possibility was lurking out there in the future? There could have been a bequest-receiving plan or all sorts of things attempted.

“Brothers and sisters in Christ, we know that we are, as a church, very conceivably sitting at the doorstep of schism. And if it not be this proposal or one of the other proposals, please, for the sake of the church, let us not go to our homes having done nothing in preparation for the great conflict that we know we face in two years.”

The assembly, by a 2:1 margin (Yes-643; No-320), adopted the recommendation of the Memorials Committee (CA03.06.26).

April 2005 Church Council Meeting

The issue of composition and size of the Church Council was brought to the April 2005
meeting of the Church Council in a resolution submitted by the Saint Paul Area Synod
WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Area Synod Assembly will receive for action a memorial to
the 2005 Churchwide Assembly concerning the creation of a Church Council comprised of a
member elected by each synod; and
WHEREAS, past consideration of such a proposal indicates both a likelihood of this
memorial being adopted by the Saint Paul Area Synod Assembly and considerable support at
churchwide levels in both 2001 (when the assembly rejected the Memorials Committee
recommendation to defeat the proposal and instead sent it to the Church Council for their
consideration) and 2003 (where the vote was 428-554); and
WHEREAS, this year the Churchwide Assembly will be considering bylaw changes
affecting governance, with proposed bylaws being drafted ahead of time; and
WHEREAS, it would be helpful in the assembly’s consideration of this option to be able
to have before it bylaw changes that would enable the creation of this Church Council
alternative; therefore, be it
RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul Area Synod Council requests that the ELCA Church Council
prepare a set of possible bylaw changes that would enable the creation of such a 65+4 member
Church Council and the elimination of unit steering committees.

During discussion, Mr. Grieg L. Anderson pointed out that the resolution from the Saint
Paul Area Synod called for the secretary to prepare bylaw language for a different
composition of the Church Council.
Ms. Linda J. Brown observed that the matter had been studied thoroughly and said
developing bylaws for possible scenarios was a poor practice.
Ms. Janet K. Thompson remarked that the intent of the resolution was to allow advance
preparation of bylaws for a position that had a great deal of support and would be put on the
floor of the Churchwide Assembly. Having bylaws in advance would enable the Churchwide
Assembly to debate the merits of the position rather than get caught up in the technicalities of
implementation. It would be helpful to the Churchwide Assembly, she asserted.
In the end, however, the Church Council voted (CC05.04.30):
To receive the resolution of the Saint Paul Area Synod related to the composition of the
Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and
To request the secretary to inform the Saint Paul Area Synod of the recommendation of
the Church Council to the Churchwide Assembly related to the size of the Church Council and
other matters of governance.

2005 Churchwide Assembly
Part of the proposal, “Faithful Yet Changing: Design for Mission through the
Churchwide Organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” before the 2005
Churchwide Assembly included an extensive section on “Governance Proposals” reprinted at
the conclusion of this exhibit.
After the assembly had voted upon all constitutional amendments related to restructuring,
the assembly to turn its attention to two groups of proposals to amend the governing
documents on the subject of governance:
1. To receive as information the report on governance submitted by the Church Council as
part of the strategic planning process, “Faithful Yet Changing: Design for Mission
through the Churchwide Organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America”;
2. To affirm the desire to (a) build a stronger relationship and connection among all the
members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and its various expressions,
agencies, and institutions; (b) maintain the churchwide organization’s effectiveness and
efficiency; (c) remain attentive to a wide range of views; (d) strengthen the voices of
members, congregations, and synods; and (e) enable this church to carry out effectively
its mission in the world;
3. To maintain the overall membership of the Churchwide Assembly and endorse a
systematic process in synodical assemblies for discussion of major issues on the agenda
of the Churchwide Assembly;
4. To maintain the Church Council membership of four officers and 33 people elected by the Churchwide Assembly to six-year terms in accord with the representational principles, but to endorse a system of nomination on a rotating basis through synodical assemblies;
5. To expand the advisory membership for meetings of the Church Council to include—in addition to nine synodical bishops and two youth advisors—the presidents of the five ethnic associations or their representatives; the chairs of the program committees for program units and trustees, as applicable, of the program units; the chair of the advisory committee on the work of justice for women; and one person representing this church’s eight seminaries, one person representing this church’s 28 colleges and universities, and one person representing the social ministry organizations;
6. To encourage greater interaction of members of the Church Council with synodical councils and synodical assemblies in their respective areas; and
7. To affirm the vision and design for operation of program committees for program units in developing coordinated and collaborative planning and decision-making on behalf of the churchwide organization.

The Rev. Peter Rogness, bishop of the Saint Paul Area Synod, proposed an amendment to the governance proposal:

To amend paragraphs four, five, and seven of the proposal (as indicated):

4. To maintain expand the Church Council membership of to four officers and 33 people elected by the Churchwide Assembly to six-year terms in accord with the representational principles, but and to endorse a system of nomination on a rotating basis through synodical assemblies;
5. To expand the advisory membership for meetings of the Church Council to include—in addition to nine synodical bishops and two youth advisors—the presidents of the five ethnic associations or their representatives; the chairs of the program units and trustees, as applicable, of the program units; the chair of the advisory committee on the work of justice for women; and one person representing this church’s eight seminaries, one person representing this church’s 28 colleges and universities, and one person representing the social ministry organizations;
7. To affirm the vision and design for operation of program committees for program units in developing coordinated and collaborative planning and decision-making on behalf of the churchwide organization.

Speaking in support of his amendment, Bp. Rogness noted that connections, relationships, and hearing voices from congregations were all important to this church’s life. He suggested that point 2 of the council’s recommendation outlined the problem of communication and effectiveness well. He asserted that the people of this church did not really know those who work at the churchwide level and that there were no real connections. He offered as evidence the election ballot that had just been completed, observing that it was “like throwing darts in a dark room,” because few people knew the nominees for whom they were voting. He argued that if members of the Church Council membership were nominated by the synods, members of this church would feel a stronger connection to the council. Bp. Rogness stated that the current level of membership on the Church Council meant that “only half of us are at the table.” He further argued that the proposed system of rotation would mean that a synod would only name a pastor to the council every 36 years.

He continued by saying that his proposal would accomplish several things: 1) It would create “a table made up of somebody sent there by every pastor and congregation in this church, by the grass roots in our synods, much like the Conference of Bishops; 2) It would open the door to moving oversight of all units of this church to the council, where they would
report to each other in a common body, possibly in review committees, eliminating the need for expensive and cumbersome separated program units; 3) It would lead to saving “substantial amounts of money” in staff time. Addressing the concern that such a council would be too large and that power would end up in the hands of the Executive Committee, he commented that the Executive Committee of the Conference of Bishops does a good job of lining up the “nitty-gritty” of meetings but that when substantive conversations were held and decisions made, the whole of the Conference of Bishops “weighs in” on the issues.

As to worries that a larger council would have limited participation because of the time demands, Bp. Rogness observed that this is a church of 4.9 million people and that there had never been a dearth of interested and qualified nominees for the current structure. As to expense, he proposed that his amendment would hold out the possibility of saving a great deal of money. He stated that management theory in the secular world emphasizes the need for focusing, streamlining, and connecting people in teams and said that this church needs that kind of efficiency and focus.

The Rev. Jonathan L. Eilert, co-chair of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, stated that the committee had discussed Bp. Rogness’s proposal in light of the rationale provided on pages 7 and 8 of Section IV of the 2005 Pre-Assembly Report, as well as the action of the Church Council and of the 2003 Churchwide Assembly detailed on page 45 of the Memorial Committee report in Section VI. He explained that a small minority of the committee had supported the proposal for a 65-member Church Council, but that, based on the rationale he cited, the committee declined to recommend the amendment.

Mr. Larry I. Rank [Oregon Synod] opposed the amendment, making the observation that a 65-member Church Council would be cumbersome and unwieldy and that other changes in structure that had been made should be allowed to proceed so that their effects could first be seen. He suggested that a lack of strong relationships was caused by all the members of this church and was not simply a problem of the churchwide organization, a view he said was shared by others in his synod and around this church, and stated that pastors and synodical officials had a responsibility for improving communication. Mr. Rank proposed that before moving to “sweeping, costly, disruptive changes, we need to go back from this assembly to our congregations and our synods and refocus our energies on improving communication.” He ended by saying that structures some people had wanted to see implemented 18 years before when this church was formed had not been adopted and probably would not be adopted, “so let’s get on with life.”

The Rev. Philip L. Hougen, bishop of the Southeastern Iowa Synod, supported the amendment, noting that one of the actions the assembly had taken had eliminated elected boards for the program units and that the assembly would no longer be electing persons from their synods to serve on these boards. He relayed that he came from a synod that had once gone 15 years without having a member serve on the Church Council and finally had received the opportunity for the previous two years to have a person on the council. That member, he said, had allowed his synod to feel connected, and had faithfully attended synod council meetings, where she received input from the synod and had reported back to them as well. He commented, “Our language about the churchwide expression as ‘them’ has changed because someone is there who is one of us.” He argued that the cost of this experience was “relatively light” and that the need to feel connected would be served “powerfully” by having one person from each synod on the Church Council. Bp. Hougen stated that these persons would still be elected by the assembly as an expression of the wider church but that the representation for each synod would allow for a stronger connection between members of this church and the churchwide expression. He also commented that going 36 years without a pastor—or, on the other hand, a layperson—from a given synod on the Church Council struck him as “unfortunate.” He concluded that Bp. Rogness’ amendment was a great improvement on the council’s proposal.
The Rev. Serena S. Sellers [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] spoke against the action, stating that, while she understood the desire for a feeling of connection with the Church Council, she saw a risk in having one person from each synod. Under the existing system, she said, when a person is elected to the council, it is as a member of this whole church and not as a member of his or her particular synod. Therefore, council members need to keep in mind what is good for this whole church. She feared that having one person from each synod on the council would lead to members who represent “one particular corner” of this church instead of being mindful of this whole church and who do not have this whole church at the heart of their decision making.

Mr. Jay R. Becklin [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] supported the amendment, seeing it as a proposal to build trust between the various units of this church. He recalled his experience in a business that had a similar organization of local units with boards of directors, statewide units, and a national unit to deal with national issues. He observed that when there was harmony, mutual support, and trust, things were accomplished. He noted that in his two years of service on his synod council, he had not met or even seen a Church Council member, which meant that for him, “there was no face to the church.” Mr. Becklin expressed his belief that such a point of contact was necessary.

Bishop Rogness’ amendment was subsequently adopted (Yes-499; No-453).

The assembly returned to its discussion of the governance proposal at a subsequent plenary session. Mr. Earl L. Mummert moved to divide the question so that paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 6 would be voted upon separately from paragraphs 4, 5, and 7. This measure was approved by the assembly, and paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 6 were adopted (CA05.06.21) without substantial discussion.

Discussion then returned paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 of the proposal, as amended, which required a two-thirds vote to adopt because of their constitutional implications.

The Rev. Jonathan L. Eilert, co-chair of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, reminded the assembly that the committee’s original response was to decline to recommend the proposed amendment to the governance proposal. He called attention to Motion J, which was before the assembly, and explained that, while the committee did not recommend the changes, if two-thirds of the assembly supported an expanded council, the committee would propose the required constitutional provisions in a first reading to begin the process of amending the constitution.

The Rev. William E. Rindy [Eastern North Dakota Synod] spoke of the importance of connecting members to the mission and of “bridging the disconnect” between congregational members and the wider church. He wondered how many voting members to the assembly could name or recognize one Church Council member whom they would feel comfortable approaching. He said that the amended proposal “would provide a recognizable face” and “one knowledgeable person” in each synod to interpret Church Council actions.

Mr. Jeff L. Kane [New England Synod] remarked that he was unclear about the implications and impact of the proposal on the polity of this church, in particular on the understanding that the Church Council is brought together to do the work of this whole church. While recognizing the need for council members to be known and to come from each of the geographical areas, he recommended that the assembly seek ways other than the amended proposal to accomplish the goals of bringing the churchwide expression closer to the members of this church. He added that the proposal would make finding nominees for council positions from the various representational categories more difficult.

Mr. Carlos E. Peña, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and chair of the Church Council, observed that the Church Council had not recommended Bp. Rogness’s proposal because council members understood that they were elected to serve this whole church, not just a single synod. He added that the council had explored several proposals, including those with councils of 33, 65, and even 128 members. The Church Council, after considering the matter, had decided that an expanded council would be too
large to be an effective deliberating body, he stated. In addition, he argued, a larger council would put more decisions into the hands of a smaller group, the Executive Committee.

The Rev. Phillip R. Nielsen [Nebraska Synod] indicated that the rationale for a change in governance included the opportunity to address a climate of mistrust and a perception of disconnect between congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization. He expressed a need “to do something obvious” to address the problem, and judged that the amended proposal was obvious. He added that if the expanded council proved unwieldy, “we can go back” to a smaller council. He challenged the notion that having council members from each synod would mean that the members would not be responsible to this whole church. He commented that “trust needs to go both ways” and that the ELCA “needs to trust the synods to provide good people” who can work for the good of this whole church.

The Rev. Gregory R. Pile, bishop of the Allegheny Synod, said that he had come to the assembly intending to support the full recommendation, but had changed his mind because of the amendments. He suggested that adding 32 people to the council would make decision-making more time-consuming and cumbersome and would afford “less opportunity to develop working relationships within the council” because of the limited time available to the council for its meetings. He pointed out that having a Church Council member did not automatically make a synod feel more connected to the churchwide expression.

The Rev. Philip L. Hougen, bishop of the Southeastern Iowa Synod, said he favored the proposal because of his experience in mission-support discussions. He declared that improvement of financial support for churchwide ministries could not be expected if business continued to be done in the same way. He added that expanding the council would be a “demonstrably positive effort” at showing that the churchwide expression was committed to being connected with all expressions of this church.

Mr. Earl L. Mummert [Lower Susquehanna Synod], member of the Church Council, commented that expanding the Church Council might help improve the sense of connectedness but would hamper the council’s work of administration and oversight. The Executive Committee would assume those functions by default, he stated. Mr. Mummert compared his service on the Church Council to his time on the board of directors of a large bank. He indicated that the bank had reduced the size of its board and eliminated its executive committee to improve decision-making and governance. He noted that the board of trustees of the Board of Pensions had also reduced its size in order to govern more effectively. He asked the assembly to allow time for the council’s proposals to be tested.

The Rev. Steven L. Ullestad, bishop of the Northeastern Iowa Synod, reported that Mr. Gary L. Wipperman, a Church Council member from his synod, also served as an advisory member to the Synod Council. In that capacity he had explained each body’s deliberations to the other and had helped to build a bridge between the two. Bp. Ullestad recommended implementing the amended proposal at the current assembly and reviewing it at the next assembly.

Ms. Linda J. Brown, a member of the Church Council for the past nine years, described the challenge facing members of the council. The amount of work was enormous. “Imagine receiving your Pre-Assembly Report twice a year,” she said. Due to increased expectations of council members, she expressed concern about finding candidates to serve who can leave their jobs and families twice a year for council meetings and at other times for synodical meetings.

Mr. John B. Litke [Metropolitan New York Synod] expressed his belief that the current structure worked well, balancing the synodical structure of the Conference of Bishops with the churchwide perspective of the Church Council. He pointed out that since some synods were 30 times larger than others, the proposal actually was not very representative. Adopting the amended proposal, he said, would create greater geographic disproportionality.

The Rev. Theodore “Ted” H. Rust [Northeastern Ohio Synod] expressed the view that
having each synod represented on the Church Council would demonstrate connectedness and serve this church as effectively as does the 65-member Conference of Bishops. The proposed council might result in an increase in mission-support income, he commented. He further suggested that a larger council would mean more opportunity for women and persons of color to be involved in the legislative aspects of this church.

Mr. David E. Laden [Saint Paul Area Synod], speaking as a member of his Synod Council, described the proposal, as amended, as “simple, straightforward, and easy to understand.” It also strengthened the connections and interdependence between this church’s expressions, in his opinion. He added that this church’s ability to fund its ministries would be positively affected by having in each synod a “direct conduit” to and from the Church Council.

Mr. Michael S. Schrey [Upper Susquehanna Synod] cautioned that having 65 members on the Church Council, each hoping to have his or her own say on each issue, would greatly lengthen council meetings. He asked rhetorically whether voting members intended to double the size of their Synod Councils and Congregation Councils in order to “improve connectedness.” Connectedness would come through each voting member and leader of this church intentionally building bridges in their congregations to the wider church, he asserted.

The Rev. William C. “Chris” Boerger, bishop of the Northwest Washington Synod, speaking in favor, remarked that it would be useful to have another person in a synod in addition to the bishop to help with communication and interpretation of churchwide decisions. He observed that sometimes “efficiency drives us to make decisions we regret.” He added that having more contributions to a conversation often leads to better decision-making and greater “ownership of decisions.”

Ms. Sally Wing [Northwest Washington Synod] affirmed that this church was not a federation of synods because each council member served this whole church. She described the difficulty in the nomination process of fulfilling the requirements of the ELCA’s representational principles, noting that computers were needed in order to achieve the necessary balance. The system, however, worked, and committees looked “like a rainbow” instead of being composed entirely of white males.

Mr. Paul Erickson [South Dakota Synod] questioned whether the current Church Council was truly representative of the membership of this church, when two-thirds of the membership of this church expressed opposition to changes in sexuality standards while the Church Council forwarded proposals recommending changes by a vote of 31–2. He would prefer elections to take place in the synods. “I trust the church, and I will trust the Church Council when it represents the entire body,” he declared.

Mr. Donald E. Lamprecht [Alaska Synod] expressed his view that the Church Council as currently constituted is representative. He pointed out that on the first two sexuality recommendations, the Churchwide Assembly had effectively returned to the recommendations of the Church Council.

The Rev. James M. Culver Jr. [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] argued that the proposal, as amended, “would strengthen the unity” of this church because of wider representation.

Ms. Barbara A. Keener [Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod], raising a point of clarification, asked what the effects of a failure to pass the proposal as amended would be on the size of the Church Council. Presiding Bishop Hanson responded that nothing would change. He added that the amended proposal would require a two-thirds vote to adopt because it involved a constitutional provision change.

Mr. Matthew L. Erickson [Southwest California Synod] inquired about the process for first and second readings of constitutional changes. Presiding Bishop Hanson referred the question to Secretary Lowell G. Almen. Secretary Almen explained that the assembly was about to vote on paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 as amended. If these provisions were approved, the Committee of Reference and Counsel would come back to the assembly with two constitutional amendments to be presented for a first reading. If they received approval by a
two-thirds majority, a second reading would take place at the 2007 Churchwide Assembly, and the amendments would require adoption at that point by another two-thirds vote. The secretary stressed, however, that the assembly at this moment was voting only on the recommendation. Should the assembly approve the recommendation, the constitutional provision changes necessitated by that approval would be put before the 2005 Churchwide Assembly at a later point in its business.

Mr. Erickson clarified that the process meant that the Church Council would not expand immediately. Presiding Bishop Hanson affirmed Mr. Erickson’s understanding, saying that any change would take place only if the 2007 Churchwide Assembly ratified the constitutional amendments by a two-thirds margin.

The chair then called for a vote on paragraphs 4, 5, and 7. The amended motion, by a vote of Yes-464; No-505, failed to receive the required two-thirds.

Mr. John D. Litke [Metropolitan New York Synod] inquired about the status of the governance proposal now that paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 had failed to pass in any form. The chair requested that Secretary Almen address the question. Secretary Almen responded that what was in place were the amended constitutional and bylaw changes, which had not contained any change in the size of the Church Council but had contained some changes concerning advisory members of the council. The Church Council would examine the Churchwide Assembly’s actions and determine if further action were required.
Appendix A: Polity and Governance

Polity may be defined briefly as the form of organization and government of a church body. The pattern of polity is informed by ecclesiology (doctrine of the Church). The system of church governance and “legislative” decision-making, in turn, is shaped by the polity of the church body.

Primary keys to understanding the polity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are provisions 5.01. and 8.11. in this church’s constitution:

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall be one church. This church recognizes that all power and authority in the Church belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ, its head. Therefore, all actions of this church by congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization shall be carried out under his rule and authority . . . .

This church shall seek to function as people of God through congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization, all of which shall be interdependent. Each part, while fully the church, recognizes that it is not the whole church and therefore lives in a partnership relationship with the others.

Purposes of This Church

The commitments of each expression are reflected in the purposes of this church, which are stated in the constitutions of each expression:

1. To proclaim God’s saving Gospel;
2. To carry out Christ’s Great Commission;
3. To serve in response to God’s love to meet human needs;
4. To worship God;
5. To nurture members in the Word of God; and
6. To manifest the unity given to the people of God.

Description of Purposes

This church seeks to participate in God’s mission in the world through the practice of these purposes, which are stated in churchwide constitutional provision 4.02. [†S6.02. in the Constitution for Synods and *C4.02. in the Model Constitution for Congregations] as follows:

a. Proclaim God’s saving Gospel of justification by grace for Christ’s sake through faith alone, according to the apostolic witness in the Holy Scripture, preserving and transmitting the Gospel faithfully to future generations.
b. Carry out Christ’s Great Commission by reaching out to all people to bring them to faith in Christ and by doing all ministry with a global awareness consistent with the understanding of God as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of all.
c. Serve in response to God’s love to meet human needs, caring for the sick and the aged, advocating dignity and justice for all people, working for peace and reconciliation among the nations, and standing with the poor and powerless and committing itself to their needs.
d. Worship God in proclamation of the Word and administration of the sacraments and through lives of prayer, praise, thanksgiving, witness, and service.
e. Nurture its members in the Word of God so as to grow in faith and hope and love, to see daily life as the primary setting for the exercise of their Christian calling, and to use the gifts of the Spirit for their life together and for their calling in the world.
f. Manifest the unity given to the people of God by living together in the love of Christ and by joining with other Christians in prayer and action to express and preserve the unity which the Spirit gives.5

**Commitments**

The mutual commitments of congregations, synods, and churchwide ministries are described in this way:

In faithful participation in the mission of God in and through this church, congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization—as interdependent expressions of this church—shall be guided by the biblical and confessional commitments of this church. Each shall recognize that mission efforts must be shaped by both local needs and global awareness, by both individual witness and corporate endeavor, and by both distinctly Lutheran emphases and growing ecumenical cooperation.6

**Common Responsibility of Partners**

Since congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization are partners that share in God’s mission, all share in the responsibility to develop, implement, and strengthen the financial support program of this church.7

**Responsibilities of Congregations**

The congregation shall include in its mission a life of worship and nurture for its members, and outreach in witness and service to its community.8

A congregation is a community of baptized persons whose existence depends on the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments and whose purpose is to worship God, to nurture its members, and to reach out in witness and service to the world. To this end it assembles regularly for worship and nurture, organizes and carries out ministry to its people and neighborhood, and cooperates with and supports the wider church to strive for the fulfillment of God’s mission in the world.9

**Primary Duties of Each Synod**

The synod shall provide for pastoral care of the congregations, ordained ministers, associates in ministry, deaconesses, and diaconal ministers within its boundaries. It shall develop resources for the life and mission of its people and shall enlarge the ministries and extend the outreach into society on behalf of and in connection with the congregations and the churchwide organization.10

**Tasks of the Churchwide Organization**

The churchwide organization shall implement the extended mission of the Church, developing churchwide policies in consultation with the synods and congregations, entering into relationship with governmental, ecumenical, and societal agencies in accordance with accepted resolutions or in response to specific agreed-upon areas of responsibility.11

---

5Provision 4.02.

6Provision 8.16.

7Provision 8.15.

8Provision 8.12.

9Provision 9.11.

10Provision 8.13.

Not Same, but Somewhat Similar

The polity and pattern of governance in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is not the same as that of the three predecessor church bodies. Yet that “legislative” decision-making system is similar to that of The American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church in America, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches.

**AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH:** The American Lutheran Church (ALC), formed in 1960, used the following definition of membership: “The membership of The American Lutheran Church shall consist of congregations. The requirements for membership shall be: a. The profession of a common faith. b. The acceptance of this Constitution and its Bylaws. c. Participation in the program of activity approved by this Church” (Provision 6.11. in the Constitution and Bylaws of The American Lutheran Church). Likewise, in the ALC district constitution, this definition was provided: “The membership of the district shall be composed of congregations” (D5.10. in the District Constitution). Further, the following was stipulated in ALC provision 4.13.: “Congregations…pledge themselves to assure…[the ALC] the human authority, power, and resources needed to carry out its purpose as set forth in this Constitution. The American Lutheran Church pledges itself to use its authority, power, and resources both to serve its congregations directly and to serve their interests in those spheres where congregations cannot act effectively alone…."

Strictly speaking, neither the districts nor the national office of The American Lutheran Church were seen as possessing any legitimate ecclesial (i.e., churchly) character in themselves. Their functions were only delegated ones from congregations. Only congregations were seen as “church,” as reflected in The American Lutheran Church’s constitution and bylaws. As a further indication of this understanding, the word, “pastor,” was defined and restricted to “a member of the clergy serving a parish” (ALC bylaw 7.22.12.).

Constitutional amendments adopted by a two-thirds vote at the ALC’s General Convention were submitted to congregations. Each congregation had one vote, determined by a majority, to approve or disapprove of the amendment. Amendments were declared approved if favored by two-thirds of the votes cast during a six-month period (ALC constitution 20.21., 20.22., and 20.23.). Few constitutional amendments were considered in the ALC. Bylaws constituted most of that church’s government documents.

**LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA:** By contrast, the membership of the Lutheran Church in America (LCA), formed in 1962, was defined in this way: “This church shall consist . . . of the congregations and ordained ministers . . .” (Article III, Section 1, of the constitution of the Lutheran Church in America). Further, it was provided that: “Congregations and ordained ministers when organized into a synod may through such synod unite with this church upon application for membership, subscription to this constitution including its Confession of Faith, and acceptance . . . at a convention of this church” (Article III, Section 3 of the LCA constitution). The definition of the Lutheran Church in America “was heavily influenced by Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, who called together Lutheran clergy and lay people to found the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1748. The former United Lutheran Church in America continued this focus, and it was reinforced by the former Augustana Lutheran Church when the LCA was formed . . . ,” Edgar R. Trexler wrote in Anatomy of a Merger, page 167.

**ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCHES:** The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (AELC), formed in 1976 in a separation from The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS), defined itself less as a church body and more as a free association. This both carried forward the strong congregational polity of the LCMS and also reflected the turmoil out of which the AELC was formed. That turmoil led to strong suspicions of vesting any authority anywhere other than in each congregation alone.

In the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, as the governing documents demonstrate, is committed to living and practicing the faith that we confess together. Therefore, the members of the ELCA are dedicated to partnership and interdependence as a church. So we
see in this declaration: “The congregations, synods, and churchwide organization shall act in accordance with the Confession of Faith set forth in Chapter 2 of this constitution and with the Statement of Purpose set forth in Chapter 4.”

The congregations, synods, and churchwide organization are each fully “church,” as we noted earlier. Yet, we also noted that each is not, when separate from one another, the whole “church.” These twin acknowledgments need to be held together by those who embrace the ecclesiology and polity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

That commitment to unity is underscored in the definition of membership in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Indeed, who does belong to this church? “The members of this church shall be the baptized members of its congregations,” the ELCA’s churchwide constitutional provision on membership declares. This means that the members of this church work together in their respective congregations, those 10,766 basic centers for mission through which members are nurtured in the Word of God as proclaimed and taught, washed and nourished through the sacraments, and sent into the journey of ministry in their daily lives. Those same members join hands with other members for the sake of the shared ministry that the people of this church undertake together through the respective synods and through the churchwide organization.

**Nature of the Church**

Within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the “Nature of the Church” is defined in the governing documents, as follows:

The Church exists both as an inclusive fellowship and as local congregations gathered for worship and Christian service.

1. Congregations find their fulfillment in the universal community of the Church, and the universal Church exists in and through congregations.

2. This church, therefore, derives its character and powers both
   a. from the sanction and representation of its congregations and
   b. from its inherent nature as an expression of the broader fellowship of the faithful.

3. In length, it acknowledges itself to be in the historic continuity of the communion of saints;
   [and]

4. In breadth, it expresses the fellowship of believers and congregations in our day.

Some individuals mistakenly have assumed that this 99-word paragraph is the only statement of the ecclesiology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, as contained in this church’s governing documents. It is not!

The use of that provision in the ELCA constitution, when coupled with the other constitutional definitions of the ELCA’s ecclesiology, represented a significant development. That provision moved the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America toward a broader, deeper, and more historically and confessionally grounded understanding. It acknowledged this church’s “inherent nature” as a reflection of the one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. Likewise, this church’s “historic continuity” with the whole Church universal, thereby, was underscored.

---

12 Provision 5.01.a.

13 Provision 6.01.

14 Provision 3.02. Emphasis added, and sections numbered for clarity.
Further, the provision on the “Nature of the Church” and related ones (such as 5.01, 8.11, and others) recognized that ecclesial (that is, churchly) reality does not reside exclusively in separate congregations, as necessary and strategic as each one is. The ELCA is a church body, not a random association of self-contained communities of faith. Thus, the churchly reality abiding also in the expressions known as synods and the churchwide organization is embraced.

Provision 3.02. itself does have an interesting history. It was copied from the constitution of the Lutheran Church in America (LCA). It was inserted as a new chapter in the ELCA constitution at the final meeting of the Commission for a New Lutheran Church (CNLC), held in Seattle June 23–25, 1986. The addition was made in response to concerns expressed by LCA synodical bishops and by the LCA Executive Council. They had worried publicly and officially about the “new church” succumbing to “congregationalism.” In the late spring of 1986, LCA Bishop James R. Crumley Jr. wrote to LCA pastors, arguing that “the solid embodiment in an ecclesiastical entity of our self-understanding and self-identity as Lutherans” was crucial for moving forward.

The new chapter that was added at the Seattle CNLC meeting was an exact quotation of Article IV, Section 2, in the constitution of the Lutheran Church in America. Although a highly significant addition, the text of the provision was inserted without debate and with support of representatives of the two other merging bodies, The American Lutheran Church (ALC) and The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (AELC).

Within a Wider Context

That crucial text of Chapter 3 of the ELCA constitution anchors the three primary expressions of this church—congregations, synods, and churchwide organization—within the context of the whole Church of Jesus Christ.

If Chapter 3 in the ELCA’s churchwide constitution on the “Nature of the Church” is viewed in isolation, it appears to present only a bipolar description of “Church” as congregations and the whole Church catholic. The ELCA’s ecclesiology and polity, however, cannot be fully understood through exclusively focusing on that chapter. The chapter must be read in the context of ELCA constitution Chapter 5 on organization, Chapter 6 on membership, Chapter 7 on ministry, Chapter 8 on relationships (especially constitutional provision 8.11.), Chapter 9 on congregations, Chapter 10 on synods, Chapter 11 on the churchwide organization, and related provisions. Seen together, these sections offer a portrait of this church’s ecclesiology and polity. In turn, the pattern of governance and decision-making reflects responsibilities assigned to each primary expression of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

The conviction that the congregations, synods, and churchwide organization are each fully the church but, in themselves, not the whole church represents a gigantic step for some members and leaders throughout the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The individualism reflected by certain immigrant strands of North American Lutheran history and the continuing individualistic spirit within U.S. society militate against a churchly awareness. Lutherans in America are not alone in facing this challenge, however. Yet the polity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America points to a deep awareness of unity and interdependence within the life of this church and, indeed, the whole Church.

---

15Provision 5.01. reads: “The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall be one church. This church recognizes that all power and authority in the Church belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ, its head. Therefore, all actions of this church by congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization shall be carried out under his rule and authority. . . .”

16Provision 8.11. affirms: “This church shall seek to function as people of God through congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization, all of which shall be interdependent. Each part, while fully the church, recognizes that it is not the whole church and therefore lives in a partnership relationship with the others.”

17Based on the author’s personal notes. See also Edgar R. Trelxler, Anatomy of a Merger (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1991), pages 165ff.
Current Pattern in ELCA

Within the ELCA, responsibility for particular types of decisions are assigned to the three primary expressions.

Congregations: Congregation meetings call pastors, elect members of the Congregation Council, conduct elections for other positions in the congregation, adopt budgets, and make other decisions concerning the internal life of that congregation.

Synod Assemblies: Synod Assemblies elect officers, members of the Synod Council, and others; adopt budgets and resolutions; and conduct other legislative business appropriate for the assembly.

Churchwide Assembly: The Churchwide Assembly elects officers, members of the Church Council, and others for churchwide boards and committees; adopts budgets; acts on memorials submitted by Synod Assemblies; considers resolutions from voting members; votes on church-to-church proposals and other matters affecting the national and international relationships of this church; and adopts by a two-thirds vote the text of social statements that have been prepared by task forces and distributed widely for study and comment throughout this church before submission to the assembly.

Other Models

Perhaps the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) operates with the closest model to what these resolutions and memorials are requesting. Yet the Presbyterian pattern does not provide for congregational or regional referenda on social statements.

In the Presbyterian pattern of governance, amendments to the Book of Order (ELCA parallel, constitution) require approval by a majority of the presbytery assemblies (ELCA parallel, Synod Assemblies).

In the Presbyterian system, however, adoption of social statements rests with the Presbyterian General Assembly (ELCA parallel, Churchwide Assembly). The same situation for adoption of social statements prevails in the governance and decision-making structures of other full-communion partner church bodies.

Principles in the polity of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) include:

Presbyters [elders and ministers of Word and Sacrament] are not simply to reflect the will of the people, but rather to seek together to find and represent the will of Christ;

Decisions shall be reached in governing bodies by vote, following opportunity for discussion, and a majority shall govern;

A higher governing body shall have the right of review and control over a lower one and shall have power to determine matters of controversy upon reference, complaint, or appeal; [and]

Governing bodies possess whatever administrative authority is necessary to give effect to duties and powers assigned by the Constitution of the church.18

Further, within the polity of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is this provision:

All governing bodies of the [Presbyterian] church are united by the nature of the church and share with one another responsibilities, rights, and powers as provided in this Constitution. The governing bodies are separate and independent, but have such mutual relations that the act of one of them is the act of the whole church performed by it through the appropriate governing body. The jurisdiction of each governing body is limited by the express provisions of the Constitution, with powers not mentioned being reserved to the presbyteries, and with the acts of each subject to

---

propose amendments [to the Book of Order] must be approved by the General Assembly and transmitted to the presbyteries for their vote.\textsuperscript{20}

When the next ensuing General Assembly shall have received written advice that a proposed amendment to the Book of Order has received the affirmative votes of a majority of all the presbyteries, the General Assembly shall declare the amendment made.\textsuperscript{21}

Responsibilities of Churchwide Assembly

Provision 12.21. in the Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America lists the responsibilities of the Churchwide Assembly:

The Churchwide Assembly shall:

a. Review the work of the churchwide officers, and for this purpose require and receive reports from them and act on business proposed by them.

b. Review the work of the churchwide units, and for this purpose require and receive reports from them and act on business proposed by them.

c. Receive and consider proposals from Synod Assemblies.

d. Establish churchwide policy.

e. Adopt a budget for the churchwide organization.

f. Elect officers, board members, and other persons as provided in the constitution or bylaws.

g. Establish churchwide units to carry out the functions of the churchwide organization.

h. Have the sole authority to amend the constitution and bylaws.

i. Fulfill other functions as required in the constitution and bylaws.

j. Conduct such other business as necessary to further the purposes and functions of the churchwide organization.\textsuperscript{22}

Establishment of churchwide policy is one of the basic duties of the Churchwide Assembly.

Observations on Process

Widespread discussion of proposed social statements and certain general policies within congregations and throughout synods, especially in Synod Assemblies, merits greater attention. This represents a crucial step prior to consideration of certain issues in the Churchwide Assembly.

A ratification process would be difficult to define. Some of the synodical resolutions reflect concern over the decisions related to issues of sexuality that were mandated by the 2001 Churchwide Assembly. Ratification of constitution amendments would have nothing to do with such decisions.

Further, a ratification process would alter significantly the underlying polity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America—a polity that merits deeper understanding in the nurture of greater ecclesial awareness of this church’s ministry and purposes.

The 2003 Churchwide Assembly voted (CA03.06.21):

To acknowledge that the subject of the memorials of the Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod, the South Dakota Synod, the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin, the Northwestern
Minnesota Synod, the Northeastern Minnesota Synod, and the Minneapolis Area Synod has been studied by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, with a detailed response already having been provided by the Church Council; and

To affirm the April 2003 response of the Church Council (CC03.04.03) as the response of the 2003 Churchwide Assembly to the memorials of the Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod, the South Dakota Synod, the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin, the Northwestern Minnesota Synod, the Northeastern Minnesota Synod, and the Minneapolis Area Synod:

To acknowledge with gratitude the resolutions of the Montana Synod, South Dakota Synod, Southwestern Minnesota Synod, and Southeastern Minnesota Synod related to potential ratification processes;

To request that the secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America convey the background information and analysis related to those resolutions to the four synods as the response of the Church Council;

To affirm the importance of widespread study and discussion of proposed social statements and major policy directions throughout the congregations and synods prior to their consideration by the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;

To acknowledge that in congregations, synods, the churchwide organization, and related institutions and agencies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the people of faith face the ongoing task of reflecting on issues within the life of the whole Church while practicing a spirit of unity and commitment to mutual understanding; and

To urge renewed reflection for a deeper understanding of the work of the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the ways in which this church is called to engage in study, discussion, and decision-making; and

To encourage the Conference of Bishops, the Church Council, synod councils, and all members of this church to maintain, strengthen, and promote trust and communication throughout this church.
Appendix B: 2005 Governance Proposal: Rationale

Many steps have been taken to engage the members of this church in the discussion about this church’s governance.\textsuperscript{23} We are particularly thankful to all those people who responded to questionnaires, including current and former members of the Church Council; synodical bishops and officers; pastors and congregation council presidents; members of boards and committees for the churchwide units of the ELCA; and the presidents of this church’s social ministry organizations, seminaries, and colleges and universities.

This church’s current system of governance has a number of strengths, including its ability to foster widespread participation, giving many people an opportunity for greater involvement in this church beyond their own congregation.... This system, however, also has some weaknesses, particularly the perception that it is complicated, unresponsive, and confusing. It has not realized fully its potential for interdependent ministry—congregations, synods, institutions, agencies, and the churchwide organization supporting each other and working together in mission—that was envisioned for it by the framers of this church.

Research conducted at the request of the Executive Committee of the Church Council shows that most members of this church are satisfied with the governance system in spite of its perceived weaknesses. On any given aspect of governance, the majority of respondents to a recent survey support the current system. Moreover, voting members of the 2003 Churchwide Assembly defeated a number of specific proposals for changing this church’s governance procedures, including synodical ratification of policy and governing documents and congregational ratification of ecumenical agreements and ministry standards. This would suggest that significant changes are not in order, and that changes, which potentially would satisfy some, would in turn likely make others dissatisfied, in equal or even greater numbers. Acknowledging this dilemma, the Executive Committee nevertheless believes that some changes in governance would strengthen this church for mission and accordingly have incorporated these proposed changes into this document.

Research indicates that some people who are dissatisfied with this church’s governance system believe that decisions do not reflect adequately the views of the majority and that the majority’s views are diluted by this church’s representational principles.\textsuperscript{24} On the other hand, at least two-thirds or more of those who responded to questionnaires favor continued use of the representational principles. The ELCA governing documents specifically state that “it shall be the responsibility of the Church Council to assure that this church maintain its commitment to inclusive representation” (bylaw 19.11.01.a.).

These principles ensure that a broad cross-section of members of this church participate in deliberations and decisions. Further, these principles reflect, to some degree, the biblical visions for the body of Christ, with all parts being seen as important for the well-being of the whole body.

To some, these principles feel quite different from past experience. Actually, principles of representation are not new for Lutherans in North America. The current principles reflect how we in this church at this time have chosen to order our life together. These principles have had an important, positive impact on the life of this church. Their existence has enabled

\textsuperscript{23}The process included discussion with the Conference of Bishops and the Cabinet of Executives and Administrative Team in the churchwide office. Two survey instruments involved identified leaders throughout this church, including seminary and colleges presidents, members of churchwide boards and steering committees, synodical vice presidents, synod councils, churchwide staff, and a random sample of congregation presidents. The second of the two surveys showed responses to an initial draft document. In preparation for the comprehensive report, churchwide boards and steering committees were invited to provide formal responses to the document.

At its November 2004 meeting, the Church Council voted (CC04.11.49) to receive the final report and recommendations related to the governance of the churchwide organization and to express gratitude to the leaders of this church who participated in the surveys in the development of this report and recommendations.

\textsuperscript{24}The representational principles, defined in constitutional provision 5.01.f., provide that, within assemblies, councils, boards, and committees, “at least 60 percent of the members . . . shall be laypersons; that as nearly as possible, 50 percent of the lay members . . . shall be female and 50 percent shall be male, and that, where possible, the representation of ordained ministers shall be both female and male. At least 10 percent of the members . . . shall be persons of color and/or persons whose primary language is other than English.”
a wider variety of people to step forward and share their gifts who may not have done so in the absence of these principles. The principles also represent a wholesome reminder that this church is not diverse racially and has not reached its goal of at least 10 percent members who are persons of color or language other than English. Adding new voices may prompt some to feel other voices are no longer heard. This tension is recognized, but it should not undermine this church’s commitment to inclusive representation.

On the Church Council

The recommendations of the Executive Committee of the Church Council regarding the Church Council are based on concern for the council’s effectiveness as a deliberating body. They also reflect the committee’s conviction that council voting members serve this whole church. The Executive Committee does not recommend a larger council, because it believes a larger council would inevitably lead to more decisions being made by a smaller group of people—namely, the Executive Committee. The recommendations respond to perceived weaknesses in the current system by giving synodical assemblies responsibility for nominating council voting members and by expanding the number of advisory voices at the table.

Proposals

1. The Church Council would remain at its current size of 33 members plus the four officers (presiding bishop, vice president, secretary, and treasurer).

2. Beginning with the 2005–2006 biennium, Church Council voting members would be nominated through synodical assemblies and elected by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly. Thereafter, 11 would be elected at each Churchwide Assembly. Synods would conduct the nomination process by whatever means they desired, so that the result would be two nominees going forward to the Churchwide Assembly, where one would be elected. There would be no nominations from the floor of the Churchwide Assembly for these positions. The representational principles would be upheld via a rotational system throughout all the synods. Likewise, a rotational system will provide that a synod will have one voting member on the Church Council for one six-year term followed by a six-year term without a voting member on the Church Council. Information about the nominees, more extensive than is currently the case and including answers to selected questions, would be printed in the Pre-Assembly Report.

3. In addition to the current advisory members (one synodical bishop from each of the nine regions and two youth members), the following also would become advisory members to the Church Council:
   a) the presidents of the five ethnic associations or their representatives;
   b) the chairs of the program committees of the five churchwide program units and also the separately-incorporated program units, i.e., Augsburg Fortress, Publishers, and Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
   c) the chair of the consulting committee on work on behalf of women; and
   d) one representative from this church’s seminaries, one from the colleges and universities, and one from the social ministry organizations, chosen through those institutions’ umbrella organizations.

Advisory members would participate in the committees of the council, where they would have the most opportunity to help shape the work and decisions of the council. The purposes of advisory members are to interpret to this church the policies, goals, and outcomes established by the council; to shape the work of their committees, synods, and organizations around those policies, goals, and outcomes; and to bring ideas, issues, and expertise to the council and its work. The list of those included as advisors is undergirded by constitutional provisions 8.30. and following, and by provision 16.22.A00.

Church Council voting members would be encouraged to interact with synods in their region in various ways, including attending at least one synodical council meeting per year,
visiting congregations, and participating in synodical assemblies, especially in years when a synod is nominating people to the Church Council. These suggestions would be incorporated into the position description of the duties of a Church Council voting member, which is being developed by the council’s task force on board development, and would be articulated during orientation of new board members. The Church Council is developing a plan for members to interact with synods that do not currently have a voting member on the council.

Synods will continue to interact with the Church Council through the significant role played by the nine advisory bishops. Synods also will be encouraged to interact more regularly with the Church Council. Among the ways this interaction could occur are the following:

1) invite Church Council voting members to synodical council meetings where they could both listen to synodical concerns and present council perspectives on upcoming or previous actions;
2) share regularly synodical council agendas, minutes, and newsletters with Church Council voting members;
3) invite Church Council voting members to write a column in the synodical newsletter; and
4) invite Church Council voting members to synodical assemblies, where they could both listen to synodical concerns and present council perspectives on upcoming or previous actions. In years when the synodical assembly is nominating people for the Church Council, the current member could talk to the assembly about the duties of a council voting member. The position description for council voting members would be distributed to the synodical assembly members.

**Rationale**

1. These proposals try to bridge the expressed disconnect between the Church Council and synods. Church Council voting members, both voting and advisory, are trying to build relationships between the churchwide organization and synods, congregations, and institutions and agencies. Church Council voting members want to be in conversation and relationship with these mission partners, opening lines of communication that extend in both directions—from synods and congregations to the churchwide organization, as well as from the churchwide organization to synods and congregations. Council voting members want to have a role in interpreting the mission of this church to synods and congregations, while also listening to their concerns. Part of this communication is the need for everyone to become better informed—on one hand about the work of the churchwide organization, and on the other about the needs, desires, and attitudes of synods and congregations. The hope is that increased and improved communication, shared information, and intentional dialogue would lead to decisions that will serve more people. The goal is that the members of this church would become contributors to the decision-making process rather than reactors to it.

2. The proposals also address the Church Council’s strong support for the representational principles. The council believes that achieving those principles is a matter for this entire church, including synods, which would nominate Church Council voting members in rotation according to representational categories.

3. The proposals address the synods’ desire for voting membership, even though not every synod would have a voting member on the Church Council at the same time. A rotational system will provide that a synod will have one voting member on the Church council for one six-year term followed by a six-year term without a voting member on the Church Council. The desire for voting membership is also addressed through synod nomination of two candidates for Church Council, one of whom would be elected. This proposed change allows synods and voting members to the Churchwide Assembly to know the candidates better. Better knowledge of candidates also would be served by having fuller biographical information available in the *Pre-Assembly Report*.

4. The Church Council continues to affirm that a council voting member serves on behalf of this whole church.
5. The expansion of the council through advisory members allows more voices to be heard.

6. The proposals continue this church’s commitments to multicultural ministry and work on behalf of women while integrating them more thoroughly into this church.

The Executive Committee is not recommending that the language of §10.01.a be changed to require Church Council participation in meetings of synodical councils. The reasons for this recommendation include recognition that council voting members’ participation may be limited due to cost, time involved, and distance (in some regions). This recommendation also encourages synods to take responsibility for this aspect of relationship-building. This recommendation should be seen as an opportunity for synods to use Church Council voting members as resources and partners.
Report of the Treasurer

The Office of the Treasurer manages the financial, business, information technologies, and building management affairs of the churchwide organization. The governing description of this office appears in constitutional provision 13.50, (and following) and continuing resolution 13.52.A.05. Two functional areas of the churchwide organization report to the Office of the Treasurer: Information Technology and Management Services. Reports on activities and major directions for these areas are included in this report.

The Office of the Treasurer serves to support the mission of ELCA congregations, synods and the churchwide organization. The Office of the Treasurer has concentrated its efforts on improving efficiency and effectiveness, including continued strengthening of internal controls, while looking for ways to decrease costs for infrastructure and thereby maximize dollars available for mission. Major areas of concentration include:

Internal Audit

- **Regional Audit Program**: The implementation of a regional office audit program has led to the strengthening of controls governing each of the nine regions, especially in the area of controls over bank accounts and segregation of duties.
- **Synod and Congregation Assistance**: Resources were provided on the elca.org Web page giving assistance to synods and congregations with respect to reviewing internal controls and setting up an ongoing internal audit process. Special assistance was offered to one synod with a fraud investigation.
- **Data Security**: facilitation of the Data Security Committee that has focused its efforts in the following areas:
  1. Conducting ongoing staff education seminars in the importance of data security;
  2. Identifying and addressing control weaknesses in the remote access program;
  3. Setting up a program to ensure controls over systems access has led to improvements (this has been completed for the Raiser's Edge system and staff is now working on other applications);
  4. Identifying a vendor and testing a product that will allow for increased scrutiny of all IT intrusion incidents; and
  5. Identifying a solution for protecting confidential data downloaded to portable media devices (e.g., laptops, flash drives) to be presented to management no later than May 1, 2008.
- **Critical Vendors**: Designing and implementing a program to identify all critical vendors and obtaining and reviewing SAS 70 reports from each to ensure the vendors’ internal controls meet our standards.
- **Operation Audits**: Scheduled reviews of financial operations of the churchwide organization to ensure accuracy, controls, and proper processes to safeguard this church’s assets. Current emphases include assisting the Information Technologies section to ensure all findings from the IT operations audit report are resolved in a timely manner.

Lutheran Center Workshops

In 2008, the Office of the Treasurer has initiated a series of learning opportunities for all staff in the Lutheran Center. The office is coordinating workshops in the areas of accounting, audit, budget, data security, technology, and financial planning. The fifteen workshops scheduled for the first five months of 2008 include eleven different topics. Certificates are issued to staff members who attend; they are eligible for continuing education credits. Evaluations indicate that these workshops have been well-received and applicable to the attendees’ work with the churchwide organization. Some workshops will be repeated and new workshops will be developed and offered in the second half of 2008.
Responding to the Blue Ribbon Committee Report

One of the recommendations in the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding report is for the churchwide organization to provide expanded acknowledgment of local giving. The wide range of reporting capabilities of the Raiser’s Edge system will allow for the gathering of information on giving by synod, whether sent through the synod or directly by the congregation. Another aspect that will enhance the information gathering is for synods to utilize fully the current synod remittance advice system (SRAS). This Excel-based program allows synods to import their monthly detailed remittance information from their financial system into an Excel spreadsheet program. The program validates, calculates, and summarizes the imported data and generates the details, which then are sent electronically to the Office of the Treasurer. The system greatly decreases staff time for processing information and increases accuracy. In order to meet this goal, it will be necessary to garner greater participation by synods; currently, only thirty-nine synods are using the system.

Synod Budget Forms

The Conference of Bishops regularly has expressed a desire that the churchwide organization provide comparable information on synod spending. There is a form that synods are asked to complete that would provide the information for comparisons. However, there is not yet full participation by the synods. In February, the Conference of Bishops reaffirmed both their desire to obtain this data and their commitment to provide it in a timely manner. The Office of the Treasurer will be working with Synodical Relations to achieve 100 percent submissions of these forms. This will form the basis for a deeper conversation related to appropriate levels for sharing of mission support income.

Services to Units

The Office of the Treasurer strives continually to enhance the service and financial information provided to the units of the churchwide organization. Some enhancements made over the past year include:

• A new budget planning worksheet developed for use by program directors that shows three prior years of actual expenses to help units more accurately prepare detailed budgets.

• A new UPS system developed to decrease invoice processing time from the previous 4-6 hours to 10 minutes. This process codes journal entries to the proper accounts, produces check requests for payments of invoices, and sends e-mails to units informing them of their UPS charges.

• Initiated the use of debit cards for the first time at the 2007 Churchwide Assembly, alleviating the need to issue per diem checks for every voting member. This system has been expanded for use at other large events.

• For the first time, the responsibility of all financial processing for the Youth Gathering will be handled by the Office of the Treasurer staff. New procedures and reports have been developed in cooperation with the Youth Gathering staff that will greatly facilitate the financial management of this event.

Leadership Transition

LaRue Unglaube, executive for information technology, has announced her retirement effective May 31, 2008, following nearly 20 years of outstanding service to the churchwide organization. The position has been posted and I will be coordinating closely with the Executive for Administration to select the next leader for this section, which is so critical to the efficient and effective operation of the churchwide organization. A general IT assessment is underway and the results of the assessment also will give some direction regarding future leadership of the IT section. I am grateful for the opportunity to have worked with LaRue and give thanks for the competency and commitment that she brought to all areas of her work.
Summary of Section Activities

Information Technology
Submitted by: Ms. LaRue Unglaube

The treasurer shall provide for information technology in support of the work of this church and the operation of Chicago-based churchwide units. In so doing, the treasurer shall have an executive for information technology, appointed by the treasurer, who shall be responsible for the development and review of guidelines and policies for computer standards, security of electronic data, application development, data storage and data retrieval, and shall enable use of electronic technologies for churchwide staff to assist in support of congregations, synods, and related institutions and agencies of this church (13.52.B05.).

IT Assessment

Virchow Krause was chosen to assist the organization in a high level assessment of the work of this section. The assessment was initiated in February and a final report is expected by mid-April 2008.

The purpose of this assessment is to ensure that all technology functions are well-managed from financial, control, and service perspectives, and that the best infrastructure is in place to ensure that decisions related to the technology needs of the organization move it forward in meeting the strategic directions.

SiteCore and NetCommunity

The Information Technology section (IT) has worked with Communication Services and Development Services on the implementation of NetCommunity and its link to Raiser’s Edge. Blackbaud NetCommunity will enable the ELCA to build stronger relationships by creating a personalized online experience for this church’s constituents, resulting in an expanded network of support. This Website management solution enables the organization to create an interactive online network, fostering a sense of lifelong connectivity with the churchwide organization and significantly reducing the amount of time and money ELCA staff must spend on administrative tasks and data entry. Best of all, it seamlessly integrates with the Raiser's Edge fundraising software, so that there will be a single source of up-to-date information across the entire organization.

The implementation of Sitecore (content management system for elca.org) also has required many hours of collaboration with Communication Services to meet their target date of April 28, 2008 for the public launch of the new format. This system has been a major project for the IT application development staff and senior network analyst.

Endowments System (EDS)

Trust Processor, a financial system provided by HWA, was selected as the replacement for the current endowment management system. The system has been installed and HWA is providing training for the Foundation accounting staff and one IT programmer. Data conversion will start after the training is completed. The Foundation plans to go live with this system in 2008.

Integrated Database Application (IDA)

This Web application is being developed for the purpose of integrating Raiser's Edge data with other data maintained by the ELCA churchwide organization. The Vocation and Education pilot project has been completed. The Office of the Secretary’s list of churchwide committee members, synod bishops and assistants, and Church Council members and advisors are the next databases planned for integration with Raiser’s Edge. Planning has started for that project.
Integrated Financial and Administrative Solution

The Integrated Financial and Administrative Solution (IFAS) is an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution that enables the organization to create efficiencies utilizing Web architecture, workflow technology, and integrated reporting to empower administrators and end users. It is the core financial and accounting system of the ELCA. The IFAS Web-based version is the next major upgrade of IFAS. This project entails two major efforts:

- Migration from UNIX server and Informix database to Windows Web servers and SQL server database
- Upgrading IFAS to a Web-based version with installation of new modules: bank reconciliation, IFAS workflow, documents online, and IFAS budgeting.

People and Places 2.0 (Mobility Database Project)

This is an upgrade to a Web application that currently allows lay rostered leaders to post their mobility forms for synods to share. The new version, searchable only by synods, will allow all rostered leaders to file mobility forms online. It also will allow congregations and other ministries to post jobs that can be searched by anyone if approved by synods. The project team plans to launch this Web application by November 2008. The Conference of Bishops expressed much appreciation for the new system.

Software solutions based on recommendation from the internal audit

iPrism was selected as a solution for the internal audit finding that employee internet usage reporting was lacking. This solution has been installed and is 90 percent implemented. IT has worked closely with Human Resources (HR) on the implementation of this product with HR taking the lead in the employee use of this tool.

The IT network team also has selected a product that will consolidate log data from many sources in one place, allow reporting on changes made to the network hardware, and allow network staff to be proactive in discovering potential capacity issues. It includes features that will give a view of employee activity that will help the organization mitigate risks.

Washington, D.C., office renovation

Network staff has been involved in the Washington, D.C., office renovation that started in December 2007. A change was made to their phone system to allow additional lines to accommodate more staff. The technology in the conference room was updated to include a projector and the network wiring was refreshed. Some new network equipment was installed to improve the functioning of their network. In addition IT is installing a GroupWise e-mail post office on their server to improve the flow of e-mail to that location.

IT internal audit

The Information Technology section continues to strengthen control processes identified by the ELCA internal auditor. A schedule for completion of all recommendations has been set and responsibilities assigned to key staff.

Management Services

Submitted by: Ms. Karen Rathbun

The treasurer shall make provisions for facilities management in support of the operation of the Lutheran Center and the function of Chicago-based churchwide units and, in so doing, the treasurer shall maintain management services with an executive for management services appointed by the treasurer who shall be responsible for building management for the churchwide organization and the coordination of central services for Chicago-based churchwide units (13.52.C05.).
Section responsibilities

Management Services has responsibility for the operation of the Lutheran Center premises in Chicago, Ill., the archives building in Elk Grove Village, Ill., and leased properties in Washington, D.C., and New York City. Management Services also provides infrastructure services including: a copy center; maintenance of floor copiers; office supplies; mail management services; scheduling and maintenance of the conference center; building concierge/reception and building tours, and the ELCAAdvantage Program, a national cooperative buying program. A building management contractor, Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL), manages the facilities, including garage maintenance, cleaning, and security functions.

Reconfiguration update

The major focus of work for the Management Services section in 2007 was completion of the reconfiguration of the Lutheran Center, which was necessary both as a result of the new organizational structure approved by the 2005 Churchwide Assembly and the need to address building upkeep after 19 years of wear and tear.

This project was completed on time and under budget and was managed by the executive for management services. The capital budget for the reconfiguration approved by the Budget and Finance Committee was $6.5 million. The total cost was just slightly over $6.0 million, a positive variance of $0.5 million. Annual depreciation of this expense over 20 years would be estimated at $300,000. In 2008, the operating budget will also support $274,000 in interest expense on the Lutheran Center building mortgage. This debt will be paid in full in January 2012.

One goal of the reconfiguration process was to increase available rental space to generate additional income. We have opened up 8,500 square feet on the sixth floor for rental and have started showing it to potential tenants. In addition, two tenants have increased their space and one has decided not to renew their lease.

Washington, D.C. office

Management Services has assisted the Church in Society unit by renegotiating the lease for the offices in Washington, D.C. and helping to reconfigure the space to add a few offices to meet the needs of partner organizations that reside in the same building through a sublease.

Security

The new security desk on the main floor has been installed and is staffed from 6:30 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. We are in the process of installing a visitors’ badge system. Any visitor without identification will have to wait for the guard to obtain permission for them to enter the building. Staff members are required to badge in and out of the facility daily. These processes not only strengthen security, but also will help to determine who is in the facility in case of an emergency evacuation.
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Greetings to you, our valued partners in ministry, as we celebrate this season of Our Lord’s Resurrection.

The fifty-second meeting of the Conference of Bishops was held March 6-11, 2008, at the San Mateo Marriott, in San Mateo, California. Spouses of the bishops are invited to the spring gathering of the conference; their time together has become an occasion to renew supportive relationships. It is an important time for us all, especially as we welcome newcomers to our fellowship and bid farewell to treasured colleagues.

Nine bishops will be leaving the conference following upcoming elections. Bishops Duane Danielson, David Donges, Rick Foss, Phil Hougen, April Ulring Larson, David Mullen, David Strobel, and Peter Strommen conclude their terms of service. And, as you are aware, Bishop Stephen Bouman has accepted the call to become executive director of Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit. These strong colleagues leave a legacy of committed service to this church, and faithful witness to the Gospel. We will miss their leadership. Nevertheless, I am confident the Holy Spirit will continue to raise up new and gifted pastors to assume the episcopal office.

Undoubtedly, many of us came to San Mateo with some level of anxiety, anticipating the draft social statement on sexuality. My colleagues are deeply impressed with the work of the Task Force and the writing team. As I write this report to you, the level of response across our synods continues to be favorable but calm, a stark contrast to some of our previous experiences. Now it is up to all of us to lead this church in a faithful and constructive response to the team’s work and to uphold our necessary part in the ongoing discernment conversation.

You may be aware that the January 2009 Bishops’ Academy will be held in Israel and Palestine. In preparation for this journey we continue to devote time to exploring the complex historical and political environment of the Holy Land. Dr. Robert Smith, continental director, Europe and the Middle East of the ELCA Global Mission program unit, led us in a very helpful exploration of Christian Zionism. Nearly all of the bishops currently plan to be a part of the trip.

As always, the bishops received helpful updates from Presiding Bishop Hanson, Vice President Carlos Peña, Secretary David Swartling, and Treasurer Christina Jackson-Skelton. We celebrated the continuing success of Augsburg Fortress, Publishers and applauded the strong and innovative efforts of the staff of *The Lutheran*.

The working committees within the Conference of Bishops deal with roster issues, companion synods, ecumenical and inter-religious concerns, shared-risk legal issues, our Good Samaritan Fund, as well as theological and ethical concerns and other matters. We received a brief demonstration of the revised online mobility form process from Pr. Stan Meyer, Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod.

Bishop Hanson and Secretary Swartling led a helpful and lively conversation on preparing to lead a synod assembly. With fifteen new bishops anticipating their first assembly, you easily can imagine the high level of attention. I cannot recall similar conversations, but I am sure the opportunity will be offered in the future.

Worship is always the center of our time together as the Conference of Bishops. I am grateful to my colleagues for their thoughtful leadership. The bishops are fine pastors and skilled worship leaders. In addition, many of us spent Sunday morning at St. Mark’s Lutheran Church in San Francisco, one of the oldest parishes in the Sierra Pacific Synod, recently rebuilt and redecorated. It was a pleasure to glimpse their strong ministry and witness in the city.

And we continue our journey of self-discovery through anti-racism training, led by Shenandoah Gale, coordinator for anti-racism education and training, Office of the Presiding Bishop.

The bishops are energized by our exploration of planting new churches. The new starts conversation is continuing among us, with helpful leadership from Pr. Stephen Bouman, Pr. Stan...
Olson, Dr. Kenn Inskeep, and Pr. Wyvetta Bullock. We are determined to find ever more effective and efficient paths to planting and nurturing faith communities.

On behalf of my colleagues in the Conference of Bishops, please accept our gratitude for—and our prayers in support of—your important work. And please join us in prayerful support of all our synods gathering in assembly in the coming weeks, especially those choosing new bishops. The Holy Spirit will refresh the Church. May the Spirit also refresh and equip you for the work to which you have been called.

Bishop Allan C. Bjornberg, Chair
The Conference of Bishops
Proposed Responses to Synodical Resolutions
Previously referred to units by Church Council or Executive Committee

1. Media Campaign for HIV and AIDS strategy
Metropolitan New York Synod (7C)

WHEREAS, HIV and AIDS has been at pandemic levels for over two decades; and
WHEREAS, the year 2005 marked the grim milestone of 1,000,000 people in the United States
alone living with HIV (and 40,000,000 worldwide); and
WHEREAS, ignorance about the subject continues to have a negative impact on the delivery of
pastoral and educational services to those infected and affected by HIV, despite a variety of
educational resources; therefore, be it
RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan New York Synod memorialize the 2007
Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to direct the
Communication Services unit of the churchwide organization to engage in collaborative
activities to raise awareness about the issues surrounding HIV disease through the use of
a media campaign directed at members of this church as well as the broader population.

Executive Committee Action
The Executive Committee of the Church Council voted [EC07.10.28g]:
To receive the resolution of the Metropolitan New York Synod requesting a media
campaign for HIV and AIDS awareness;
To refer the resolution as information to the units of this church involved in the ongoing
preparation of a strategy on HIV and AIDS to be brought to the Church Council in April
2008; and
To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.

CC ACTION [EN BLOC]
Recommended:
To authorize a delay in the response of the Church in Society and Global
Mission units to the resolution of the Metropolitan New York Synod requesting a
media campaign for HIV and AIDS awareness;
To recommend that the response be included in the churchwide strategy on
AIDS and HIV, which will be brought to the November 2008 meeting of the Church
Council; and
To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.

2. Cost of Board of Pensions Medical Coverage
Southwestern Texas Synod (4E)

WHEREAS, the rising costs of medical coverage for clergy and lay staff members of our
synod’s congregations are adversely affecting salaries because salaries are tied to the amount of
medical premiums paid by congregations; and
WHEREAS, many of the congregations of the Southwestern Texas Synod are considering other
routes to providing medical coverage for their pastors and staff; therefore, be it
RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Texas Synod Council communicate to the
Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America that the Board of
Pensions review the way it funds the cost of medical benefits; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Texas Synod Council request that the Church
Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America direct the Board of Pensions of
the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to research the viability of more options for
congregations in the form of “cafeteria” plans, allowing for higher deductibles and
optional coverage, and respond to the Southwestern Texas Synod Council regarding new
options.
Executive Committee Action

The Executive Committee of the Church Council voted [EC07.03.08]:

To receive the resolution of the Southwestern Texas Synod Council related to the costs of medical benefits for rostered people and staff;

To refer the resolution to the Board of Pensions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in consultation with the Conference of Bishops; and

To request that the Board of Pensions bring a progress report to the November 2007 meeting of the Program and Services Committee and a report and possible recommendations no later than the April 2008 meeting of the Church Council.

Response from the Board of Pensions

In the November 2007 progress report, the Board of Pensions shared information that the Board’s ongoing work with keeping health costs as low as possible would be informed by the Southwestern Texas Synod Council resolution. Additionally, it was stated that as a unit of this church the Board of Pensions would, as per direction of the Executive Committee of the Church Council, be engaging synodical bishops in conversation about the matter raised by the Southwestern Texas Synod Council.

The Board of Pensions currently is in the process of completing annual visits with bishops and synod staffs as well as seminary and churchwide leaders. This year, in particular, because of a comprehensive benefits study being conducted with the assistance of Hewitt Associates, the consultations are looking at the ELCA philosophy of benefits and its five supporting principles: plan participation, level of benefits, bundled program, contribution policy, and sharing of health costs. The feedback from the consultations will assist the Board of Pensions in understanding how it is meeting its mission to “provide retirement, health, and related benefits and services to enhance the well-being of those who serve through the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and other faith-based organizations.” It also will be very informative in finalizing a response to the Southwestern Texas Synod Council resolution. As a result of the study and the information received, a report with recommendations will be prepared for the next meeting of the Church Council in November 2008.

CC ACTION [EN BLOC]

Recommended:

To receive the interim response of the Board of Pensions to the resolution of the Southwestern Texas Synod regarding the cost of health and related benefits;

To request that a full report and possible recommendations be brought to the November 2008 meeting of the Church Council; and

To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.
Proposed Responses to Churchwide Assembly Actions
Responses from units to Church Council

1. Immigration and Sanctuary
[Memorial B7][CA07.06.33i]

a. Northwest Washington Synod (1B)
RESOLVED, that the bishop of the Northwest Washington Synod lead and comfort our Hispanic community during this time of kairos until the time of justice comes upon us and have us as part of our flock; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the good offices of our congregations, Synod Council, and the office of the bishop denounce and demand that the raids, deportations, and massive firings of undocumented immigrant workers cease immediately; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the bishop meet with the heads of our ecumenical partners to jointly denounce the massive raids and deportations; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the bishop encourage Lutheran agencies, congregations, and committees to designate grants that will create or support faith-based institutions that are currently serving the undocumented immigrants within the United States, who are currently being defrauded by unscrupulous and untrustworthy organizations that profit at their expense; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the bishop meet with grass-roots leaders involved in immigration issues to listen to their concerns and pray for members who are confronting deportation proceedings; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the bishop and synod office make available the “New Sanctuary Movement Statement of Support and Involvement” to congregations and that the Synod Council consider adopting this statement at the 2008 Synod Assembly; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the Northwest Washington Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America memorialize the 2007 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to request that the presiding bishop provide for an urgent national meeting church workers, lawyers, and theologians to establish strategies for accompanying undocumented immigrants, including the establishment and support of sanctuaries in congregations; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the Northwest Washington Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America memorialize the 2007 Churchwide Assembly to request that the Office of the Presiding Bishop arrange an urgent meeting with Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service to discuss the expansion of its mission from solely providing services to refugees to directly assisting refugee families within the United States that need legal representation as they confront deportation proceedings and other immigration proceedings; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the Northwest Washington Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America memorialize the 2007 Churchwide Assembly to request that the presiding bishop and the Conference of Bishops encourage all synods of this church to establish committees on immigration that include leaders from the Hispanic community who are involved in immigration issues and to encourage the members of this church to continue to pray that God gives us the power and will to walk with the immigrant community in this time of trial and injustice.

b. Southwest California Synod (2B)
WHEREAS, the membership of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) has consisted historically of immigrant people from many nationalities and ethnicities; and
WHEREAS, the Latino community has been deeply affected by the current deportation policies
of the U.S. government, which have caused significant pain and suffering to Lutheran families; and

WHEREAS, other ethnic communities also have suffered because of these policies; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA has an obligation under the Gospel of Jesus Christ to proclaim good news to the poor, the hurting, the marginalized, and the voiceless, and further to denounce unjust, discriminatory practices, which destroy the livelihood and dignity of our brothers and sisters; and

WHEREAS, pastors and laypersons are cognizant of the divine imperative found in Leviticus 19:33-34: “When an alien lives with you in your land, do not mistreat him. The alien living with you must be treated as one of your native born. Love him as yourself for you were aliens in Egypt”; and

WHEREAS, the church has a role to be a prophetic voice for those who are afraid to speak publicly against injustice; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 2007 Assembly of the Southwest California Synod encourage the synod bishop and council to provide the rostered leaders of this synod with basic education on immigration law and procedure; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southwest California Synod encourage conversation among the members, congregations, and conferences on the plight of the immigrant community in this synod, including the testimonies of individuals and families in the congregations of this synod; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southwest California Synod Assembly memorialize the 2007 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:

a. to encourage the Office of the Presiding Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to meet with the heads of this church’s ecumenical partners to lift up the human cost to individuals, families, congregations, and communities when the laws of current immigration policies are implemented;

b. to request that the Church in Society unit call a meeting with grass-roots leaders on immigration issues, and specifically to include representatives of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service to discuss its mission and strategies for providing services to refugees and immigrant families within the United States;

c. to urge the synods to establish committees on immigration that include leaders from communities who are involved in and affected by immigration issues; and

d. to urge that the Church in Society unit provide grants that will encourage the creation or support of trustworthy faith-based institutions, including those in the new Sanctuary movement, that currently serve the undocumented immigrant population in the United States.

c. Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8B)

WHEREAS, Jesus teaches us in Matthew 25 to feed the hungry, give water to the thirsty, clothe the naked, care for the sick, visit the imprisoned, and welcome the stranger; and

WHEREAS, Leviticus 19:33-34 instructs us: “When an alien resides with you in your land, you shall not oppress the alien. The alien who resides with you shall be to you as the citizen among you; you shall love the alien as yourself, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God . . .”; and

WHEREAS, Lutherans have served Christ for over 60 years through refugee resettlement ministry and have been invited to provide services to new immigrants by the United States government, which also has a proud history of welcoming persecuted people; and

WHEREAS, legislation passed in the Real ID and Patriot Act II programs, which are intended to prevent terrorists and those sympathetic to terrorist organizations from entering the United States, has created unintended barriers for thousands of genuine refugees, who pose no threat to our communities or national security and otherwise would be welcome to resettle in the United States; and

WHEREAS, based on the same law, immigration judges must deny asylum (refugee status) for asylum seekers with legitimate claims, resulting in genuine refugees being unjustly held in
detention and ultimately returned to the country of their persecution; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service already has identified current material support language that needs to be revised and actively has engaged in advocating to the United States government for appropriate changes in legislation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 2007 Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod

1. Go on record expressing gratitude for legislators, including Representative Pitts (PA-16, R), who have written and sponsored legislation to correct the unintended consequences of material support;

2. Urge the Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod office to request the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and the president of the United States to support such legislation that corrects the unintentional consequences of Real ID and Patriot Act II; and

3. Encourage the Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod congregations and individual members to contact their legislatures in support of such legislation;

and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 2007 Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod Assembly memorialize the 2007 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, through the Office of the Presiding Bishop, also to request a change in United States law so that genuine refugees are not barred on grounds of material support.

Churchwide Assembly Action [CA07.06.33i]:

To thank the Southwest California Synod, Northwest Washington Synod, and Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod for calling this church’s attention to the urgent concern for immigrants who are being unjustly treated;

To reaffirm the revision and updating of the 1998 Message on Immigration that was requested by the ELCA Church Council in response to the synodical resolutions received in 2006 for its consideration and approval in November 2007 and to anticipate that the revisions will address new concerns that are emerging related to immigrant rights and just policies toward immigrants in this country;

To reaffirm the work of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) in partnership with the synods of this church in the development of immigration task forces;

To continue this church’s support for and close partnership with LIRS, including the delivery of technical assistance, networking, grants to dedicated and independent legal service projects, and advocacy for comprehensive immigration reform; and

To request that the Church in Society unit work with LIRS and other relevant churchwide units to convene opportunities for partners and interested leaders to meet to establish opportunities and strategies for further supporting and accompanying undocumented immigrants.

CC ACTION [EN BLOC]

Recommended:

To authorize a delay in the response of the Church in Society unit to the action of the 2007 Churchwide Assembly in response to memorials from the Southwest California Synod, Northwest Washington Synod, and Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod;

To anticipate that the revised Message on Immigration, which will be considered by the Church Council at its November 2008 meeting, will serve as the response to these memorials; and

To request that the secretary of this church inform the synods of this action.
2. Continuing Subsidies of Worthy Ministries
[Memorial A1] [CA07.06.33a]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) traditionally has supported new, transformational, and innovative ministries for at least three years; and

WHEREAS, this synod at times has identified ministries that realize the primary purposes stated in ¶6.02. but have little prospect of becoming self-supporting while at the same time they may be deserving of ongoing support from the wider church; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA has convened a Blue Ribbon Task Force to strengthen funding of ministry and sharing of mission support; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Indiana-Kentucky Synod in assembly memorialize the ELCA to study this issue, including the practices of this synod, as outlined in the synod outreach binder, and of other denominations and bring to the Churchwide Assembly as soon as practical a recommended approach for setting criteria and subsidizing such ministries that need ongoing support from the wider church.

Churchwide Assembly Action [CA07.06.33a]:

To express gratitude to the Indiana-Kentucky Synod for its request for a “recommended approach for setting criteria and subsidizing such ministries that need ongoing support from the wider church”;

To acknowledge with thanks the commitment of the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission (EO) unit to:

1. Continue to work with congregations, synods, and other partners to explore contextual solutions to questions related to sustainability, utilizing the principles described in the response above;

2. Consult with ecumenical partners about how they sustain ministries that are not self-supporting;

3. Discuss the realities of funding and sustainability to gain input from those who work with the ethnic strategies and with ministries among people in poverty;

4. Involve stewardship staff in the development or renewal of ministries in order to strengthen resources for supporting and equipping stewardship efforts in economically marginalized contexts;

5. Receive and review the outcomes of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding in order to gain insights about strengthening mission support and ministry funding and incorporate them into Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission processes;

6. Train mission directors and stewardship staff about sustainability as part of the cultural proficiency work of the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit; and

To request that the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit, in consultation with the Conference of Bishops, continue to study these issues and bring a report and possible recommendations to the April 2008 meeting of the Church Council.

Response from Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission

Because of staff transitions in the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit, including the lack of a mission director in the Indiana-Kentucky Synod, the unit requests additional time to gather information from the synod about the reasons for the memorial and to respond to it thoroughly.

CC ACTION [EN BLOC]
Recommended:

To authorize a delay in the response of the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit to the memorial from the Indiana-Kentucky Synod concerning continuing subsidies for worthy ministries;

To request that a report and possible recommendations be brought to the
November 2008 meeting of the Church Council; and
To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.

3. HIV and AIDS Funding

[Motion A] [CA07.06.35 ]

RESOLVED, to instruct the Church Council to take steps to develop a plan to provide up to an additional $1 million in funding to implement the HIV and AIDS strategy.

Churchwide Assembly Action [CA07.06.35]:

To refer this motion to the Church Council and encourage its continued support of the development and funding of this church’s strategy on HIV and AIDS.

CC ACTION [EN BLOC]

Recommended:

To authorize a delay in the response of the Office of the Presiding Bishop and the Office of the Treasurer to the request for funding for the churchwide strategy on HIV and AIDS; and

To recommend that the response be included in the churchwide strategy on AIDS and HIV, which will be brought to the November 2008 meeting of the Church Council.
CHURCH COUNCIL
Lay Male [Term 2011] to replace resignation of Bradley Dokken, Williston, ND (3A)
1. a. Keith M. Johnson, Hazen, ND (3A)
    b. Baron D. Blanchard, Bismarck, ND (3A)

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MISSION INVESTMENT FUND
Lay Female [Term 2013] to replace resignation of Barbara Swartling, Bainbridge Island, WA (1B)
1. Julie E. Swanson, Roanoke, VA (9A)

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE ELCA FOUNDATION
Lay Male [Term 2013] to replace vacancy of Brian F. Hofland, West Harrison, NY (7C)
1. John H. Saeger, Lancaster, PA (8D)
CHURCH COUNCIL: LAY MALE
Mr. Keith M. Johnson
Western North Dakota Synod (3A)

1) Congregational membership
   English Lutheran, Hazen, ND

2) Experience relevant to this position
   Teaching Search Bible Study for 9 years;
   Synod Council of Western ND

3) Church-related service
   WND Synod Council - 5yrs;
   Chair, Resolutions & Counsel for WND Synod Assembly;
   President English Lutheran Council twice

4) Education
   A.S., North Dakota State U.- Bottineau; B.S., North Dakota State U. - Fargo

5) Occupation
   Administrator; Custer Health

6) Community service
   President, Concert Series - 19 yrs.;
   Hazen School Board , 16 yrs. President last 8;
   Community Theater - since 1981

7) Year of birth
   1954

8) Primary language
   English

Describe why you wish to be elected as a member of Church Council?
It would be an honor for me to be able to represent western ND on the National Council. I think that we sometimes have not let the national church know of the needs we have, or of the wonderful things we can contribute. We feel close to the heart of this church's roots, and, yet, we sometimes feel distanced from that church's heart. It's as much our fault as anyone's. I have seen the national church's staff people up close as I've served on Synod Council, and they are wonderful christian people who are genuinely concerned about us. I'd like to make the work of the national church as real to western ND as their own congregations.

Are there particular perspectives that you would contribute as a member of the Church Council?
Well, I am a Lutheran from birth, having been baptized at the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Free Church in Bisbee, ND, a stone's throw from the Canadian border. I know something of the challenges of growing a faith and a congregation in an area that is not otherwise growing, and, indeed, may be shrinking. I believe strongly in sharing my faith, not only with people that live a comfortable distance from me, but with the people I see every day.

What, in your judgment, is the most important responsibility of the Church Council?
The Church Council must run the church, not like a business, but like an organization that looks to Jesus as its example. That requires a faithful sort of “foolishness” that requires a courage that can only be found where 2 or 3 - or 65 - gather. We must make decisions based on love and an open heart, while not adulterating or watering down our doctrine and our understanding of how God comes to us. We as Lutherans have the most wonderful gift to give the world - a God who comes down. We can’t let the “adiaphora” of the noise of potentially divisive decisions cloud our face of witness to the world.
**CHURCH COUNCIL: LAY MALE**

**Mr. Baron D. Blanchard**  
Western North Dakota Synod (3A)

1) **Congregational membership**  
Lutheran Church of the Cross, Bismarck, ND

2) **Experience relevant to this position**  
Voting Member in the 2007 Churchwide Assembly;  
Church Council Member of Lutheran Church of the Cross;  
Middle School Teacher

3) **Church-related service**  
Voting Member in the 2007 Churchwide Assembly;  
Church Council Member of Lutheran Church of the Cross;  
Youth Group Co-Organizer of Lutheran Church of the Cross

4) **Education**  
B.S, Northern State University (1999-2004); M.S, Valley City State University (2006-Pres)

5) **Occupation**  
Geography Teacher; Bismarck Public Schools

6) **Community service**  
Fellowship of Christian Athletes Huddle Leader/Camp Counselor;  
North Dakota State Wrestling Tournament Worker

7) **Year of birth**  
1981

8) **Primary language**  
English

*Describe why you wish to be elected as a member of Church Council:*

I wish to serve God and the ELCA by being a contributing member to the Church Council in an effort to answer God's calling to service, and aid in the accomplishment of the missions and initiatives set forth by the ELCA.

*Are there particular perspectives that you would contribute as a Church Council member?*

I feel I would add a perspective of a 20-30 year old that has gone away from the Church and returned on fire to serve my Lord and Savior.

*What, in your judgment, is the most important responsibility of the Church Council?*

The most important responsibility of the Church Council is to serve with prayer and discernment over the many issues and initiatives in the ELCA.
ELCA FOUNDATION: LAY MALE

Mr. John H. Saeger
Lower Susquehanna Synod (8D)

1) Congregational membership
   Grace, Lancaster, PA, Lancaster, PA

2) Experience relevant to this position
   Participated in fund raising for church and community organizations;
   Participated in asset/portfolio management for church and community orgs.;
   Engaged in and led strategic planning efforts for business and community orgs.

3) Church-related service
   Volunteer Synodical Stewardship Consultant;
   Chair, Congregational Mission Resource Team;
   Member, Board of Directors, Luthercare (social service/CCRC agency)

4) Education
   BS Lafayette College

5) Occupation
   Vice President, Lancaster Division (Retired); PPL Electric Utilities

6) Community service
   Board Chair, Williamsport-Lycoming County Chamber of Commerce;
   Board President, Parish Resource Center, Lancaster;
   Board President, Leadership Lancaster

7) Year of birth
   1938

8) Primary language
   English

Describe why you wish to be elected as a member of this board:
I have served both the church and community in key roles in fund raising, asset and portfolio management, mission identification/articulation and strategic planning. Each of these opportunities has broadened my experience base and has enhanced my ability to serve in this capacity. I have over forty years of experience in leadership roles with church, community and business organizations which, I believe, has prepared me well for service on this board. I am familiar with, and have generously supported financially, the mission of the ELCA Foundation, and I pledge to continue to do so. I would be honored to serve the ELCA in this capacity.

Are there particular perspectives that you would contribute as a board member?
I believe successfully developing resources for mission requires that the mission be clearly articulated and an expectation that abundant resources are available to support the mission. The challenge is to encourage those with the means to see support of the mission as an important expression of their values. Too often organizations scale down their mission because they believe resources are scarce. I believe, with God's help, we can find the resources to make great accomplishments toward His plan to reconcile the world to Himself. Also, it is my experience that aggressive management of assets within reasonably established risk parameters provides the best return over the long haul. I bring the perspective of having overseen management of asset portfolios for both church and community organizations.
MISSION INVESTMENT FUND: LAY FEMALE

Ms. Julie E. Swanson
Virginia Synod (9A)

1) Congregational membership
   St. John Lutheran Church, Roanoke, VA

2) Experience relevant to this position
   Currently I am a CEO of a Lutheran social service agency;
   Knowledge and experience with financial management;
   Strong commitment to the mission and work of the church locally and nationally

3) Church-related service
   Serve on the board of the VA Synod Mission Office of Planned Giving;
   Sunday School and Vacation Bible School Teacher;
   Served on church social service and advocacy committees

4) Education
   B.S., North Dakota State University; Certificate, Case Western Reserve University;
   M.S., University of South Florida

5) Occupation
   Chief Executive Officer; Lutheran Family Services of Virginia

6) Community service
   Advocate and president for a domestic violence center;
   Officer and member of American Association of Fundraising Executives;
   Volunteer at elementary school

7) Year of birth
   1950

8) Primary language
   English

Describe why you wish to be elected as a member of this board:
As a leader of a Lutheran social ministry organization I have a strong understanding of the work of the church and the management of a non-profit business. As a Christian and a Lutheran I value the work of the larger church as it assists and works with individual congregations. I will be able to bring my knowledge and experience to the position of board member and I am eager to understand and learn about the important work of the Mission Investment Fund.

Are there particular perspectives that you would contribute as a board member?
I have a strong background in financial management and the development of programs and services. I have worked on federal housing grants and build five different types of housing projects. I have also participated in and lead the strategic planning process for nonprofits. I have experienced a natural disaster and worked with the national church in responding to the needs of Lutheran congregations and the community. Overall because of my work as a leader of a Lutheran nonprofit I will bring management and strategic direction skills to my role as a board member.
## Church Council Member Synod Visit Summary

A full report is available in a notebook on the resource table located in the Council room.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Synod Name</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date of Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>M. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Northwest Washington</td>
<td>M. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Southwest Washington</td>
<td>D. Chenoweth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Eastern Washington-Idaho</td>
<td>D. Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>D. Chenoweth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>D. Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Sierra Pacific</td>
<td>M. Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Southwest California</td>
<td>J. Tutt-Starr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>J. Tutt-Starr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Grand Canyon</td>
<td>M. Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain</td>
<td>S. Loy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Western North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Eastern North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>J. Sorenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Northwest Minnesota</td>
<td>P. Obregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>Northeast Minnesota</td>
<td>A. Niedringhaus</td>
<td>Synod Council</td>
<td>11/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>Southwest Minnesota</td>
<td>P. Obregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G</td>
<td>Minneapolis Area</td>
<td>J. Munday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3H</td>
<td>Saint Paul Area</td>
<td>J. Munday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3I</td>
<td>Southeastern Minnesota</td>
<td>A. Neidringhaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>S. Langhauser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Central States</td>
<td>S. Langhauser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Arkansas-Oklahoma</td>
<td>R. Brakke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>N. Texas-N. Louisiana</td>
<td>R. Brakke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Southwestern Texas</td>
<td>M. Helmke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast</td>
<td>M. Helmke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Synod Name</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date of Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Metropolitan Chicago</td>
<td>K. Graddy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>K. Graddy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>Central/Southern Illinois</td>
<td>K. Graddy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>Southeastern Iowa</td>
<td>N. Hirsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>Western Iowa</td>
<td>N. Hirsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>Northeastern Iowa</td>
<td>G. Wipperman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5G</td>
<td>Northern Great Lakes</td>
<td>D. Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5H</td>
<td>Northwest Synod of Wisconsin</td>
<td>D. Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5I</td>
<td>East-Central Synod of Wisconsin</td>
<td>J. Emery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5J</td>
<td>Greater Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5K</td>
<td>South-Central Synod of Wisconsin</td>
<td>J. Emery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5L</td>
<td>La Crosse Area</td>
<td>G. Wipperman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Southeast Michigan</td>
<td>S. Schlesinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>North/West Lower Michigan</td>
<td>S. Schlesinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Indiana-Kentucky</td>
<td>K. Hunsinger</td>
<td>Synod Council: 1/06, 3/06, 9/06, 9/07</td>
<td>6/06, 6/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly: 6/06, 6/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Northwestern Ohio</td>
<td>K. Hunsinger</td>
<td>Synod Council: 11/05, 12/05, 2/06, 4/06, 12/06, 1/07, 2/07, 12/07</td>
<td>5/06, 5/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly: 5/06, 5/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>Northeastern Ohio</td>
<td>D. Anderson</td>
<td>Synod Council</td>
<td>3/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Southern Ohio</td>
<td>D. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>J.P. Rajashekar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>D. Truland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C</td>
<td>Metropolitan New York</td>
<td>J. Linman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7D</td>
<td>Upstate New York</td>
<td>D. Truland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7E</td>
<td>Northeastern Pennsylvania</td>
<td>J. Richter</td>
<td>Synod Council</td>
<td>1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F</td>
<td>Southeastern Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7G</td>
<td>Slovak Zion</td>
<td>D. Truland (if needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Synod Name</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date of Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Northwestern Pennsylvania</td>
<td>L. Reitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Southwestern Pennsylvania</td>
<td>J. Linman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>W. Lloyd, Jr.</td>
<td>Synod Council</td>
<td>5/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
<td>Lower Susquehanna</td>
<td>J. Richter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8E</td>
<td>Upper Susquehanna</td>
<td>L. Reitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Delaware-Maryland</td>
<td>R. Wahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8G</td>
<td>Metropolitan Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>R. Wahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8H</td>
<td>West Virginia-Western Maryland</td>
<td>W. Lloyd, Jr.</td>
<td>Synod Council</td>
<td>11/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>R. Connelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>R. Connelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>J. Bunker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Florida-Bahamas</td>
<td>J. Bunker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>P. Wallace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELCA Church Council Retreat July 25-27 2008
Eaglewood Conference Center, Itasca, Illinois

Draft Schedule

Friday, July 25, 2008

Afternoon
Arrive Lutheran Center (*specific times to be determined*)
Executive Committee Meeting
One-on-one stewardship conversations (*to be scheduled*)
Transportation to Eaglewood Conference Center

6:00 p.m. Dinner at Eaglewood

7:00 p.m. Welcome
Opening devotions
Retreat introduction

7:30 p.m. **Hearing**
“….he even makes the deaf to hear and the mute to speak.” (Mark 7:37b)

**Can I Get a Witness? Sharing Narratives, Breaking Silence**
Youth from the Church of the Abiding Savior, Lutheran, Durham, NC
Women’s monologues
Council members

9:00 p.m. Social time

Saturday, July 26, 2008

8:00 a.m. Breakfast

9:00 a.m. Opening prayer/meditation

9:15 a.m. Reflection on learnings, discoveries, insights

9:35 a.m. **Seeing**
“Then Jesus laid his hand on [the man’s] eyes again; and he looked intently and his sight was restored, and he saw everything clearly.” (Mark 8:25)

**Synthesizing the Learning**
- Framework
- Definitions and concepts
- Intersection between sexism and racism
- Analysis

**Where are we going?**
What does the anti-racist, anti-sexist Church Council look like?

11:30 a.m. Break
12:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. Free time
One-on-one stewardship conversations (*to be scheduled*)
2:00 p.m.  **Equipping**
“[Jesus] called the twelve and began to send them out two by two, and gave them authority over the unclean spirits. He ordered them to take nothing for their journey except a staff; no bread, no bag, no money in their belts.”  
(Mark 6:7-8)

**Assembling the Tool Bag: what do we need to get there?**
- Identify group assets, wisdom, knowledge, and experience for transformation
- What is needed for further subversive living?

5:45 5:00 p.m.  Meditation

6:00 p.m.  Dinner

7:00 p.m.  Social time

**SUNDAY**
8:00 a.m.  Breakfast

9:00 a.m.  Opening prayer
Reflection on learnings, discoveries, insights

9:15 a.m.  **Living the Kingdom**
“They cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many who were sick and cured them.”  (Mark 6:13)

**Application**

11:00 a.m.  Closing worship

12:00 p.m.  Adjourn
Transportation to the Lutheran Center and O’Hare airport

**Preparation for the retreat**
- April 2008 Church Council meeting: power and privilege; deepening understanding of white privilege (complicity, silence); definitions of anti-sexism and anti-racism
- Pre-retreat reading: Study guide and reflection questions to accompany Allan Johnson,  *Privilege, Power and Difference* (distributed)
  Sherrilyn Ifill,  *On the Courthouse Lawn*, Chapters 7 and 8 (distributed)
  Allan Johnson,  *The Gender Knot*, Chapters 3-6 (distributed)
Church Council Committee Charters

ELCA Audit Committee Charter

Purpose
The primary purpose of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) Audit Committee is to assist the Budget and Finance Committee of the Church Council in fulfilling its general oversight of the churchwide organization's accounting and financial reporting, internal control systems, and audit functions.

Authority
Subject to the approval of the ELCA Budget and Finance Committee, the Audit Committee shall have the authority to retain special legal, accounting, or other consultants to advise the committee. The Audit Committee shall have the authority to request any officer or employee of the churchwide organization, its outside counsel, or independent auditor to attend a meeting of the committee or to meet with members of the committee.

Responsibility
Church management is responsible for preparing financial statements in accordance with GAAP, maintaining a system of internal controls and complying with appropriate laws and regulations. The director for internal audit is responsible for evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of the system of internal controls. The independent auditor is responsible for performing an independent audit as a basis for providing an opinion that this church's financial statements are presented fairly in accordance with GAAP.

The Audit Committee is responsible for reviewing significant accounting and reporting issues and judgments made in connection with the preparation of the financial statements, including analyses of the effects of alternative GAAP methods on the financial statements.

The Board of Pensions, Augsburg Fortress Publishers, the Mission Investment Fund (MIF), and the Women of the ELCA (W/ELCA) are separately incorporated units and, as such, have independent financial statement audits. The ELCA Audit Committee has no responsibilities with respect to the Board of Pensions, Augsburg Fortress Publishers, the MIF, or W/ELCA.

Membership
The Audit Committee shall consist of six members. A minimum of two members should be Church Council Budget and Finance Committee members. Members of the committee shall be appointed by the Budget and Finance Committee and forwarded to the Church Council for approval. Budget and Finance Committee members should be appointed for a two-year term with the possibility of reappointment up to their Church Council term. Non-Church Council members should be appointed for a two-year term, renewable for two additional terms. Terms need to be staggered in recognition of the need for continuity of committee membership from year-to-year.

The chair of the committee shall be a member of the Budget and Finance Committee and shall be appointed by the chair of the Budget and Finance Committee. Members of the committee will have no relationship to the church that may interfere with the exercise of the member's independence and must be financially literate. At least one member shall have accounting or related financial management experience.

In order to provide for an effective committee, attendance at the Audit Committee meeting is required of all members. Upon two successive absences that have not been approved by the committee, the member's position shall be declared vacant by the chair.
Meetings
The Audit Committee will meet at least two times per year or more frequently as circumstances require. Meeting agendas will be cleared by the committee chair in advance of the meeting. Minutes will be prepared by one of the churchwide staff, approved by the committee, and maintained in the permanent records of the church.

Duties and Responsibilities
The Audit Committee shall have the following duties and responsibilities with respect to:

Financial Statements
• Inquire of the independent auditors and churchwide organization management as to the acceptability and appropriateness of financial accounting practices and disclosures used or proposed.
• Review the church's audited financial statements and related footnote disclosures and consider whether they are complete and consistent based on information known to committee members.
• Discuss with the independent auditors the effect of regulatory and accounting initiatives on the ELCA's financial statements.
• Review with the independent auditors any matters related to the conduct of the audit that are required to be communicated to the committee under generally accepted auditing standards, including, but not limited to, any significant changes required in the original audit plan or any serious difficulties or disputes with management during the course of the audit.

External Audit
• Recommend to the Budget and Finance Committee the engagement, retention, or discharge of the independent auditors and consider the appropriateness of rotating independent auditors on a regular basis.
• Evaluate the performance of the independent auditors.
• Review and approve the independent auditors' audit fees and the proposed audit plan.
• Review and confirm the independence of the external auditors by monitoring fees paid to the auditor for consulting or other non-audit services and reviewing any relationships that may impact the objectivity or independence of the auditor.

Internal Audit
• Review and approve the appointment or dismissal of the director of internal audit in consultation with the Executive for Administration.
• Review with the director of internal audit the charter, staffing, and organizational structure of the internal audit function.
• Review the effectiveness of the internal audit function by obtaining assurance there are no restrictions that would limit the director for internal audit's ability to carry out his or her audit responsibilities.
• Review and approve the annual internal audit plan and schedule based on a mutually acceptable risk assessment. As part of this responsibility, review the fraud risk assessment with management and internal audit, providing guidance and input as appropriate.

Internal Control
• Review any internal control comments and recommendations in the independent auditor's management letter that are classified as material weaknesses or reportable conditions as well as management's response to these comments and recommendations.
• Review internal audit's report to the committee, including significant comments and recommendations to management and management's responses to these comments and recommendations.
• Review, on an annual basis, the code of ethics policy.
Communication and Reporting
• Meet, in separate executive sessions, as necessary, with the independent auditor, the director for internal audit, or churchwide staff to discuss any matters that the Audit Committee believes should be discussed privately.
• Provide for an open avenue of communications between the independent auditor or director for internal audit and the committee chair.
• Review and assess the adequacy of this charter annually and submit proposed changes to the Budget and Finance Committee for their review and submission to the Church Council for approval.
• Report the committee’s performance of the duties and responsibilities defined in this charter, including any recommendations the committee deems appropriate, to the Budget and Finance Committee of the Church Council.

The effective date of this charter is November 8, 2002.

Board Development Committee
1. Provide materials and venues that nurture and grow the members of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church to be faithful, wise and courageous leaders on the Church Council, within synods and congregations, and throughout the larger church.
   a) Identify and propose “primers” to be presented to the Church Council at the regularly scheduled council meetings. Primers are understood to be short, informative presentations about various works and programs of the larger church or related to the Church Council’s role as the ELCA’s board of directors.
   b) Coordinate the planning and implementation of themes and agendas for the semi-annual Church Council retreats.
2. Connect directly with newly elected members of the Church Council and provide opportunity for appropriate closure of retiring members of the Church Council.
   a) Prepare and continuously update the “Church Council Orientation Manual” and ensure its distribution to new members.
   b) Coordinate and assist with new member orientation programs.
   c) Assign mentors to each newly elected member of the Church Council
d) Propose and coordinate opportunity for debriefing of all retiring members as and when appropriate.
3. Interface with committees on anti-racism, gender, and other such committees as sanctioned by the Church Council for purposes of coordinating programs for and presentations to the Church Council.
4. Propose venues and opportunities for socialization and fellowship among Church Council members, staff and advisors for purposes of community and trust building and as recreation.

Budget and Finance Committee
14.41.A05. A Budget and Finance Committee shall be composed of members of the Church Council elected by the council and the treasurer of this church as an ex officio member of the committee. This committee shall have staff services provided by the Office of the Presiding Bishop and the Office of the Treasurer. The committee shall prepare and present a comprehensive budget to the Church Council for its consideration and presentation to the Churchwide Assembly. In addition, the committee shall relate to the work of the Office of the Treasurer and the Development Services unit.
How the committee will fulfill its responsibilities

1. Budget oversight
   a) Review and recommend approval of current and World Hunger income proposals.
   b) Review revised income estimates and recommend spending authorization.
   c) Approve annual capital expenditure budget.
   d) Recommend action on synod mission support plans.
   e) Provide leadership for Churchwide Assembly budget hearing and report.

2. Church Council designated funds
   f) Review financial position of the churchwide organization and adequacy of available cash and investment reserves before considering any requests for Church Council designated funds.
   g) Recommend action on any requests for designation of funds by the Church Council, Churchwide Assembly, or Office of the Bishop.
   h) Review reports on all active Church Council designated funds.
   i) Review Church Council funds functioning as endowment.

3. Audit
   j) Recommend changes to the ELCA Audit Committee charter to the Church Council.
   k) Approve Audit Committee nominations for recommendation to the Church Council.
   l) Receive and forward the report of the Audit Committee.

4. Cash and investments
   m) Review and recommend approval of cash and investment policies.
   n) Review and recommend approval of cash management policy.
   o) Review cash balances compared to cash management policy.
   p) Review investment performance and management as compared to policy.

5. Receive reports
   q) Managements Services section
   r) Information Technology section
   s) Development Services unit
   t) Mission support consultations and planning

6. Budget and Finance Committee charter
   u) Review Budget and Finance Committee charter and recommend changes to the Church Council.

Churchwide staff positions supporting the committee
- Treasurer, Office of the Treasurer
- Budget director, Office of the Treasurer
- Controller, Office of the Treasurer
- Assistant treasurer, Office of the Treasurer
- Executive for administration, Office of the Presiding Bishop
- Director for mission support, Synodical Relations
- President, ELCA Foundation and executive director, Development Services

How the committee will evaluate its work
A committee calendar and task list will be used to assure that the committee has completed its responsibilities as outlined in the charter.
**ACTION ITEMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>BF/CC</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election of Committee chair and vice chair <em>(Churchwide Assembly year only)</em></td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of agenda</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of minutes</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current year spending authorization</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following year spending authorization</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve biennium budget proposal <em>(Churchwide Assembly year only)</em></td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve following year capital budget</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of new Church Council designated funds <em>(as needed)</em></td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of synod mission support plans</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Audit Committee members <em>(as needed)</em></td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Audit Committee report</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve Audit Committee charter revisions <em>(as needed)</em></td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve investment policies <em>(as needed)</em></td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve cash management policies <em>(as needed)</em></td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve Budget and Finance Committee charter revisions <em>(as needed)</em></td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATION ITEMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>BF/CC</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial statement review</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review current year capital budget expenditures</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Church Council designated funds</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of director for mission support</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Development Services</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Church Council funds functioning as endowment</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of the Treasurer</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Information Technology</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Management Services</td>
<td>BF/CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review cash balances compared to cash management policy</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review investment performance to policy</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legal and Constitutional Review Committee

I. Organization and Accountability

1.1. Constituted by action of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee is described in continuing resolution 14.41.B05.: A Legal and Constitutional Review Committee shall be composed of members of the Church Council elected by the council, shall include the secretary of this church as an ex officio member of the committee, and shall have staff services provided by the Office of the Secretary. This committee shall provide ongoing review of legal and constitutional matters. It shall review all proposed amendments to the constitutions, bylaws, and continuing resolutions.

1.2. The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee has no authority to act independently beyond this charter except for other purposes specifically assigned it by Council action, and in all things remains accountable to the Church Council. No actions or recommendations by the committee shall conflict with the governing documents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

II. Purposes

2.1. The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee shall assist the Church Council by providing ongoing review of legal and constitutional matters. Specifically, the committee shall:

a. review all proposed amendments to the constitutions, bylaws, and continuing resolutions;

b. review proposed rules and policies and amendments to existing rules and policies to assure conformity with the Constitution, Bylaws and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;

c. review all proposed policies and amendments to existing policies related to the maintenance of the rosters of this church;

d. review amendments to the governing documents of the synods and seminaries of this church;

e. review amendments to the governing documents of affiliated agencies and other related entities as required;

f. review other legal documents and amendments to legal documents which require approval by the Church Council;

g. review requests for acknowledgement of independent Lutheran organizations prior to their consideration by the Church Council;

h. receive periodic updates on litigation involving this church;

i. assist, when requested by the secretary of this church, in preparing interpretive rulings on disputes involving the constitutions, bylaws, or continuing resolutions;

j. review and analyze other legal or constitutional issues as requested by the secretary of this church or the Church Council; and

k. provide recommendations for action by the Church Council.

2.2. The committee shall provide a forum for the exchange of ideas among interested members of the Church Council, churchwide officers and staff, advisors, and bishops of this church related to legal, governance, and oversight matters.

2.3. The committee shall conduct consultations, when appropriate or requested, for the purpose of examining and describing in-depth legal matters facing this church or complex
amendments to the constitutions, bylaws, or continuing resolutions, when such information sharing outside the regular plenary sessions of the Church Council would facilitate the deliberations of the council.

2.4. The committee shall prepare and distribute among its members meeting minutes and other appropriate material as needed.

III. Composition and Membership

3.1. The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee shall be composed of:
   a. voting members of the Church Council, elected by the council, who shall have voice and vote on the committee;
   b. the secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, who shall have voice and vote on the committee;
   c. ELCA general counsel and associate general counsel, who shall have voice but not vote on the committee;
   d. at least one liaison bishop to the Church Council, who shall have voice but not vote on the committee;
   e. at least one advisory member to the Church Council, who shall have voice but not vote on the committee;
   f. staff members of the Office of the Secretary as deemed necessary, who shall have voice but not vote on the committee; and
   g. such other advisory or liaison members as may be invited to participate from time to time by the committee or the Church Council, who shall have voice but not vote on the committee.

3.2. Members of the committee will have, or will develop, thorough knowledge of the Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the polity and governance of this church, and this church’s standards for rostered ministry and discipline.

3.3. Except for the secretary of this church, voting members of the committee shall be elected by the Church Council to a two-year term which begins at the first meeting following a Churchwide Assembly. No term limits shall restrict membership on this committee.

3.4. Members of the committee shall respect the confidential nature of committee deliberations and legal updates provided by the general counsel, and shall not disclose or discuss the content of such confidential matters outside a committee meeting except as appropriate in a plenary or executive session of the Church Council.

IV. Chair

4.1. Voting members of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee shall elect a chair at the first meeting following a Churchwide Assembly by means of an ecclesiastical ballot (as defined in the ELCA constitution), or by unanimous consent, as determined by committee members. Only voting members of the Church Council shall be eligible to serve as chair or cast ballots for the chair.

4.2. The chair shall act as communication liaison between the committee and the Church Council, and shall report the recommendations of the committee during plenary sessions of the Church Council.

4.3. The chair shall coordinate the assignment of activities to committee members, and may establish sub-committees and necessary deadlines as needed, based upon member input.
4.4. The chair shall develop, in consultation with the secretary of this church and appropriate staff members, an agenda for meetings and provide for minutes of meetings.

4.5. The chair shall ensure the effectiveness of meetings by directing discussion to meet mission objectives.

4.6. The chair shall serve on the Executive Committee of the Church Council.

V. Meetings

5.1. The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee shall convene in conjunction with regular meetings of the Church Council.

5.2. Special meetings may be convened, via conference call, for special or emergency reasons.

5.3. Meeting agendas shall be provided to members prior to meetings, along with materials for discussion.

5.4. Voting and non-voting members of the committee shall regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the committee.

VI. Decision Making Process

6.1. All decisions of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee shall be reached by consensus or, when this is not possible, by simple majority of the voting members present and voting. Proxy and absentee voting shall not be permitted.

6.2. A simple majority of the voting membership of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

VII. Amendment of Charter

7.1. The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee shall review this charter at the first meeting of the committee following a Churchwide Assembly.

7.2. Amendments to this charter may be recommended, at any meeting, for approval by the Church Council.

This charter was approved by the Church Council on April 13, 2008.
Planning and Evaluation Committee
[To be provided November 2008]

Program and Services Committee
Purpose: This committee (ELCA 14.41.D99) assists the Church Council in assuring that churchwide purposes, policies, and objectives are being fulfilled through the programs and services of the units of the churchwide organization to enable the following strategic directions of the ELCA:

• Support congregations in their call to be faithful, welcoming, and generous, sharing the mind of Christ.
• Assist members, congregations, synods, and institutions, and agencies of this church to grow in evangelical outreach.
• Step forward as a public church that witnesses boldly to God's love for all that God has created.
• Deepen and expand our global, ecumenical, and interfaith relationships for the sake of God's mission.
• Assist this church to bring forth and support faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God's mission in a pluralistic world.

Responsibilities:
1. Review and consider new and revised churchwide policies and strategies recommended by units that have implications for congregations, synods, other churchwide units, or institutions and agencies of this church for recommendation to the Church Council. This includes:
   a. New and revised social policies and procedures
   b. New and revised social statements
   c. Proposals from program units
   d. Personnel policies, including pension and benefits
2. Monitor corporate social responsibility policies, issue papers, social criteria investment screens, and related activities. Review and consider recommendations to Church Council.
3. Ensure churchwide unit policies and procedures are effective in practice and consistent with overall churchwide purposes, policies, and objectives.
4. Act on the policies and recommendations proposed by churchwide units subject to consideration by the CWA.
### Church Council Committee Evaluation

Instructions: This document is designed to obtain your evaluation of the effectiveness of the committee. Circle the number on the rating scale that corresponds to your evaluation of the committee in each of the following categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of role and function is lacking. We are unclear about our responsibilities.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>Clarity of role and function is present. We distinguish clearly between policy determination and management functions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership is dominated by one or a few persons and other resources within the committee are never used.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Leadership is shared among members according to abilities and insights. Every member's resources are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important issues are not dealt with but “swept under the rug” or dealt with outside of the committee.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Important issues are consistently on the agenda for open consideration, debate and decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation is lacking. We are consistently caught off guard without adequate information, facts, and documentation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Preparation is outstanding. Members and staff do excellent preliminary work. Members are well informed and understand the pros and cons of all decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of ideas is poor. We do not really listen. Ideas are ignored.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Communication of ideas is good. We listen and try hard to understand one another's ideas. Ideas are well presented and acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible participation is lacking. We reflect our own biases. We “grind our own axes” and watch from the “outside.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Responsible participation is present. We are sensitive to the need to reflect on what is best for our organization and the entire community. Everyone is “on the inside.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of diversity is limited. Individuals perceived as different are rejected or ignored.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Acceptance of diversity is high. We recognize and respect the uniqueness of each person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of individuals is stifled. Conformity is explicitly or implicitly fostered. Persons do not feel free to express their individuality. They are manipulated.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Freedom of individuals is enhanced and encouraged. The creativity and individuality of individuals is respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of relationship is one of hostility, suspicion, indulgent politeness, fear, anxiety, or superficiality.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Climate of relationship is one of mutual trust and genuineness; the atmosphere is friendly and relaxed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making is superficial. We are really a “rubber stamp” for those on the “inside.” Decisions are forced upon us.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Decision making is participative. All data are available and all opinions are aired, with resultant “ownership” of decisions that are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action agreements are not reached. We never set target dates or plan for follow through.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Action agreements are reached. We agree on next steps to be taken and set target dates for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity is lacking. At each meeting, we seem to “start from scratch.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Continuity is present. We build on previous work in an efficient way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity is low. Our meetings are a waste of time and money. We are just coasting along.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Productivity is high. We are digging hard and earnestly at work on important tasks. We create and achieve at each meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above evaluation, what suggestions or ideas do you have for increasing the effectiveness of this committee? (NOTE: Give particular attention to ways of strengthening the items which you rated 4 or below.)
2007 OPERATING RESULTS SUMMARY

The churchwide organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America had income over expense of $2.5 million in current operating funds for the fiscal year ended January 31, 2008.

Receipts totaled $83.3 million for fiscal year 2007 compared with $83.0 million the previous year, an increase of $0.3 million or 0.4%. Expenses related to the current operating fund amounted to $80.8 million, an increase of $1.2 million or 1.5% from fiscal 2006. Revenue was favorable to the budget by $1.9 million or 2.3%. Expenses were below the Church Council authorized level by $1.0 million or 1.2%.

Income from congregations through synods in the form of mission support income increased slightly to $66.1 million, an increase of $0.5 million or 0.7%. This was the second consecutive year with an increase in annual mission support income, following four years of decline. It is the fourth consecutive year of an increase in total current operating income.

Other temporarily restricted and unrestricted funds available for the budgeted operations of the church amounted to $17.2 million compared with $17.3 million in 2006. Major sources of income in these categories included: Missionary Sponsorship, $3.8 million; bequest and trust income, $2.3 million; investment income, $2.7 million; endowment income, $2.2 million; grants for new starts, $2.5 million; Vision for Mission, $1.2 million; and other income of $3.4 million. Included in other income is $0.7 million in unrestricted gifts from synods and other partner organizations that shared bequests and proceeds from the sale of property.

Total contributions to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal in 2007 reached $22.1 million, a new high, of which a record $21.3 million was for the general World Hunger Appeal. This represents an increase of 11.1% over 2006 and the third consecutive year of income growth in the World Hunger general appeal. Designated World Hunger income was $0.8 million, with the majority, $0.6 million, designated for the Stand with Africa campaign.

ELCA members in 2007 contributed $3.1 million for the ELCA disaster response and an additional $3.9 million was received in federal grants for hurricane relief, for a total of $7.0 million. This compares to $5.1 million from members and $3.4 million in external grants in 2006. The disaster appeal that received the most donations continued to be the 2005 hurricanes response with receipts of $0.9 million. Other disaster income was primarily for the general disaster fund, $0.5 million; general domestic disaster fund, $0.8 million; and the general international disaster fund, $0.4 million.

Overall, it was a year of positive financial results for the churchwide organization. Mission support income increased in 42 synods and six regions. The range in synod variances as compared to the prior year was again high, with increases up to 11.9% and decreases as low as 38.3%, but the vast majority of synods performed within 5% of their plan. In total, the churchwide organization received 98.0% of synod mission support income plans. Investment income realized a short-term boost of 15.7% and exceeded budget by $1.5 million because of higher restricted fund levels, the market value of the investments, and improved interest rates. Unrestricted bequest and trust income exceeded budget by $0.4 million and contributed to a positive revenue variance. The variance above budget of $0.4 million was transferred to the Mission Development Fund. World Hunger results continued to exceed expectations.

Exhibit F, Part 2b, pages 1-11 provides additional information including variance analysis relative to budget and previous year results, a report of mission support by synods, and supporting charts. Exhibit F, Part 2c is a report on World Hunger. Exhibit F, Part 2d includes the Statements of Financial Position and information on net assets and fund balances.
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
CURRENT OPERATING FUNDS
SUMMARY OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES
(In Thousands)
For the Year Ended January 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007 ACTUAL</th>
<th>2007 BUDGET</th>
<th>2006 ACTUAL</th>
<th>Year-to-Date Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT YEAR (v_s)PRIOR YEAR (v_s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRESTRICTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Support</td>
<td>$ 66,129</td>
<td>$ 65,800</td>
<td>$ 65,664</td>
<td>Favorable/(Unfavorable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 8,181</td>
<td>$ 5,772</td>
<td>$ 7,355</td>
<td>2,409 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unrestricted</td>
<td>74,310</td>
<td>71,572</td>
<td>73,019</td>
<td>2,738 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPORARILY RESTRICTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Gifts</td>
<td>$ 5,756</td>
<td>$ 5,900</td>
<td>$ 5,815</td>
<td>(144) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 3,239</td>
<td>$ 3,950</td>
<td>$ 4,177</td>
<td>(711) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Restricted</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>9,993</td>
<td>(855) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>83,305</td>
<td>81,422</td>
<td>83,012</td>
<td>1,883 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$ 80,783</td>
<td>$ 81,422</td>
<td>$ 79,620</td>
<td>639 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td>$ 2,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 3,392</td>
<td>2,522 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Current Operating Funds

## Revenue Summary

**For the Year Ended January 31, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007 Actual</th>
<th>2007 Budget</th>
<th>2006 Actual</th>
<th>2007 Budget vs. Prior Year</th>
<th>2006 Budget vs. Prior Year</th>
<th>Year-To-Date Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNRESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Support</td>
<td>$66,129,117</td>
<td>$65,800,000</td>
<td>$65,664,031</td>
<td>$329,117</td>
<td>$465,086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for Mission</td>
<td>1,211,077</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,224,403</td>
<td>(38,923)</td>
<td>(13,326)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>2,730,165</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>2,360,172</td>
<td>1,480,165</td>
<td>369,993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests and Trusts</td>
<td>1,573,182</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,899,017</td>
<td>373,182</td>
<td>(325,835)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>731,174</td>
<td>722,000</td>
<td>506,733</td>
<td>9,174</td>
<td>224,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>934,724</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>(15,276)</td>
<td>(15,276)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,000,124</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>414,482</td>
<td>600,124</td>
<td>585,642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td>74,309,563</td>
<td>71,572,000</td>
<td>73,018,838</td>
<td>2,737,563</td>
<td>1,290,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEMPORARILY RESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Sponsorship</td>
<td>3,828,427</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>3,852,112</td>
<td>(171,573)</td>
<td>(23,685)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests and Trusts</td>
<td>757,825</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,592,096</td>
<td>(742,175)</td>
<td>(834,271)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>1,481,313</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>1,585,254</td>
<td>31,313</td>
<td>(103,941)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit-Designated Gifts</td>
<td>427,885</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>463,247</td>
<td>27,885</td>
<td>(35,362)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Investment Fund</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restricted</strong></td>
<td>8,995,450</td>
<td>9,850,000</td>
<td>9,992,709</td>
<td>(854,550)</td>
<td>(997,259)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$83,305,013</td>
<td>$81,422,000</td>
<td>$83,011,547</td>
<td>$1,883,013</td>
<td>$293,466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRELIMINARY AND UNAUDITED 2nd Close**
## EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
### CURRENT OPERATING FUNDS
#### ACTUAL EXPENSES VS. SPENDING AUTHORIZATION
For the Year Ended January 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007 Actual Spending</th>
<th>2007 Authorization</th>
<th>Variance (Unfavorable)</th>
<th>Percent of Actual to Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM UNITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission</td>
<td>20,655,778</td>
<td>20,886,550</td>
<td>230,772</td>
<td>98.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mission</td>
<td>15,969,559</td>
<td>16,108,913</td>
<td>139,354</td>
<td>99.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Ministries</td>
<td>1,261,980</td>
<td>1,290,285</td>
<td>28,305</td>
<td>97.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>3,867,246</td>
<td>3,861,428</td>
<td>(5,818)</td>
<td>100.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation and Education</td>
<td>11,779,555</td>
<td>11,734,280</td>
<td>(45,275)</td>
<td>100.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop</td>
<td>5,897,317</td>
<td>6,003,000</td>
<td>105,683</td>
<td>98.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes sections of Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations, Human Resources, Research and Evaluation, Synodical Relations and Worship and Liturgical Resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>6,537,085</td>
<td>6,428,665</td>
<td>(108,420)</td>
<td>101.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes sections of Information Technology and Management Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>3,454,435</td>
<td>3,577,705</td>
<td>123,270</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes Churchwide Assembly, Church Council and Legal Expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE UNITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Services</td>
<td>3,137,261</td>
<td>3,264,279</td>
<td>127,018</td>
<td>96.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>2,742,662</td>
<td>2,861,550</td>
<td>118,888</td>
<td>95.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Treasury</td>
<td>809,278</td>
<td>818,615</td>
<td>9,337</td>
<td>98.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree Minimum Health Obligation</td>
<td>2,801,385</td>
<td>2,801,385</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>1,496,583</td>
<td>1,690,000</td>
<td>193,417</td>
<td>88.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95,345</td>
<td>95,345</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$80,410,124</td>
<td>$81,422,000.00</td>
<td>$1,011,876</td>
<td>98.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Development Fund</td>
<td>373,182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(373,182)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,783,306</td>
<td>$81,422,000</td>
<td>$638,694</td>
<td>99.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

**SYNODICAL REMITTANCES**

for the period ending January 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL PLAN</th>
<th>REVISED ESTIMATE</th>
<th>CURRENT PERIOD</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>$ VARIANCE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC MISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMOUNT MS% % REC'D</td>
<td>AMOUNT MS% % REC'D</td>
<td>2007 2006</td>
<td>2007 2006</td>
<td>% Vary Monthly Y-T-D SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1A $ 205,863 42.0% 80.9%</td>
<td>$ 173,514 37.0% 96.0%</td>
<td>21,033 31,447</td>
<td>166,584 187,878 (11.3%)</td>
<td>(10,415) (21,294) 37,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W. Wash</td>
<td>1B 675,000 45.0% 97.1%</td>
<td>675,000 45.0% 97.1%</td>
<td>81,187 78,659</td>
<td>655,460 629,665 4.1%</td>
<td>2,528 25,795 273,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. Wash</td>
<td>1C 453,463 37.0% 95.0%</td>
<td>453,463 37.0% 95.0%</td>
<td>44,216 45,202</td>
<td>430,820 422,668 1.9%</td>
<td>(986) 8,152 155,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Wash / Id</td>
<td>1D 364,800 38.0% 100.4%</td>
<td>364,800 38.0% 100.4%</td>
<td>55,966 43,011</td>
<td>366,342 327,332 11.9%</td>
<td>12,955 39,009 78,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1E 456,000 40.0% 105.0%</td>
<td>456,000 40.0% 105.0%</td>
<td>53,846 64,232</td>
<td>478,816 463,203 3.4%</td>
<td>(10,387) 15,613 142,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1F 419,265 38.5% 100.0%</td>
<td>419,265 38.5% 100.0%</td>
<td>55,443 51,922</td>
<td>419,265 399,000 5.1%</td>
<td>3,521 20,265 182,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Region 1</td>
<td>2,574,391 40.2% 97.8%</td>
<td>2,542,042 39.8% 99.0%</td>
<td>311,691 314,475</td>
<td>(2,784) 87,541 870,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Pacific</td>
<td>2A 1,176,000 49.0% 99.2%</td>
<td>1,217,328 49.0% 95.9%</td>
<td>162,525 153,310</td>
<td>1,167,043 1,125,784 3.7%</td>
<td>9,215 41,259 236,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW California</td>
<td>2B 718,340 49.0% 103.7%</td>
<td>718,340 49.0% 103.7%</td>
<td>42,173 57,555</td>
<td>745,223 735,403 (1.1%)</td>
<td>(15,382) (8,180) 398,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>2C 1,161,000 54.0% 102.6%</td>
<td>1,161,000 54.0% 102.6%</td>
<td>156,751 132,082</td>
<td>1,190,795 1,123,733 6.0%</td>
<td>24,669 67,422 635,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon</td>
<td>2D 1,294,380 47.0% 103.2%</td>
<td>1,330,100 47.0% 100.5%</td>
<td>145,634 90,418</td>
<td>1,336,446 1,233,753 8.3%</td>
<td>55,216 102,693 273,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mt.</td>
<td>2E 1,500,000 50.0% 102.0%</td>
<td>1,577,900 50.0% 97.0%</td>
<td>160,364 149,232</td>
<td>1,530,369 1,462,474 3.2%</td>
<td>11,132 47,985 367,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Region 2</td>
<td>5,849,720 49.7% 102.1%</td>
<td>6,004,668 49.8% 99.4%</td>
<td>667,445 582,596</td>
<td>84,849 251,089 1,911,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. No. Dak</td>
<td>3A 358,764 41.5% 107.7%</td>
<td>358,764 41.5% 107.7%</td>
<td>37,108 34,667</td>
<td>386,485 380,581 1.6%</td>
<td>2,441 5,904 149,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. No. Dak</td>
<td>3B 504,800 40.0% 87.2%</td>
<td>504,800 40.0% 87.2%</td>
<td>62,268 61,063</td>
<td>439,985 418,636 5.1%</td>
<td>1,206 21,329 131,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dak</td>
<td>3C 853,439 42.0% 101.3%</td>
<td>878,007 42.0% 98.4%</td>
<td>48,967 55,515</td>
<td>864,154 860,368 0.4%</td>
<td>(6,549) 3,785 261,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W. Minn</td>
<td>3D 861,900 51.0% 100.1%</td>
<td>918,000 51.0% 94.0%</td>
<td>84,071 134,283</td>
<td>862,828 855,271 0.9%</td>
<td>(48,212) 7,557 230,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E. Minn</td>
<td>3E 710,500 49.0% 95.4%</td>
<td>683,550 49.0% 99.1%</td>
<td>82,492 61,349</td>
<td>667,671 666,503 1.7%</td>
<td>21,143 11,168 241,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. Minn</td>
<td>3F 1,211,068 52.5% 98.7%</td>
<td>1,211,068 52.5% 98.7%</td>
<td>180,918 247,838</td>
<td>1,195,494 1,190,669 0.4%</td>
<td>(66,920) 4,825 478,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpls Area</td>
<td>3G 2,284,000 57.1% 85.5%</td>
<td>2,090,000 55.0% 93.4%</td>
<td>418,277 352,865</td>
<td>1,952,504 2,011,579 (2.9%)</td>
<td>65,413 (59,075) 481,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul Area</td>
<td>3H 1,170,000 50.0% 96.4%</td>
<td>1,144,000 50.0% 96.8%</td>
<td>95,554 112,399</td>
<td>1,128,020 1,116,263 1.1%</td>
<td>(16,845) 11,757 241,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Minn</td>
<td>3I 1,186,500 52.5% 95.3%</td>
<td>1,163,925 52.5% 97.2%</td>
<td>194,202 188,400</td>
<td>1,130,791 1,180,278 (4.2%)</td>
<td>5,802 (49,487) 276,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Region 3</td>
<td>9,140,971 50.2% 94.5%</td>
<td>8,952,114 49.7% 96.5%</td>
<td>1,205,857 1,248,378</td>
<td>(42,521) (42,239) 2,492,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2,394,000</td>
<td>2,365,500</td>
<td>331,699</td>
<td>263,418</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central States</td>
<td>1,158,050</td>
<td>1,158,050</td>
<td>1,154,975</td>
<td>1,190,497</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark/Ok</td>
<td>275,200</td>
<td>289,300</td>
<td>33,961</td>
<td>40,978</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Tx / N La</td>
<td>595,350</td>
<td>611,065</td>
<td>79,357</td>
<td>74,951</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. Tex</td>
<td>1,058,750</td>
<td>1,058,750</td>
<td>1,066,276</td>
<td>1,069,167</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tx.-La. Gulf Coast</td>
<td>812,500</td>
<td>812,500</td>
<td>81,158</td>
<td>94,450</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Region 4</td>
<td>6,293,850</td>
<td>6,295,165</td>
<td>689,058</td>
<td>637,851</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Chicago</td>
<td>2,113,458</td>
<td>2,034,010</td>
<td>1,082,125</td>
<td>1,040,474</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Illinois</td>
<td>1,755,720</td>
<td>1,611,030</td>
<td>1,531,537</td>
<td>1,525,900</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen. So. Ill</td>
<td>588,000</td>
<td>583,100</td>
<td>586,007</td>
<td>577,365</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Iowa</td>
<td>1,050,500</td>
<td>1,050,500</td>
<td>1,066,276</td>
<td>1,069,167</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iowa</td>
<td>826,500</td>
<td>826,500</td>
<td>793,563</td>
<td>849,353</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E. Iowa</td>
<td>917,560</td>
<td>917,560</td>
<td>914,250</td>
<td>914,250</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Great Lakes</td>
<td>1,050,500</td>
<td>1,050,500</td>
<td>1,066,276</td>
<td>1,069,167</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW of Wisc</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>584,440</td>
<td>564,160</td>
<td>571,111</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C. Wisc</td>
<td>1,161,030</td>
<td>1,161,030</td>
<td>1,531,537</td>
<td>1,525,900</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grtr Milwaukee</td>
<td>914,250</td>
<td>914,250</td>
<td>903,665</td>
<td>897,272</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Mich</td>
<td>1,082,125</td>
<td>1,082,125</td>
<td>1,077,931</td>
<td>1,077,931</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Region 5</td>
<td>13,734,377</td>
<td>13,690,999</td>
<td>13,496,818</td>
<td>13,425,917</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original Plan**

**Revised Estimate**

**Current Period**

**Year-to-Date**

**$ Variance**

**Specific Mission Support**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFIC MISSION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>MS%</th>
<th>% REC'D</th>
<th>REVISED ESTIMATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>MS%</th>
<th>% REC'D</th>
<th>CURRENT PERIOD</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>% VARY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC MISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>1,391,724</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>1,391,724</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>238,254</td>
<td>242,217</td>
<td>1,318,725</td>
<td>1,313,793</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>1,265,004</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>102.0%</td>
<td>1,307,075</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>177,488</td>
<td>169,665</td>
<td>1,290,908</td>
<td>1,254,902</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>651,000</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>651,000</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>96,641</td>
<td>133,650</td>
<td>643,487</td>
<td>603,313</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. E. Penn</td>
<td>755,882</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>105.8%</td>
<td>775,882</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>105.8%</td>
<td>124,340</td>
<td>97,951</td>
<td>811,224</td>
<td>1,125,314</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. E. Penn</td>
<td>1,722,500</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>1,708,000</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>217,913</td>
<td>224,756</td>
<td>1,516,087</td>
<td>1,600,446</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. E. Penn</td>
<td>1,484,000</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>1,484,000</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>95,899</td>
<td>151,782</td>
<td>1,484,000</td>
<td>1,476,973</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Zion</td>
<td>651,000</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>651,000</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>96,641</td>
<td>133,650</td>
<td>643,487</td>
<td>603,313</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Region 7</td>
<td>7,324,330</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>7,339,901</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>957,644</td>
<td>1,026,820</td>
<td>7,178,152</td>
<td>7,080,334</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. W. Penn</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>100.2%</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>100.2%</td>
<td>66,063</td>
<td>52,079</td>
<td>456,109</td>
<td>457,157</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. W. Penn</td>
<td>1,331,000</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>100.7%</td>
<td>1,331,000</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>100.7%</td>
<td>76,714</td>
<td>147,161</td>
<td>1,339,732</td>
<td>1,366,236</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>525,500</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>525,500</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>65,648</td>
<td>66,557</td>
<td>509,326</td>
<td>515,714</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Susquehock</td>
<td>2,139,375</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>2,139,375</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>147,702</td>
<td>133,650</td>
<td>1,290,908</td>
<td>1,254,902</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Susquehock</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>74,501</td>
<td>19,094</td>
<td>635,501</td>
<td>612,756</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del / Md</td>
<td>1,531,170</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>1,531,170</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>171,115</td>
<td>166,101</td>
<td>1,697,285</td>
<td>1,744,306</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro DC</td>
<td>1,083,500</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>1,083,500</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>109,075</td>
<td>52,079</td>
<td>1,092,575</td>
<td>1,087,384</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Virgin-W Mdyl</td>
<td>332,574</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>332,574</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,018</td>
<td>6,797</td>
<td>332,574</td>
<td>332,226</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Region 8</td>
<td>8,018,119</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>8,042,561</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>738,577</td>
<td>701,154</td>
<td>7,887,407</td>
<td>7,940,109</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1,120,291</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
<td>1,130,291</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
<td>93,445</td>
<td>108,060</td>
<td>1,140,251</td>
<td>1,103,496</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>100.4%</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>100.4%</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>166,667</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>1,538,001</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>1,538,001</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>51,267</td>
<td>123,667</td>
<td>1,484,004</td>
<td>1,484,004</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>1,442,501</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>1,290,300</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>103.1%</td>
<td>105,521</td>
<td>146,313</td>
<td>1,330,416</td>
<td>1,303,496</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida-Bahamas</td>
<td>1,518,224</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>1,518,224</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>177,457</td>
<td>158,843</td>
<td>1,456,781</td>
<td>1,474,011</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Region 9</td>
<td>7,664,016</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>7,521,815</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>602,690</td>
<td>705,949</td>
<td>7,450,430</td>
<td>7,397,407</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67,361,926</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>67,099,316</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>7,952,332</td>
<td>8,057,206</td>
<td>66,129,117</td>
<td>65,664,031</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Synodical Mission Support By Month
2001 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$5.07</td>
<td>$5.45</td>
<td>$5.40</td>
<td>$5.94</td>
<td>$5.15</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
<td>$5.19</td>
<td>$4.86</td>
<td>$6.11</td>
<td>$5.63</td>
<td>$7.18</td>
<td>$8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
<td>$5.20</td>
<td>$6.37</td>
<td>$5.48</td>
<td>$4.82</td>
<td>$5.53</td>
<td>$4.85</td>
<td>$4.76</td>
<td>$5.85</td>
<td>$5.23</td>
<td>$6.98</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$5.13</td>
<td>$4.81</td>
<td>$5.79</td>
<td>$5.49</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
<td>$5.32</td>
<td>$4.37</td>
<td>$5.06</td>
<td>$5.68</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$7.37</td>
<td>$7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$4.97</td>
<td>$5.45</td>
<td>$5.68</td>
<td>$4.97</td>
<td>$5.14</td>
<td>$4.87</td>
<td>$4.53</td>
<td>$5.10</td>
<td>$5.08</td>
<td>$5.36</td>
<td>$7.18</td>
<td>$7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
<td>$5.33</td>
<td>$5.58</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
<td>$5.11</td>
<td>$4.77</td>
<td>$5.05</td>
<td>$4.97</td>
<td>$4.93</td>
<td>$5.43</td>
<td>$6.87</td>
<td>$7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$5.14</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
<td>$4.96</td>
<td>$5.52</td>
<td>$5.07</td>
<td>$4.68</td>
<td>$5.04</td>
<td>$4.82</td>
<td>$5.18</td>
<td>$5.47</td>
<td>$6.53</td>
<td>$8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$5.11</td>
<td>$5.17</td>
<td>$5.36</td>
<td>$5.53</td>
<td>$4.99</td>
<td>$5.03</td>
<td>$5.04</td>
<td>$4.62</td>
<td>$5.59</td>
<td>$5.31</td>
<td>$6.43</td>
<td>$7.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Support Income
Original and Revised Plans vs. Actual
with Actual as Percentage of Original and Revised Plans

[Graph showing Mission Support Income over years from 1997 to 2007, with Actual as Percentage of Original and Revised Plans.]
Mission Support Income
Original and Revised Plans vs. Actual
with Actual as Percentage of Original and Revised Plans
Mission Support Received In Preceeding 12 Months
Through January 2008

April 2002

Millions

$60  $62  $64  $66  $68  $70  $72

Operating Income Versus Operating Expense 1989 - 2007
Using Inflation Adjusted Figures With 1989 as the Base
## World Hunger - General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Actual Vs. Estimate</th>
<th>Current Vs. Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$2,994,115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Synods</td>
<td>11,572,439</td>
<td>11,750,000</td>
<td>(177,561)</td>
<td>(169,093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Giving</td>
<td>7,144,137</td>
<td>6,250,000</td>
<td>894,137</td>
<td>905,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>292,571</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>17,571</td>
<td>23,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests, Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,276,883</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>1,801,883</td>
<td>1,372,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>21,286,030</td>
<td>18,750,000</td>
<td>2,536,030</td>
<td>2,131,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>20,074,875</td>
<td>20,057,122</td>
<td>(17,753)</td>
<td>(1,973,482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td>$1,211,155</td>
<td>($1,307,122)</td>
<td>$2,518,277</td>
<td>$158,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$4,205,270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## World Hunger - Designated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Stand</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>With Africa</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$1,132,427</td>
<td>$955,083</td>
<td>$177,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Synods</td>
<td>254,446</td>
<td>146,883</td>
<td>107,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Giving</td>
<td>561,227</td>
<td>449,663</td>
<td>111,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests, Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>820,198</td>
<td>601,071</td>
<td>219,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>901,561</td>
<td>619,500</td>
<td>282,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td>($81,363)</td>
<td>($18,429)</td>
<td>($62,934)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$1,051,064</td>
<td>$936,654</td>
<td>$114,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Revenue** $22,106,228
**Combined Expenses** $20,976,436
**Combined Net** $1,129,792
**Combined Fund Balance** $5,256,334

PRELIMINARY AND UNAUDITED 2nd Close
## EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
### Consolidating Statement of Financial Position

#### PRELIMINARY AND UNAUDITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>Churchwide</th>
<th>*Endowment Funds</th>
<th>*Deferred Gift Funds</th>
<th>Total January 31 2008</th>
<th>Total January 31 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$2,666,289</td>
<td>$3,086,135</td>
<td>$7,588,008</td>
<td>$13,340,432</td>
<td>$18,984,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Securities Held as Collateral For Securities Loaned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,698,760</td>
<td>56,698,760</td>
<td>72,133,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable Under Securities Loan Agreements</td>
<td>31,570,535</td>
<td>346,902,694</td>
<td>196,047,813</td>
<td>574,521,042</td>
<td>545,833,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>13,384,344</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>425,408</td>
<td>13,809,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Receivable</td>
<td>2,009,639</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>957,180</td>
<td>2,966,819</td>
<td>3,034,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Affiliates</td>
<td>1,738,051</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,303,576</td>
<td>1,991,085</td>
<td>1,500,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses, Advances and Other Assets</td>
<td>3,961,696</td>
<td>2,856,455</td>
<td>1,367,642</td>
<td>18,618,882</td>
<td>17,346,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Investments</td>
<td>74,961</td>
<td>17,251,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,391,891</td>
<td>1,476,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Interest in Outside Trusts</td>
<td>3,961,696</td>
<td>2,856,455</td>
<td>1,367,642</td>
<td>18,618,882</td>
<td>17,346,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Surrender Value of Life Insurance</td>
<td>1,391,891</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,391,891</td>
<td>1,476,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, Plant &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>62,471,569</td>
<td>74,961</td>
<td>17,251,240</td>
<td>62,471,569</td>
<td>58,140,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation/ Amortization</td>
<td>1,023,209</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,023,209</td>
<td>1,023,209</td>
<td>1,071,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$86,886,075</td>
<td>$370,099,957</td>
<td>$207,705,088</td>
<td>$664,691,120</td>
<td>$638,565,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LIABILITIES | | | | | |
| Accounts Payable | $4,231,902 | $11,209 | $2,358,418 | $6,601,529 | $7,121,815 |
| Notes Payable | 7,655,768 | - | - | 7,655,768 | 9,388,246 |
| Accrued Liabilities | 2,260,521 | - | 111,546 | 2,372,067 | 1,990,130 |
| Due to Related Organizations | - | 171,569 | 645,906 | 817,475 | 708,212 |
| Unfunded Post-Retirement Medical Liability | 90,900,361 | - | - | 90,900,361 | 81,349,362 |
| Deferred Revenue | 26,110 | 171,684 | 2,146,794 | 2,344,588 | 2,183,475 |
| Annuities Payable | - | - | 111,403,250 | 111,403,250 | 117,274,641 |
| Funds Held for Others In Perpetuity | - | 40,037,108 | - | 40,037,108 | 32,634,678 |
| Funds Held for Others | - | 130,721,224 | 53,598,588 | 184,319,812 | 163,397,570 |
| Total Liabilities | $105,074,662 | $171,112,794 | $170,264,502 | $446,451,958 | $416,048,129 |

| NET ASSETS | Unrestricted/Undesignated | 33,742,826 | 20,066,286 | 6,543,743 | 60,352,855 | 49,717,442 |
| Unfunded Post-Retirement Medical Liability Designated | 11,358,988 | - | - | 11,358,988 | 13,922,901 |
| Temporarily Restricted | 27,609,960 | 59,187,723 | 15,238,667 | 102,036,350 | 111,351,445 |
| Permanently Restricted | - | 119,733,154 | 15,658,176 | 135,391,330 | 128,875,095 |
| Total Net Assets | ($18,188,587) | $196,967,163 | $37,440,586 | $218,239,162 | $222,517,521 |

| Total Liabilities and Net Assets | $86,886,075 | $370,099,957 | $207,705,088 | $664,691,120 | $638,565,650 |

*As of December 31, 2007*
# Statement of Financial Position

**Churchwide Operations**

**Preliminary and Unaudited**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January 2008</th>
<th>January 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$2,666,289</td>
<td>$6,046,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>31,570,535</td>
<td>44,847,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>13,384,344</td>
<td>13,312,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Receivable</td>
<td>2,009,639</td>
<td>1,037,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Affiliates</td>
<td>1,738,051</td>
<td>1,050,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances and Other Assets</td>
<td>3,961,696</td>
<td>2,575,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Investments</td>
<td>74,961</td>
<td>74,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Surrender Value of Life Insurance</td>
<td>1,391,891</td>
<td>1,476,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, Plant &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>62,471,569</td>
<td>58,140,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation/Amortization</td>
<td>(33,406,109)</td>
<td>(31,786,027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Current Assets</td>
<td>1,023,209</td>
<td>1,071,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$86,886,075</td>
<td>$97,848,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|              |              |              |
| **LIABILITIES** |              |              |
| Accounts Payable | $4,231,902   | $4,185,749   |
| Mortgage and Notes Payable | 7,655,768   | 9,388,246    |
| Accrued Liabilities | 2,260,521    | 1,989,610    |
| Deferred Revenue | 26,110       | 59,647       |
| Unfunded Post Retirement Medical Liability | 90,900,361  | 81,349,362   |
| **Total Liabilities** | $105,074,662 | $96,972,614 |

|              |              |              |
| **NET ASSETS** |              |              |
| Unrestricted/Undesignated | $33,742,826 | $30,712,178 |
| Unfunded Post Retirement Medical Liability * | (90,900,361) | (81,349,362) |
| Designated | 11,358,988   | 13,922,901   |
| Restricted | 27,609,960   | 37,590,082   |
| **Total Net Assets** | ($18,188,587) | $875,799     |

| **TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS** | $86,886,075 | $97,848,413 |

* Increase of $12,426,277 due to adoption of FASB 158 accounting standard.
## EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
### Statement of Financial Position
#### Endowment Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31 2007</th>
<th>December 31 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$3,086,135</td>
<td>$7,011,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Securities Held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Collateral for Securities Loaned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,838,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable Under Securities Loan Agreements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(19,838,589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>346,902,694</td>
<td>310,055,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,267,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Receivable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Receivable</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>692,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses &amp; Other Assets</td>
<td>2,856,455</td>
<td>2,714,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Interest in Outside Trusts</td>
<td>17,251,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$370,099,957</td>
<td>$337,693,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$11,209</td>
<td>$2,251,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Related Organizations</td>
<td>171,569</td>
<td>511,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>171,684</td>
<td>171,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Held for Others In Perpetuity</td>
<td>40,037,108</td>
<td>32,634,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Held for Others</td>
<td>130,721,224</td>
<td>113,460,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$171,112,794</td>
<td>$149,029,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$20,066,286</td>
<td>$13,177,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>59,187,723</td>
<td>62,302,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>119,733,154</td>
<td>113,183,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$198,987,163</td>
<td>$188,663,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$370,099,957</td>
<td>$337,693,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRELIMINARY AND UNAUDITED
### EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
#### Statement of Financial Position
#### Deferred Gift Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31 2007</th>
<th>December 31 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$7,588,008</td>
<td>$5,925,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Securities Held as Collateral for Securities Loaned</td>
<td>$56,698,760</td>
<td>$52,295,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable Under Securities Loan Agreements</td>
<td>($56,698,760)</td>
<td>($52,295,292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>196,047,813</td>
<td>190,930,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>425,408</td>
<td>1,477,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Receivable</td>
<td>957,180</td>
<td>1,996,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Affiliates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Receivable</td>
<td>1,300,143</td>
<td>1,298,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses &amp; Other Assets</td>
<td>18,894</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Interest in Outside Trusts</td>
<td>1,367,642</td>
<td>1,394,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,705,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>$203,023,672</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31 2007</th>
<th>December 31 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$2,358,418</td>
<td>$684,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Related Organizations</td>
<td>645,906</td>
<td>197,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Liabilities</td>
<td>111,546</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>2,146,794</td>
<td>1,952,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuities Payable</td>
<td>111,403,250</td>
<td>117,274,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Held for Others</td>
<td>53,598,588</td>
<td>49,936,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$170,264,502</strong></td>
<td><strong>$170,045,587</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31 2007</th>
<th>December 31 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$6,543,743</td>
<td>$5,827,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>15,238,667</td>
<td>11,459,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>15,658,176</td>
<td>15,691,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,440,586</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,978,085</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Liabilities and Net Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31 2007</th>
<th>December 31 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,705,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>$203,023,672</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRELIMINARY AND UNAUDITED
Cash and Short Term Investments
1998 - 2007
Cash and Investments and Net Assets By Fund
(Exclusive of Retiree Obligations)

Millions

Cash and Equivalents
Unrestricted
Designated
General Restricted
Disaster
World Hunger

### SUMMARY OF REVENUE, EXPENSE AND NET ASSETS FOR ALL FUNDS
**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JANUARY 31, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Funds</th>
<th>Designated Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>All Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Gathering</td>
<td>The Lutheran</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>World Hunger (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$83,305,013</td>
<td>$1,636</td>
<td>$3,771,970</td>
<td>$2,009,843</td>
<td>$5,783,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>80,783,306</td>
<td>238,926</td>
<td>3,818,657</td>
<td>4,623,522</td>
<td>8,681,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue In Excess of Expense</td>
<td>$2,521,707</td>
<td>($237,290)</td>
<td>($46,687)</td>
<td>($2,613,679)</td>
<td>($2,897,656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Net Assets</td>
<td>30,712,178</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>646,359</td>
<td>373,884</td>
<td>12,478,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Net Assets</td>
<td>$33,233,885</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>$409,069</td>
<td>$327,197</td>
<td>$9,864,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Excluding Unfunded Post Retirement Liability and based on second close, prior to final adjustments.
(2) Includes designated World Hunger programs.
Fiscal 2007 Revenue For All Fund Groups

$124,286,293
Fund Balances as of January 31, 2008

$71,092,929

- Unrestricted: 39.1%
- Restricted-Other: 26.0%
- Designated-Other: 11.6%
- World Hunger: 6.2%
- Disaster: 12.1%
- The Lutheran: 4.5%
- Youth Gathering: 0.5%
# Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
## 2008 Income Estimate
With 2005, 2006, and 2007 Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Support</td>
<td>$65,468,030</td>
<td>$65,664,031</td>
<td>$66,129,117</td>
<td>$66,600,000</td>
<td>$66,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for Mission</td>
<td>1,026,609</td>
<td>1,179,171</td>
<td>1,211,077</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>922,985</td>
<td>2,361,935</td>
<td>2,730,165</td>
<td>786,000</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests &amp; Trusts</td>
<td>3,037,637</td>
<td>1,891,142</td>
<td>1,573,182</td>
<td>1,200,000 (100,000)</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>528,600</td>
<td>506,733</td>
<td>731,174</td>
<td>774,000</td>
<td>34,260</td>
<td>808,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>933,829</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>934,724</td>
<td>1,062,015 (108,310)</td>
<td>953,705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>263,671</td>
<td>422,562</td>
<td>1,000,124</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td>$72,181,361</td>
<td>$72,975,574</td>
<td>$74,309,563</td>
<td>$72,072,015</td>
<td>$89,950</td>
<td>$72,161,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEMPORARILY RESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Support</td>
<td>3,736,031</td>
<td>3,814,224</td>
<td>3,828,427</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests and Trusts</td>
<td>1,071,424</td>
<td>1,592,136</td>
<td>757,825</td>
<td>1,500,000 (100,000)</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>1,845,168</td>
<td>1,590,278</td>
<td>1,481,313</td>
<td>1,523,635</td>
<td>31,550</td>
<td>1,555,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Designated</td>
<td>457,729</td>
<td>431,934</td>
<td>427,885</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Investment Func</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restricted</strong></td>
<td>$9,610,352</td>
<td>$9,928,572</td>
<td>$8,995,450</td>
<td>$9,923,635 ($68,450)</td>
<td>$9,855,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Funds</strong></td>
<td>$81,791,713</td>
<td>$82,904,146</td>
<td>$83,305,013</td>
<td>$81,995,650</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$82,017,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD HUNGER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Synods</td>
<td>$12,008,477</td>
<td>$11,714,239</td>
<td>$11,572,439</td>
<td>$11,950,000</td>
<td>$ (450,000)</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Direct Giving</td>
<td>4,254,489</td>
<td>6,224,965</td>
<td>7,144,137</td>
<td>6,353,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>7,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>227,108</td>
<td>269,471</td>
<td>292,571</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests, W/ELCA, and</td>
<td>514,514</td>
<td>939,451</td>
<td>2,276,883</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total World Hunger</strong></td>
<td>$17,004,588</td>
<td>$19,148,126</td>
<td>$21,286,030</td>
<td>$19,250,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>$98,796,301</td>
<td>$102,052,272</td>
<td>$104,591,043</td>
<td>$101,245,650</td>
<td>$771,500</td>
<td>$102,017,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
### 2008 Expense Proposal

*With Comparison to Revised 2007 Proposal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission</td>
<td>$20,886,550</td>
<td>$20,670,562</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,670,562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Ministries</td>
<td>1,290,285</td>
<td>1,334,475</td>
<td>1,334,475</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,861,428</td>
<td>3,811,343</td>
<td>4,008,560</td>
<td>4,278,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>3,861,428</td>
<td>3,811,343</td>
<td>3,811,343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation and Education</td>
<td>11,734,280</td>
<td>11,843,222</td>
<td>11,843,222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presiding Bishop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,003,000</td>
<td>6,381,765</td>
<td>6,381,765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl. sections of Ecumenical and Interreligious Relations, Research and Evaluation, Human Resources, Synodical Relations and Worship and Liturgical Resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,577,705</td>
<td>3,608,965</td>
<td>3,608,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl. Churchwide Assembly, Church Council and Legal Expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,428,665</td>
<td>6,642,905</td>
<td>6,642,905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl. sections of Information Technology and Management Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,264,279</td>
<td>3,730,245</td>
<td>3,730,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,861,550</td>
<td>2,897,725</td>
<td>2,897,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Treasury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>882,500</td>
<td>882,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retiree Minimum Health Obligation</strong></td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depreciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,690,000</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Initiative Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95,345</td>
<td>128,795</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>150,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$81,422,000</td>
<td>$81,995,650</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$82,017,150</td>
<td>$18,750,000</td>
<td>$19,250,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
### 2008 Expense Proposal
### With Comparison to Revised 2007 Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2007 Revised</th>
<th>Total Proposal</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>New Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission</td>
<td>20,886,550</td>
<td>20,670,562</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,670,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mission</td>
<td>29,536,799</td>
<td>29,680,948</td>
<td>565,800</td>
<td>30,246,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Ministries</td>
<td>1,290,285</td>
<td>1,334,475</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,334,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>7,850,599</td>
<td>7,921,243</td>
<td>68,900</td>
<td>8,090,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation and Education</td>
<td>11,885,580</td>
<td>11,998,347</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>12,004,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop</td>
<td>6,003,000</td>
<td>6,381,765</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,381,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl. sections of Ecumenical and Interreligious Relations, Research and Evaluation, Human Resources, Synodical Relations and Worship and Liturgical Resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>3,577,705</td>
<td>3,608,965</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,608,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl. Churchwide Assembly, Church Council and Legal Expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>6,428,665</td>
<td>6,642,905</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,642,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl. sections of Information Technology and Management Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Services</td>
<td>3,264,072</td>
<td>3,730,245</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,730,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>4,023,370</td>
<td>4,114,900</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>4,123,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Treasury</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>882,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>882,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree Minimum Health Obligation</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>1,690,000</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative Fund</td>
<td>115,375</td>
<td>128,795</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>150,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$100,172,000</td>
<td>$101,245,650</td>
<td>$771,500</td>
<td>$102,017,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Exhibit F, Part 3b
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Endowment Fund</th>
<th>Date Fund Was Established</th>
<th>Market Value As Of December 31, 2007</th>
<th>Market Value As Of December 31, 2006</th>
<th>Current Recipient Of Endowment Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALC Foundation Fund</td>
<td>January 27, 1986</td>
<td>$2,195,614</td>
<td>$2,172,266</td>
<td>Foundation of the ELCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry C. Boraas Legacy</td>
<td>August 10, 1955</td>
<td>$80,693</td>
<td>$79,840</td>
<td>50% to Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Ministry Fund</td>
<td>October 10, 1979</td>
<td>$347,002</td>
<td>$343,335</td>
<td>Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert G. Carlson Memorial Fund</td>
<td>December 1, 1978</td>
<td>$1,825,029</td>
<td>$1,805,740</td>
<td>Global Mission / Vocation and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPL Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>Pre-1963</td>
<td>$73,706</td>
<td>$72,927</td>
<td>Vocation and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGM General Endowment</td>
<td>November 6, 1997</td>
<td>$55,001</td>
<td>$54,420</td>
<td>Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGM Missions</td>
<td>July 8, 1926</td>
<td>$262,409</td>
<td>$259,635</td>
<td>Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of Persons with Other Faiths</td>
<td>July 22, 1992</td>
<td>$56,353</td>
<td>$55,757</td>
<td>Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCA Educational Grant Program</td>
<td>January 1, 1996</td>
<td>$126,127</td>
<td>$124,794</td>
<td>Vocation and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCA General Memorial Fund</td>
<td>September 19, 1997</td>
<td>$230,980</td>
<td>$223,880</td>
<td>ELCA Current Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund to Supplement Overseas Retirement Benefits</td>
<td>May 18, 1987</td>
<td>$184,051</td>
<td>$175,156</td>
<td>Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Hatleberg Estate</td>
<td>November 25, 1974</td>
<td>$77,489</td>
<td>$76,670</td>
<td>Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In The City for Good (and income account)</td>
<td>April 27, 1998</td>
<td>$1,960,919</td>
<td>$1,832,631</td>
<td>Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>Pre-1963</td>
<td>$28,020</td>
<td>$27,724</td>
<td>Vocation and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Builders Support Fund</td>
<td>July 15, 1997</td>
<td>$243,449</td>
<td>$262,911</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Development Fund</td>
<td>February 1, 2007</td>
<td>$945,282</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Education Fund</td>
<td>Pre-1963</td>
<td>$58,219</td>
<td>$57,604</td>
<td>Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickler Family Memorial Fund</td>
<td>January 21, 1983</td>
<td>$1,528,685</td>
<td>$1,512,528</td>
<td>ELCA Current Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia Ministry Fund</td>
<td>May 23, 1996</td>
<td>$2,384,744</td>
<td>$2,384,833</td>
<td>Global Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs Retirement Endowment Fund</td>
<td>October 1, 1995</td>
<td>$566,745</td>
<td>$560,755</td>
<td>Office of the Presiding Bishop/Synodical Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for Mission Income Fund</td>
<td>April 1, 1998</td>
<td>$802,610</td>
<td>$763,819</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$14,033,127 $12,847,225
Summary of Church Council Designated Funds
1999 - 2007 (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Mile Ministry Fund</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$11,969,149</td>
<td>$30,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies on Sexuality</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>975,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-Specific Resources</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>66,863 (2)</td>
<td>333,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of New Primary Worship Resource</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>667,598 (2)</td>
<td>282,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development Initiative</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,587,622</td>
<td>1,807,831 (2)</td>
<td>779,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Among People Living in Poverty</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>174,445 (2)</td>
<td>225,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for Engagement in Israel and Palestine</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>60,751</td>
<td>39,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,587,622</td>
<td>$15,722,210</td>
<td>$1,865,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Does not include Church Council Designated Funds Functioning as Endowment.
(2) This relates to the Church Council Designated funds only. Other revenue sources have supplemented this work.
### Church Council Designated Fund Report for:

**Year Designated by Church Council:** 1999  
**Estimated Period of Designation:** 1999 - 2007  
**Reporting Date:** January 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry Among People in Poverty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mission</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Ministry That Needs Special Attention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs Retirement Fd Functioning as Endow</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the City for Good Funds Function as Endow</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Racism projects with Ecumenical Partners</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>269,149</td>
<td>30,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Hunger Appeal Anniversary</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Project</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$3,969,149</td>
<td>$30,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense to Operating/Designated Fund</strong></td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$6,969,149</td>
<td>$30,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lutheran Center Mortgage Relief**  
**Grand Total**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Center Mortgage Relief</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$11,969,149</td>
<td>$30,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Church Council Designated Fund Report for:

### ELCA Studies on Sexuality

#### Year Designated by Church Council:
- 2001, 2002
- 2001 - 2009

#### Estimated Period of Designation:
- January 31, 2008

#### Reporting Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Inception-To-Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Compensation and Travel</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td>561,931</td>
<td>228,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force, Hearings and Focus Groups</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>176,032</td>
<td>(55,032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Circle Consultations</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>21,239</td>
<td>2,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Distribution (less sales)</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>212,869</td>
<td>(17,869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,150,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>975,572</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,428</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Church Council Designated Fund Report for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>To Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese / Mandarin Worship Resource</td>
<td>$130,800</td>
<td>$55,387</td>
<td>$75,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native Worship Resource</td>
<td>$67,860</td>
<td>$3,808</td>
<td>$64,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Evangelism Language Resources</td>
<td>$7,668</td>
<td>$7,668</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Projects</td>
<td>$206,328</td>
<td>$66,863</td>
<td>$139,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated to date:</td>
<td>$193,672</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$193,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Church Council Funds</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$66,863</td>
<td>$333,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

Other Cultural Specific Resources Available Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Implementation Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual Program Budget Allocation</td>
<td>54,125</td>
<td>54,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consignment Sales</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unit Participation</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$592,375</strong></td>
<td><strong>$525,512</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Church Council Designated Fund Report for:

**INTRODUCTION OF NEW PRIMARY WORSHIP RESOURCE**

**2005**

2005 - 2008

**January 31, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Inception-To-Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement Packet</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>21,319</td>
<td>43,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview Kit (Augsburg Fortress expense)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,245</td>
<td>(14,245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELW Introductory Package</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>173,921</td>
<td>(29,921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(study guide; liturgical review cons.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,755</td>
<td>(35,755)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Events:</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>266,930</td>
<td>223,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchwide/Synodical/Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Worship Event</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>161,487</td>
<td>33,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 CWA Core Resources Reception</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Expenses</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consignment Sales</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(6,059)</td>
<td>2,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Church Council Funds</strong></td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>667,598</td>
<td>282,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Sources of Funding:**

- Worship and Liturgical Resources budget      | 50,000 | -                 | 50,000    |

**Total Available Resources**                  | 1,000,000| 667,598           | 332,402   |
Church Council Designated Fund Report for:
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE
Year Designated by Church Council: 2005
Reporting Date: January 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Inception-To-Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>($6,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>463,422</td>
<td>405,997</td>
<td>57,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>26,196</td>
<td>(6,396)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>15,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Travel</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>12,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>4,437</td>
<td>(4,437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>(1,186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multicultural Ministries:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Middle Eastern Ministries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Leadership Development</strong></td>
<td>$537,622</td>
<td>$483,114</td>
<td>$54,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Church Council Designated Fund Report for:

**LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE**

*Year Designated by Church Council: 2005*

*Estimated Period of Designation: 2005 – 2008*

*Reporting Date: January 31, 2008*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Inception-To-Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Development Initiative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation and Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation of PhDs</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the Connections</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Center at Atlanta</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Leaders</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidacy Committee Training</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Mission Leaders (25%)</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missiologists/Leadership Consultation</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Ministries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come, See, Discover</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>33,374</td>
<td>74,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Descent Horizon</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Leadership Development</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>11,469</td>
<td>48,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/AK Native Community Center</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American Young Adult Network</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>5,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of Color Gathering</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/AK Native Youth Gathering</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/AK Native Leadership</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Leaders Network</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Horizon Internships</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>76,004</td>
<td>223,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Trainers Network</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Call to Public Justice</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>61,643</td>
<td>38,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mission:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult Program</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>22,775</td>
<td>77,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg Seminary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections Institute</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Leaders Institute</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native Ministry</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran School of Theology-Chicago</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Staff Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Leaders Event ('07)</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Grant Strategy Committee Meeting ('05)</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Developing Leaders</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Synod-ELCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Leadership Development Grant</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Church of the Redeemer</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Leaders Initiative</td>
<td>17,890</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Available**

$2,050,000 $1,324,717 $725,283

$2,587,622 $1,807,831 $779,791
### Church Council Designated Fund Report for:

**MINISTRY AMONG PEOPLE IN POVERTY**

**Year Designated by Church Council:**

2005

**Estimated Period of Designation:**

2005-2008

**Reporting Date:**

January 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name or Expense Type</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Inception-To-Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>363,500</td>
<td>143,861</td>
<td>219,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Travel</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>8,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Special</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,542</td>
<td>(542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Material</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>(6,350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Services</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>(2,335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Registrations</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>(1,145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Church Council Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>400,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,445</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,555</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Designated Fund Transfers</td>
<td>211,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>211,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Gifts</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>613,410</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,445</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>438,965</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Church Council Designated Fund Report for:

**Strategy for Engagement in Israel and Palestine**

**Year Designated by Church Council:**

**Estimated Period of Designation:**

**Reporting Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name or Expense Type</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Inception-To-Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td>$29,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip to Israel/Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Briefing</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy and Awareness Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit of Companions <em>from</em> the Holy Land</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>9,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Production</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>25,489</td>
<td>(9,489)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td>(367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant for Peace Camp for Palestinian Children in Ranallah</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td>(900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS- EAPPI-US Restructuring and recruitment Grant</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery (T-Shirt/DVDs/Communion Ware)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,793)</td>
<td>3,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accompaniment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>&quot;Seeding&quot; Visits to the Holy Land</em></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract and Support Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Help</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>29,405</td>
<td>(4,405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$60,751</td>
<td>$39,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**2009 Synod Mission Support Plans**

**And 2005, 2006 and 2007 Actuals with 2008 Revisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYNOD NAME</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>2005 ACTUAL MS %</th>
<th>2006 ACTUAL MS %</th>
<th>2007 ACTUAL MS %</th>
<th>2008 REVISED ESTIMATES AMOUNT MS %</th>
<th>2009 REVISED ESTIMATES AMOUNT MS %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>178,753</td>
<td>42.58%</td>
<td>187,878</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>166,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W. WASH</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>643,860</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>629,665</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>655,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. WASH</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>408,968</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>422,688</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>430,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.WASH/ID</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>329,585</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td>327,352</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>363,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>443,460</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>463,203</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>478,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>1F</td>
<td>386,250</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>399,000</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
<td>419,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA-PACIFIC</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>1,150,169</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
<td>1,125,784</td>
<td>48.10%</td>
<td>1,167,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>703,831</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>753,403</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>745,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND CANYON</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>1,105,337</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>1,123,373</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>1,190,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKY MTN</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>1,237,186</td>
<td>45.13%</td>
<td>1,233,753</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>1,346,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. NO.DAK</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>360,677</td>
<td>42.59%</td>
<td>380,581</td>
<td>41.50%</td>
<td>386,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. NO.DAK</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>432,349</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>418,636</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>439,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO. DAK</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>822,255</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>860,368</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>864,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW. MINN.</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>870,717</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
<td>855,271</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
<td>862,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE. MINN.</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>647,636</td>
<td>49.78%</td>
<td>666,503</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>677,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW. MINN.</td>
<td>3F</td>
<td>1,151,872</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td>1,190,669</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td>1,195,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINPLS. AREA</td>
<td>3G</td>
<td>2,200,459</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>2,011,579</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>1,952,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST PAUL (M)</td>
<td>3H</td>
<td>1,137,075</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1,116,263</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1,128,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>2,356,268</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
<td>2,354,023</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
<td>2,391,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL STATES</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1,135,565</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>1,190,497</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>1,154,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARK/OK</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>263,800</td>
<td>42.30%</td>
<td>280,217</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
<td>274,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.TEX/N.LOU</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>565,941</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>604,225</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>612,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W.TEXAS</td>
<td>4E</td>
<td>1,035,177</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>1,067,169</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>1,066,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULF COAST</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>776,745</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>797,108</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>780,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO CHGO</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>2,122,999</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>1,982,860</td>
<td>55.98%</td>
<td>2,024,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. ILL</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>1,529,918</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>1,525,900</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>1,531,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN.SO.ILL</td>
<td>5C</td>
<td>1,072,782</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>1,044,474</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>1,082,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE IOWA</td>
<td>5D</td>
<td>1,688,248</td>
<td>53.50%</td>
<td>1,734,643</td>
<td>53.50%</td>
<td>1,707,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST IOWA</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>622,439</td>
<td>53.50%</td>
<td>577,365</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>588,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE IOWA</td>
<td>5F</td>
<td>848,876</td>
<td>47.00%</td>
<td>849,353</td>
<td>47.00%</td>
<td>793,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N GRT LKES</td>
<td>5G</td>
<td>552,607</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>571,111</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>564,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW.SYN (W)</td>
<td>5H</td>
<td>884,368</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>893,493</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>938,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC WISC</td>
<td>5I</td>
<td>1,029,761</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>1,043,088</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>1,067,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRTR MILWKEE</td>
<td>5J</td>
<td>1,621,035</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
<td>1,626,889</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
<td>1,637,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO.-CENT (W)</td>
<td>5K</td>
<td>1,075,560</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
<td>1,077,931</td>
<td>59.60%</td>
<td>1,078,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACROSSE (W)</td>
<td>5L</td>
<td>461,258</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>466,829</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>488,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE. MICH</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>878,953</td>
<td>53.03%</td>
<td>879,273</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>903,665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Synod Mission Support Plans

#### 2005, 2006 and 2007 Actuals with 2008 Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS %</td>
<td>MS %</td>
<td>MS %</td>
<td>AMOUNT %</td>
<td>AMOUNT %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/W LOWER MICH</td>
<td>938,466</td>
<td>919,466</td>
<td>920,231</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/KY</td>
<td>1,243,732</td>
<td>1,345,866</td>
<td>1,382,061</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,377,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW OHIO</td>
<td>1,326,310</td>
<td>1,332,025</td>
<td>1,310,738</td>
<td>1,331,484</td>
<td>1,305,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE OHIO</td>
<td>1,143,553</td>
<td>1,130,723</td>
<td>1,120,810</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. OHIO</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>1,082,097</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>1,329,175</td>
<td>1,313,793</td>
<td>1,318,725</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ENGLAND</td>
<td>1,251,433</td>
<td>1,243,902</td>
<td>1,290,908</td>
<td>1,361,670</td>
<td>1,315,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO NY</td>
<td>625,135</td>
<td>603,915</td>
<td>643,487</td>
<td>651,000</td>
<td>651,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPSTATE NY</td>
<td>733,136</td>
<td>788,611</td>
<td>820,904</td>
<td>837,000</td>
<td>837,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE PENN</td>
<td>1,669,830</td>
<td>1,658,443</td>
<td>1,611,929</td>
<td>1,669,500</td>
<td>1,616,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE PENN</td>
<td>1,456,947</td>
<td>1,476,973</td>
<td>1,457,180</td>
<td>1,510,500</td>
<td>1,510,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAK ZION</td>
<td>38,713</td>
<td>34,297</td>
<td>35,018</td>
<td>34,866</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW PENN</td>
<td>481,032</td>
<td>457,157</td>
<td>456,109</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW PENN</td>
<td>1,377,335</td>
<td>1,366,236</td>
<td>1,339,732</td>
<td>1,320,000</td>
<td>1,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEGHENY</td>
<td>525,440</td>
<td>515,714</td>
<td>509,326</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW SUSQ</td>
<td>2,198,425</td>
<td>2,156,009</td>
<td>2,121,826</td>
<td>2,152,500</td>
<td>2,152,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPP SUSQ</td>
<td>658,648</td>
<td>612,756</td>
<td>602,465</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL-MRYLND</td>
<td>1,468,125</td>
<td>1,422,465</td>
<td>1,454,457</td>
<td>1,459,432</td>
<td>1,459,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO DC</td>
<td>1,075,864</td>
<td>1,086,546</td>
<td>1,070,918</td>
<td>1,071,125</td>
<td>1,071,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. VA/WYLD</td>
<td>322,090</td>
<td>322,266</td>
<td>323,574</td>
<td>323,574</td>
<td>340,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>1,080,798</td>
<td>1,103,496</td>
<td>1,140,251</td>
<td>1,222,358</td>
<td>1,193,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. CAROLINA</td>
<td>2,183,333</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,008,334</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO. CAROLINA</td>
<td>1,425,285</td>
<td>1,484,004</td>
<td>1,461,104</td>
<td>1,538,000</td>
<td>1,538,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHEASTERN</td>
<td>1,318,068</td>
<td>1,303,496</td>
<td>1,300,016</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA-BAHAMAS</td>
<td>1,407,335</td>
<td>1,474,011</td>
<td>1,490,125</td>
<td>1,703,400</td>
<td>1,703,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,400</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Remittances**

- **2005**: $65,468,030 (50.63%)
- **2006**: $65,664,031 (50.58%)
- **2007**: $66,129,117 (50.50%)
- **2008**: $68,159,804 (50.54%)
- **2009**: $67,954,688 (50.66%)
**ELCA ENDOWMENT FUND POOLED TRUST**
as of December 31, 2007, with comparative totals for 2006
(unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Held for Others:</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCA Congregations</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synods</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women of the ELCA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Ministry Organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Organizations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lutheran Church Body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Ministry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ministry Organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCA Churchwide Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges or Universities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>524</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted-Board Designated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit ELCA Churchwide Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporarily Restricted Funds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit ELCA Churchwide Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Other Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanently Restricted Funds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit ELCA Churchwide Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Other Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Unrestricted-Board Designated, Temporarily Restricted and Permanently Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAND TOTAL - ALL ACCOUNTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL - BENEFITING ELCA CHURCHWIDE ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ELCA INVESTMENT POLICY COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS

**January 31, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Harris Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total market value -- millions</td>
<td>$ 6.08</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration and maturity - Average (+/- 25%)</td>
<td>.49 yrs (1)</td>
<td>.84 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity exceptions - Single issue max years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality - average</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality - second tier max</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality - below BBB exceptions</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification - single issue max</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification - other eligible securities max</td>
<td>44.26%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification - repurchase agreements max</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited investments exceptions</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility exceptions</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Harris Static Index
** Merrill Lynch 1 - 5 Yr Gov/Credit

(1) Lower than target to maintain liquidity during transition to higher average balance.

Harris Bank serves as the custodian and investment manager - there are no sub managers
Cash Management Policy Compliance
Actual through January 2008

Millions

Jan  Feb  Mar  Apr  May  Jun  Jul  Aug  Sep  Oct  Nov  Dec  Jan

- Actual Cash Balance
- Target Balance per Cash Mgmt Policy
- Total Designated & Restricted Fund Balance
- Minimum Requirement of Two Months Disbursements

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
CHURCH COUNCIL
April 11-13, 2008
Exhibit F, Part 8
Page 1
NEW TEXT IS UNDERLINED

Section 1.

(a) A Board of Trustees shall consist of not less than twelve nor more than thirty persons, approximately one-third (1/3) of whom shall be elected at each Annual Meeting. They shall hold office for three years and until their successors have been elected. The Trustees serving at the time this amendment is adopted shall be divided at the designation of the Nominating Committee into three groups approximately equal in size. The first group shall serve an initial term of one year; the remaining groups shall serve initial terms expiring at successive one-year intervals after the first year. Thereafter, at its Annual Meeting, or Special Meeting, the sole voting member of the Corporation shall elect individuals to fill the then-existing vacancies on the Board. Each elected Trustee shall hold office for a term of three years and until a successor is duly elected, unless the Trustee sooner resigns or is removed pursuant to Article V., Section 2 of this Constitution.

(b) At least 25% of the membership of the Board of Trustees shall be members of a congregation of a Lutheran Church, including the bishop of the Metropolitan New York Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America who shall be an ex officio voting member of the Board, with the understanding that the Nominations Committee and the Board shall make all reasonable efforts to maintain the Lutheran percentage as close to 50% as feasible, recognizing the need to also reflect the diversity of the community on the Board and to recruit Trustees with the skills and resources to support LMC. Three members of the Board shall be nominated by the board of Sunset Park Health Council, Inc. The President and Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation shall be an ex officio voting member of the Board.

(c) To be eligible for Board membership, a trustee candidate shall (a) exemplify basic qualities of honesty, integrity, justice, and sound moral character; (b) be committed to uphold the purposes, philosophy and general policy of the Corporation as stated in the Constitution and By Laws and have the willingness and ability to devote necessary time to Board activities and be able to apply realistically experience and expertise to make decisions objectively, and (c) recognize the confidential character of information discussed at Board meetings and strive to avoid the appearance of any conflict of interest.
LUTHERAN MEDICAL CENTER

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE III
ADMINISTRATION

Section 1.

The Board of Trustees shall select and employ a competent, experienced President and Chief Executive Officer who shall be its direct executive representative in the management of the Medical Center. The Board shall also establish a formal process for periodic evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer. This Executive shall be given the necessary authority and held responsible for planning, development and administration of the Medical Center in all its activities and departments subject only to such policies as may be adopted and such orders as may be issued by the Board of Trustees or by any of its Committees to which it has delegated power for such action. The Chief Executive Officer shall be an ex officio voting member of the Board and act as the duly authorized representative of the Board of Trustees in all matters in which the Board has not formally designated some other person for that specific purpose.
POLICY ON RELATIONSHIPS OF CHURCHWIDE UNITS
WITH INDEPENDENT LUTHERAN ORGANIZATIONS
Effective: April 2006

Process: Acknowledgment of an independent Lutheran organization in relation to a unit of the churchwide organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America requires conscientious deliberation and thorough evaluation before implementation.

“The Church Council shall establish the criteria and policies for the relationship between this church and independent, cooperative, and related Lutheran organizations. The policies adopted by the Church Council shall be administered by the appropriate unit of the churchwide organization. The determination of which organization shall relate to a specific unit of the churchwide organization shall be made by the Church Council” (ELCA churchwide bylaw 14.21.16.).

Any acknowledgment of a relationship with independent, cooperative, and related Lutheran organizations that seek to relate with this church while maintaining their independence and autonomy shall include the following steps:

1. The organization seeks information from an appropriate unit regarding an acknowledged relationship.
2. The unit provides relevant information, including the criteria for a relationship, questions to be answered by the organization, and materials to be supplied by the organization, all of which shall be included in the documentation file submitted by the unit to the Office of the Secretary.
   a. Questions to be answered include:
      (1) Why does the organization seek a relationship with a churchwide unit?
      (2) How does the organization, in fulfilling its commitments, work compatibly and assist the respective churchwide unit in the unit’s work?
      (3) Does the organization fulfill or enhance particular activities that the respective unit is unable to accomplish?
      (4) How would the organization use the acknowledged relationship in its interpretation and fund-raising activities?
      (5) What is the organization’s relationship to other church-related ecumenical entities?
      (6) Is the program or activity of the organization national or international in scope?
   b. Materials to be submitted include:
      (1) A copy of relevant descriptive documents, such as a constitution, corporate bylaws, purpose statement, policies, guidelines, and budget;
      (2) Samples of publicity and fund-raising materials;
      (3) A list of staff, leaders, and board members as well as a description of the method of election for board members; and
      (4) Documentation of the organization’s independent status and insurance coverage for any existing or potential liabilities of such an organization.
3. The organization submits the requested information and material to the unit. In the case of an independent Lutheran organization that may relate to more than one churchwide unit, the secretary will designate one unit to serve as the lead unit for acknowledgment of such a relationship under this policy.
4. The unit’s executive director:
   a. reviews the request and formulates a recommendation for action by the Church Council.
   b. submits the recommendation along with documentation on the proposed relationship to the secretary.
   c. agrees to keep current the documentation on file in the Office of the Secretary.
   d. agrees to certify annually to the secretary that the acknowledged relationship remains in good order; and
   e. requests by July 1 of each year the listing or continued listing of the organization in the Yearbook of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
5. The secretary certifies that the necessary documentation has been placed on file in the Office of the Secretary.
6. The Church Council acts on the recommendation submitted by the unit’s executive director.
7. The unit’s executive director notifies the organization of the Church Council’s action.

Criteria: The criteria for reviewing an organization for possible acknowledgment of a relationship with a unit of the churchwide organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America include:

1. Scope and Constituency: The organization’s membership is national or churchwide in its scope. If the constituency is primarily local or regional, any relationship more appropriately would be to a synod or group of synods.
2. Determination of compatibility with the ELCA: The organization’s statement of faith, purpose, and activities are compatible with the ELCA’s governing documents, specifically the sections on Confession of Faith, Nature of the Church, Statement of Purpose, and Principles of Organization.
3. Focus: The organization’s purpose and activities are compatible with the program and policy of the churchwide unit proposing such a recognition of relationship.
4. Extension of ministry: The organization undergirds or extends the work of the churchwide unit that proposes such a recognition of relationship.
5. Documents: The organization has a constitution or bylaws and a purpose statement, and is an officially recognized nonprofit entity.
6. Leadership: As appropriate, the organization seeks leadership on its board and staff that is diverse in gender, culture, and ethnicity.
7. Funding: The organization’s financial operation is open for inspection and appropriately audited; the method and scope of its fund-raising is compatible with ELCA funding processes.
8. Accountability: The organization will agree to appropriate methods of accountability to the unit proposing recognition. Such agreement might include periodic programmatic and financial reports. Further, the organization agrees in a written agreement to defend and indemnify the ELCA churchwide organization and any related entities from claims, liability or financial demands arising out of the relationship.
9. Commitment: The organization agrees to support the purposes and goals of the churchwide organization and to refrain from publicity or fund-raising techniques that diminish the public image of the churchwide organization, its financial resources, and its effectiveness in mission.
10. Publicity: The organization consents to the use of mutually agreed phraseology in any publicity to describe the relationship with the appropriate churchwide unit.
11. Review of Relationship:
   a. The unit and organization agree to a regular review biennially and a comprehensive
      review of the relationship every four years.
   b. On an annual basis, the unit’s executive director shall certify to the secretary continued
      acknowledgment of the relationship.
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ITEMS FOR ACTION

1. Agreement with the United Methodist Church

PS ACTION
Recommended: To transmit the following resolution to the ELCA Church Council for approval:
   To give thanks to God for the deepening relationship with The United Methodist Church that has resulted from Interim Eucharistic Sharing;
   To thank the members of the Lutheran-United Methodist Dialogue for the final report of the dialogue and the proposal for full communion, “Confessing Our Faith Together”;
   To encourage continued study of this proposal for full communion throughout this church; and
   To anticipate action of the United Methodist General Conference on this full communion agreement, as it meets April 23-May 2, 2008; and
   To request a formal proposal for a full-communion agreement with The United Methodist Church for consideration by the Church Council at its November 2008 meeting for action by the 2009 ELCA Churchwide Assembly.

2. Evangelical Lutheran Worship: Pastoral Care

PS ACTION
Recommended: To transmit the following resolution to the ELCA Church Council for approval:
   To commend Evangelical Lutheran Worship: Pastoral Care for use by pastors and lay persons involved in this church’s ministry of care;
   To express gratitude for the conscientious efforts of the reviewers and the insights and observations by the many people who helped to shape and refine the content of Evangelical Lutheran Worship: Pastoral Care; and
   To encourage the completion of the second volume of materials related to occasional services in the life of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION and DISCUSSION

3. Book of Faith initiative: The committee received an update on plans for and coordination of the Book of Faith initiative from Diane Jacobson, director, and Stan Olson, executive director, Vocation and Education. Dr. Jacobson will bring a report annually to the Church Council beginning with this meeting.

4. Update on social statement on genetics: The committee received an update on the development of the social statement on genetics from Sandy Schlesinger, Church Council advisor to the task force, and Roger Willer, director for studies. The proposed social statement will be considered by the 2011 Churchwide Assembly. The PowerPoint slides are online at http://community.elca.org.

5. At the request of the Executive Committee, the Program and Services Committee discussed the Church Council’s approach to the draft social statement on human sexuality. The Program and Services Committee recommends that the Council approve the following action to replace the original action on agenda page 14:
PS ACTION
Recommended: To transmit the following revised resolution to the ELCA Church Council for approval:

To go into a “committee of the whole” for the purpose of an overview and general discussion by Church Council members and advisors of the draft social statement on human sexuality for the following:

- Introduction and overview (30 minutes)
- Questions for clarification (10 minutes)
- “Fishbowl” with advisors (30 minutes)
- Conversation (60 minutes).

ITEMS FOR EN BLOC ACTION and INFORMATION

6. Message on Immigration (delay)

PS ACTION
Recommended: To transmit the following resolution to the ELCA Church Council for approval:

To authorize a delay in the new Message on Immigration until the November 2008 meeting of the ELCA Church Council; and

To anticipate that the Program and Services Committee of the Church Council receive and provide input to the draft document prior to its November 2008 meeting in accordance with Policies and Procedures of the ELCA for Addressing Social Concerns; and

To further anticipate that the Church in Society program unit will consider the feasibility of working with Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) to develop supporting material for the message following its adoption by the Church Council.

7. Corporate Social Responsibility

PS ACTION
Recommended: To transmit the following resolution to the ELCA Church Council for En Bloc approval:

To approve the amendments to the following Corporate Social Responsibility issue papers, but to request that the wording of the original issue papers be archived for historical and research purposes:

- Issue paper 5: Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All;
- Issue paper 6: For Peace in God’s World: Human Rights;
- Issue paper 7: For Peace in God’s World: Violence in Our World.

PS ACTION
Recommended: To transmit the following resolution to the ELCA Church Council for En Bloc approval:

To approve the amendments to the “ELCA Boycott Policy and Procedure” as printed in Exhibit K, Part 3.
8. **Response to resolution: Cost of BOP Medical Care (delay)**

**PS ACTION**

**Recommended:** To transmit the following resolution to the ELCA Church Council for En Bloc approval:

To receive the interim response of the Board of Pensions to the resolution of the Southwestern Texas Synod regarding the cost of health and related benefits;

To request that a full report and possible recommendations be brought to the November 2008 meeting of the Church Council; and

To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.

9. **Discussion: protocols for discussion of draft social statements**

The committee discussed the process for Church Council consideration of social statements, including Church Council attendance at hearings for the social statement on human sexuality and the process through April 2009, including the schedule for spring 2009 committee meeting. Rebecca Larson also indicated that information will be brought to the November 2008 meeting of the Church Council related to future social statement topics.

*Hearings on the social statement:* The Program and Services Committee encourages Church Council members to attend at least two hearings on the draft social statement on human sexuality for the purpose of listening to the responses of this church to the draft statement.

*Proposed spring 2009 schedule for Program and Services*

- With the whole church: receive proposed social statement and recommendations on rostering from the Task Force for the ELCA Studies on Sexuality (February 2009)
- Receive report of feedback from Conference of Bishops (early March 2009)
- Program and Services working group conference call (time frame to be determined)
- Receive review and comment from program committee of Church and Society (mid-March 2009)
- Program and Services will review and make recommendations to March 2009 Church Council meeting. Pre-meeting of Program and Services Committee anticipated on March 26, 2009 (executive session).

10. The committee finalized its charter for the 2007-2009 biennium. The charter is printed in Exhibit D, Part 3.

11. John Munday was appointed advisor from Church Council to task force for criminal justice social statement (2013).
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Program Units

Church in Society
Submitted by Pr. Rebecca S. Larson

The Church in Society unit shall assist this church to discern, understand, and respond to the needs of human beings, communities, society, and the whole creation through direct human services and through addressing systems, structures, and policies of society, seeking to promote justice, peace, and the care of the earth (16.12.D05).

Administration

In regards to Lutheran Disaster Response, a meeting will be held on April 10 to discuss with representatives of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) a policy shift whereby the LCMS is developing a comprehensive response system which focuses on LCMS congregations and districts. Kevin Massey is serving as interim director for LDR.

The Church in Society program committee considered a resolution from the Consulting Committee for the Justice for Women Program and voted to recommend to the executive director the development of a social statement on sexism.

Advocacy

ELCA Washington Office staff completed more than fifty Lutheran-specific Senate
lobby visits on the farm bill between September and December 2007. Part of farm bill work included working with ELCA bishops’ ready benches and specific briefing of bishops from key states to empower them to call elected officials.

Staff also worked with others in the faith community to urge Congress to keep a provision to increase fuel economy standards in the energy bill, and the President signed the legislation with this provision.

Washington Office staff conducted civic engagement tours in early primary states, unveiling and using a new ELCA civic participation guide, “Called to Be a Public Church.”

Staff of the Corporate Social Responsibility program held many successful dialogues with corporations on such things as policies to protect children from human trafficking, sales of mature-rated video games to minors, and phasing out PVC (polyvinyl chloride) packaging.

The Lutheran Office for World Community at the United Nations arranged a meeting between representatives of the Lutheran Church in Liberia and the ELCA with the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General in Monrovia, to discuss ways the local church can collaborate more closely with the UN Mission to Liberia.

Poverty Ministries
The focus of the winter 2008 CS program committee meeting was on poverty. The program committee took a tour of Bethel New Life on the Westside of Chicago and reflected theologically on the visit under the leadership of Dr. Richard Perry of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago faculty.

Poverty Ministries convened a first conversation with the staff of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service and key ELCA staff to talk about the New Sanctuary Movement and how synods and congregations might be advised to respond.

A dozen synods have applied to participate in the “Vital Congregations-Just Communities” congregational organizing initiative.

The director for Community Development Services has been working with local pastors in New Orleans to address the rise of violence.

Studies
The social statement on education was published and mailed to every rostered leader in February. “The Sponsorship of Legal Gaming by American Indian Tribes” was also published.

The Draft Social Statement on Human Sexuality was released to the public on March 13.

Social Ministry Organizations
The process of revising and updating the 1997 version of the ELCA affiliation criteria for social ministry organizations set forth in “A Social Ministry Partnership” continues. This document currently presents a unified set of criteria for ELCA and LCMS agencies. The LCMS has conducted a review of its process of recognizing service organizations. It appears that changes in the requirements by the LCMS will set forth stipulations that would prevent recognition of some organizations that have an inter-faith composition.

Lutheran Services in America (LSA) has launched the “Aging in Community Initiative” to build new models for in-home non-medical support for aging individuals as well as for in-home caregivers. Thrivent Financial for Lutherans is providing funding support.

World Hunger Ministries
Nearly 400 requests for domestic hunger grants were received and are being evaluated for 2008.

The ELCA is partnering with Lutheran World Relief and the LCMS for an initiative on malaria: the Lutheran Malaria Initiative (LMI).

World Hunger is nearing completion of its strategic consultation process, examining its organizational structure and multiple areas for future engagement.
Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission
Submitted by Pr. Stephen Bouman

The Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit shall foster and facilitate the efforts of congregations, synods, and related institutions and agencies in reaching out in witness to the Gospel to people in all contexts and cultures within the territory of this church. It will do so by equipping existing congregations and ministries; developing new ministries and congregations; seeking to renew strategic ministries; and working with congregations and synods in programs and strategies for renewal and evangelical outreach. (16.12.A05)

A personal note from the Executive Director

There are several broad areas of engagement that have guided my first weeks of listening and enlisting partnership for this mission we share. First, we must be guided by a missiology through scriptural engagement with every baptized disciple in the ELCA. The heartbeat of this missiology will be grounded in traditional Lutheran heartbeats of grace, vocation, Law and Gospel, Baptism and Eucharist. With the heart in place we will be free to learn from all manner of Christian approaches to growing the mission of this church. Second will be intentional pursuit of the Great Commission with an emphasis on “every nation” as we become a truly inclusive national communion, putting flesh, bone, and muscle on our rhetoric of inclusivity for the sake of the reign of God among us. Third will be seeking a way to do mission strategies in every synod, conference (or coalition of the willing), and congregation that will help us re-root in our communities and push the staffing, resources, and spiritual energy (of EOCM) and this whole church as close to the ground as possible, so that our communal missiology and Gospel inclusion will sing a grassroots song of love to God for the life of the world. What follows are some of the wonderful programs, initiatives, resources and servant partnerships being accomplished by God’s grace through EOCM, which put legs on these three broad areas of engagement.

EOCM staff and transitions

In February EOCM welcomed Pr. Stephen P. Bouman as executive director. We bid farewell to Pr. Richard Magnus in December 2007. An assistant director for the development of new congregations and director for African ministries began their service with EOCM in late fall 2007. Both positions reflect the increased development for both new starts and African National ministry growth. EOCM is currently in discussions with synod bishops and other staff regarding the following vacancies that we are filling, strategically aligned with EOCM goals and direction: director for discipleship, director for the renewal of congregations, Minnesota mission director, and northeast area ministry stewardship staff. In addition, interviews are confirmed for a Region 9 deployed stewardship staff to be officed at Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary. We continue to partner with synods on several stewardship and mission director vacancies.

Start new and renewal of congregations

During 2007 the ELCA through EOCM began a total of 56 new missions. In addition, there were 42 congregations under development and 14 SAWC’s (Synodically Authorized Worshipping Communities). This brings the total number of congregations under various stages of development to 221. Ethnic ministry new starts teams bring together local leaders, Multicultural Mission staff, mission directors, and synod staff for planning and visioning for ministry in a variety of contexts such as African Descent, African National, Asian/Pacific Islander, Arab/Middle Eastern, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Latino as well as urban and emerging new starts teams. In partnership with the Research and Evaluation section,
EOCM has initiated the development of a matrix to track and evaluate new starts and our partnership and collaboration with the Mission Investment Fund which furthers EOCM’s ongoing support to new starts as they seek to purchase land or work toward building construction.

African National ministries grew to 90 mission sites around the country with 21 new sites in 2007. These new missions include congregations under development with mission developers, Synodically Authorized Worshipping Communities (SAWC’s), worshipping fellowships, and emerging house churches. Most of these missions are led by lay leaders who are being encouraged to enter seminary, TEEM, or lay leadership programs. Currently less than 15 ELCA African National leaders are ordained clergy. Strong partnerships have been developed with the Vocation and Education unit, both encouraging many leaders towards contextual theological preparation and initiating the development of a resource proposal that shares “best practices” of the African National global church.

African Descent ministry highlights include assisting struggling congregations through a redevelopment process that includes the congregational leadership, synodical partners, the EOCM leadership office, and the African Descent outreach strategy team. The development of a missional work plan for the southeastern area of the United States (primarily Region 9) has commenced.

The program for renewal of congregations is in a transition period with several staff teams coordinating the work of coaching, Natural Church Development (NCD), and transformational ministry. These staff teams will sustain the current work and maintain the quality of the work offered while providing a healthy stewardship of our present staff.

Coaching has grown in the last four years with 31 basic coaching training (Coaching 101) events offered in 2007. In October, the third “Developing Coaching Excellence” event produced 51 “certified” coaches. These coaches provide support, advice, and counsel to new mission developers. A Latino coaching project has also emerged that currently is being piloted in several synods with a goal of developing a contextualized coaching curriculum in 2008.

**Discipleship**

The evangelizing church team provided evangelism grants to congregations, synods, and other ELCA organizations to further their evangelizing and outreach efforts. All aspects of the evangelism strategy were promoted through resources (print and web), synodical and conference events, and networking events. The prayer website continues to foster and promote prayer throughout the church and beyond. Latino evangelization continues to be strengthened through resources, a Spanish prayer Website and the lay Latino leadership project.

EOCM’s stewardship efforts include the development of resources and the Website through shared and deployed synodical staff. The efforts have contributed to the ELCA’s increased mission support in 2007. The stewardship team has taken on several responsibilities directed by the recommendations of the ELCA Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC). A new position, Region 9 deployed stewardship, has been developed in response to the Blue Ribbon Committee’s call to review our current stewardship staffing structure. *Stories of Faith in Action*, the primary annual mission interpretation resource has introduced a new design and format this year.

The Christian education staff is in partnership with the Book of Faith formation team to explore and enhance children’s resources within this initiative. The team also held a children’s ministry consultation to strengthen ministry opportunities with and/or for children in worship.
Leadership

EOCM’s partnership between Region 3, Luther Seminary, and the Vocation and Education and EOCM units was further developed. This pilot project assists Luther Seminary students to explore and experience vocational ministry options in the areas of mission development or redevelopment. Six candidates have been identified and recommended for missional work in 2007.

LMM has with the Building for the Future Campaign added $1,050,000 in cash, planned gifts and pledges to it's endowment. The goal of the campaign is $1.5 million. In addition, LMM has continued the process of incorporation while maintaining a close relationship to this church through EOCM. Planning for the 2008 Lutheran Men in Mission Assembly (business meeting) and the Lutheran Men’s Gathering continues.

A rural ministry consultation was held in January to discuss the future of small town and rural ministry. This consultation brought together over 25 practitioners along with representatives from several ELCA units to identify challenges, resources, and opportunities related to rural and small town ministries. The “Celebrating Rural Life” gathering, co-sponsored by the Nebraska Synod, will be held this July 16-19, 2008, at Midland College in Fremont, Neb.

Global Mission

Submitted by Pr. Rafael Malpica-Padilla

The Global Mission unit shall be responsible for this church’s mission in other countries and shall be the channel through which churches in other countries engage in mission to this church and society.(16.12.B05)

Building Capacity through Participation in Companion Churches’ Ministries

Lutheran Malaria Initiative

The ELCA Global Mission unit has engaged in conversations with companions relating to the emerging Lutheran Malaria Initiative (LMI), within the context of this church’s ongoing HIV/AIDS commitments. Initial conversations have revealed strong interest among companions – in particular in the Lutheran World Federation’s regional expression in Southern Africa – to engage in a coordinated effort to address these two diseases, which together with TB, are major killers in the developing world.

In addition, GM has engaged in fruitful conversations with Lutheran World Relief concerning coordination of LMI engagement with the Lutheran World Federation (World Service and Mission and Development), the ELCA’s Companion Synods Program, the many GM-related networks in the ELCA, and Global Mission Events and resources. Should LMI be approved by the ELCA Church Council in April 2008, GM plans to hire a new staff person to provide for the programmatic implementation of LMI with companion churches, plus assure integration with HIV/AIDS efforts.

Global Service

At the same time, the ongoing work of Global Mission continues, including placement and support of mission personnel. 271 ELCA mission personnel were serving in 48 countries on February 27, 2008: 82 in Africa, 71 in Asia and the Pacific, 79 in Europe and the Middle East, and 39 in Latin America. These mission personnel serve in a variety of patterns of service: long-term (102), contract (18), two-year programs (39), seminary interns (5), volunteers (49), Global Mission Associates (16), grants (2), and Young Adults in Global Mission (40).

Security and safety issues continue to be a concern in providing care for mission personnel and support to our companions. The post-election crisis in Kenya was closely monitored by GM staff since the end of 2007; the decision was made to keep in country both
the ELCA young adults and the other missionaries and their families serving in Kenya. The on-going situation in the Central African Republic has required continual monitoring, in partnership with our companion church there. The unexpected strike and violence in Cameroon in February caused difficulties for two companion synod delegations that were in country when the disruptions occurred. GM mission personnel provided strong support to these delegations as they tried to leave the country in the midst of the crisis. These three areas highlight the unwelcome risks inherent in global mission relationships.

Strategic Planning

Global Mission continues to engage in strategic planning, seeking to implement the primary outcome it has identified: increasing the capacity of companions to engage in mission (witness and service). Continental desks have completed the development of strategic plans for each country, and continental or regional strategies will be completed by June 2008.

At the same time, Global Mission will begin a new cycle of strategic planning by reviewing existing policy documents, including Global Mission in the 21st Century. The fall 2008 ELCA Missiologists Gathering will review from a theological perspective this decade-old articulation of the accompaniment methodology for mission, which guides GM’s work. As the planning process continues, companion church leaders will be engaged in conversation relating to this foundational ELCA document. As the first step in the new planning cycle, any changes to GM-21 that emerge will be shared with the ELCA Church Council.

Building the Capacity of Companions to Meet Human Need

Development

Global Mission accompanies people who are impoverished and oppressed and addresses basic human needs through and with companion churches and related Lutheran and ecumenical agencies. Activities include improving food security, providing access to clean water, medical assistance, including preventive health care programs, and support for orphans. GM also assists communities in their efforts to overcome poverty through community development and seeks to build the capacity of companions to maintain and strengthen sustainable development projects.

In 2007, the GM and World Hunger budget for such activities (including overage funds) totaled $14,179,802. These funds support development projects in over 40 counties through companion churches and, in 30 countries, through Lutheran World Federation programs. The funds also support both Lutheran World Relief, a ministry of ELCA and LCMS that supports local community-based organizations, and other ecumenical organizations. Many of these activities address the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

HIV/AIDS Response

For twenty years, Global Mission has funded companions as they respond to the HIV/AIDS crisis. In 2007, over $525,000 in Stand with Africa funds and $600,000 from World Hunger were designated for HIV/AIDS response, including counseling and support for families and children affected by this endemic disease. Last year $500,000 of the World Hunger Appeal’s 2006 overage was sent to Lutheran World Federation to assist member churches’ efforts to assist people affected and infected by this endemic disease. Global Mission’s health consultant provides training and accompanies companion churches in Africa in their efforts to assist people affected by and living with HIV/AIDS.

ELCA Global Mission continues to work with the inter-unit team that is developing a churchwide HIV/AIDS strategy (in response to the action taken by the 2007 Churchwide
Assembly. As part of GM’s ongoing strategic planning process, GM continental desks are finalizing regional strategies for engagement with companions that are responding to the HIV/AIDS crisis. These plans will be woven into a unit-wide plan that will inform the churchwide development of an integrated domestic and internal response to this disease.

In the development of a churchwide HIV/AIDS strategy, the ELCA has an opportunity to learn from companion churches in other countries – fellow members in the Lutheran World Federation – that have developed churchwide action plans. These plans are rooted in the wider LWF commitment to engage in this area and include commitments to reflect theologically on this issue, address HIV/AIDS-related stigma at the congregational and community level, engage in advocacy with people living with HIV/AIDS, and articulate specific commitments that will enable churches to become “HIV/AIDS-competent” in all aspects of their life and work.

International Disaster Response

In 2007, Global Mission responded to 30 international disasters in 21 countries, providing approximately $2.5 million to companion churches and Lutheran and ecumenical organizations.

Twelve of these disasters were in Africa, fourteen in Asia and the Middle East, and four in Latin America. The ongoing civil war in Darfur, which has spread to neighboring Chad, Central African Republic, and Cameroon, is of major concern. The frequent earthquakes in Indonesia and floods in Southeast Asia, Central America and Latin American are also challenging.

Three years after the tsunami hit the northern coast of Sumatra on December 26, 2004, Indonesia and the surrounding countries remain vulnerable to natural disasters, including earthquakes. In 2007, the ELCA initiated and provided funding for a major Lutheran World Federation consultation involving Indonesian churches and their international partners. A February 2008 roundtable discussion moved forward the proposal for Indonesian Lutheran churches and Nommensen University in Indonesia to establish a Center for Disaster Risk Management and Community Development Studies. This center will strengthen and build the capacities of the churches and communities to respond to future disasters. LWF-World Service will assist in the coordination of the program at the center.

GM will support the center’s program, provide scholarships, and accompany the Lutheran churches in Indonesia in this effort during the 2008-2014 period, using funds contributed to ELCA International Disaster Response for tsunami response. The establishment of this sustainable disaster risk management program for the Lutheran Churches in Indonesia at Nommensen University could be utilized as a training center for Southeast Asia as a whole.

Building the Capacity of the ELCA

Structural and Staffing Changes

Following consultation with the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the ELCA Global Mission unit is restructuring in a way that makes it more effective in its engagement with both international and domestic companions. GM will now have three “sections”:

1. Global Program, which includes the work of GM Continental teams (working with companion churches), Leadership Development (scholarships), and International Development and Disaster Response (sustainable development, including work through LWF and LWR). This structure will facilitate coordination and synergy between these streams of GM work, including increased integration at the country and regional levels. A new staff position is being added to assist GM continental teams in project planning, evaluation, and monitoring, beginning with World Hunger-funded projects.
(2) Global Formation, which broadens GM’s previous “global education” focus. This section will seek to be a good “steward of the ecology of relationships” relating the ELCA’s global mission. It will better respond to the increase in direct engagement of congregations, synods, and para-church organizations in mission globally, which is enabled by improvements in communication and travel. This section will continue to plan and implement Global Mission Events, with a new component of pre-event engagement and education of congregations (“Global Mission Formation Events”). This year’s GME will be held in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, July 17-20, 2008. Development of resources, in coordination with the redesign of the ELCA’s Web presence, will also be part of the responsibilities of this team. A new staff position in this section will focus on nurturing and building synergy among the increasing number of ELCA-related entities engaged directly in global mission and will provide additional support and coordination for the ELCA’s expanding Companion Synods program.

(3) Global Service. Formally called “International Personnel,” this section will continue to recruit, interview, place, and support missionaries and volunteers serving on behalf of the ELCA with global companions. An upgraded position will provide leadership to both “grow” the Young Adults in Global Mission Program and recruit for the increasingly diverse positions companions are requesting be filled by ELCA missionaries.

In addition, a GM Finance section will undergird the work of all of these sections, while GM Administration will provide unit-wide leadership and planning.

Multicultural Ministries
Submitted by Pr. Sherman Hicks

The Multicultural Ministries unit shall guide the churchwide organization in the multicultural dimensions of its work.(16.12.E05)

As people of God, we are claimed, gathered, and sent to make Christ known in every corner of the world to help develop strong ministries and leaders. The Multicultural Ministries unit leads, coordinates, educates and holds accountable churchwide efforts and programs with synods, regions, and agencies and institutions as they identify, develop, and strengthen the multicultural dimensions of their work. The following are a glimpse of the ongoing work of the Multicultural Ministries unit carried out through the implementation of the strategic directions of the churchwide organization.

Multicultural Ministries assists this church to bring forth and support faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God’s mission in a pluralistic world through:

The ELCA Leaders of Color Gathering (LOC) was a pre-event to the “Spirit of Wholeness in Christ” racial ethnic multicultural event. LOC held July 11-12, 2007 in Los Angeles Calif. was sponsored by the Multicultural Ministries unit in partnership with a diverse group of leaders of color from the ELCA churchwide staff, regional staff, and congregations. The gathering brought together over 100 LOC participants.

The LOC event was a gathering that will bear fruit for this whole church. From this gathering a database is being created to help the ELCA in its ministry. Multicultural Ministries continuously receives requests from synods and churchwide units for recommendations, nominations, and references for African American, Black, Arab and Middle Eastern, Asian and Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Latino men and women to fill committee, board, staff positions, and contracted assignments in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. As a result of these requests, Multicultural Ministries is creating and will maintain a multicultural leader’s information database.

Leadership development is the number one concern of the American Indian and Alaska Native community. It is a challenge to recruit, mentor, and support leaders in vocations that
will serve the ELCA and the whole church.

In November 2007 the director for American Indian and Alaska Native ministries provided “Becoming” a leadership training event for American Indian and Alaska Native young people (ages 16-22). The emphasis of the event was to build self esteem, explore leadership gifts and build skills that can be used in their home communities, congregations, and career planning.

**Multicultural Ministries steps forward as a public church that witnesses boldly to God’s love for all that God has created through:**

Members from the multi-ethnic community will be invited to participate in a multi-ethnic leadership consultation sponsored by the Multicultural Ministries unit. The two-day consultation of 20-30 multi-ethnic high school and college-age youth and young adults will initiate conversation about the needs and concerns of the community as it responds to the leadership components of the various ethnic strategies and the evangelism strategy of this church. This will be the first time multi-ethnic (multi-racial) leaders will participate in identifying their needs. One need is to increase and strengthen cohesiveness within and among the communities of color, which must include honoring and affirming multi-ethnic members. Special attention will be given to the church vocations and congregational leadership. This project will begin a paradigm shift by creating new relationships, establishing strong networks, forming new alliances, and increasing the visible presence of multi-ethnic leaders as they move into full participation and integration within their contexts.

In January 2008 the Multicultural Ministries staff said farewell to Carmen Rodriguez, director for Latino ministries upon her retirement. The director for Latino ministries position was posted on March 3, 2008. It is hoped that a new staff person will be on board no later than June 1, 2008.

In January 2008 Kholoud Khoury, consultant for Arab and Middle Eastern ministries took a temporary leave of absence so she could return to Palestine in order to get a new visa. The Multicultural Ministries unit along with Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission is working with Kholoud and an attorney for her return to the United States. Thus far she has received approval for the H-1B petition. It is the prayer and hope of her friends and colleagues that she will be allowed to visit the consulate’s office in Jerusalem and soon be approved for a visa.

**Multicultural Ministries assist members, congregations, synods, and institutions and agencies of this church to grow in evangelical outreach through:**

The Saint Paul Synod has been working with the American Indian community to develop a worshiping space to address the needs of the “east metro” area of Saint Paul, Minn. Staff members of Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission (EOCM) and Multicultural Ministries (MM) are working on criteria for the development of new starts in the Indian community.

“To increase Asian congregations, ministries, and synodical authorized worshiping communities from 75 in 2001 to 115 by 2010, an increase of 40 in eight years.

*Asian Strategy, p. 12*

To achieve this goal, the director for Asian and Pacific Islander ministries has been working closely with the Asian church planting team and Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission. This group has prepared the groundwork for the upcoming new ministries this year which will include:

1) Chinese, Woodbury, Minn.
2) Thai, Whittier, Calif.
3) Pan Asian, Cupertino, Calif.
4) Korean, Marietta, Ga.
5) English ministry at Kalem Lutheran Church, Roslyn, N.Y.
6) Chinese, Irvine, Calif.
7) Tamil, Houston, Texas;
8) English ministry at Indian for Christ, Rockville, Md.

Publishing House of the ELCA
Submitted by Ms. Beth Lewis

The Publishing House of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America—also known as Augsburg Fortress, Publishers—shall be responsible for the publishing, production, and distribution of publications to be sold to accomplish the mission of this church, work in close cooperation with congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization to provide a diversity of published resources, and relate to other churchwide units through resource planning groups.(16.31.A05)

ELCA Congregations

- *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* (ELW) and the family of accompanying resources played a huge part in our success in 2007. From publication in October 2006 through January 2008, we have sold in excess of 960,000 copies of the ELW pew edition.
- Beyond the sales of ELW pew editions, approximately 3000 ELCA congregations also use the content of ELW through their subscriptions to *Sundaysandseasons.com*, our web-based worship planning resource. This is up almost 38 percent in terms of number of congregational subscribers over 2006.
- *Herewestandconfirmation.com*, AF’s confirmation curriculum, is being subscribed to by over 2650 congregations (up by 14+ percent over 2006).
- *Akaloo.org*, our intergenerational faith formation web-based resource, had a 54 percent subscription increase in 2007 over 2006. We continue to receive kudos from Akaloo subscribers. One example is from Pastor Dennis Ellisen (Our Saviour’s Lutheran Church, Appleton, WI) who describes Akaloo as the best faith formation resource he has ever used. “Akaloo helps parents see that they have a role in building faith. If we’re serious about faith formation, we should have 6,000 churches Akalooing!... We used to burn out teachers like toast. Akaloo has been a great help. Now teachers are looking forward to coming back to teach.”
- We have recently revamped our Church Library program. Information is available on our website: http://www.augsburgfortress.org/community/churchlibrary/?redirected=true
- One of our major new projects is to develop resources in support of the ELCA’s Book of Faith initiative. In the pipeline are:
  1. *Opening the Book of Faith: Lutheran Insights for Bible Study*, a small book that will teach readers how Lutheran theological insights and hermeneutical principles guide understanding and interpretation of Scripture will be published in April 2008. The book also introduces four methods for studying the Bible that, when used together, provide a way to experience the Bible more fully. Copies of this book will be available for free to ELCA synod assembly attendees when they register to receive Book of Faith eNewsletters from AF. A leader guide to aid in group use of the book will be available online at augsburgfortress.org/bookoffaith
2. A basic “introducing the Bible” curriculum will be published in fall 2008. This course will include flexible leader and participant materials, including video, for both large and small group teaching formats.

3. A major new adult Bible study curriculum will be published in spring 2009. It will be flexible and customizable to any size group and feature strong leader materials so that lay leaders will feel comfortable leading the study.

4. The Lutheran Study Bible will be published in March 2009. An NRSV Bible, it will integrate study notes reflective of Lutheran perspectives and theology, helpful Bible section introductions, maps, timelines and biblical historical background, as well as articles introducing the Bible, Luther and the Bible, and Lutheran principles for Bible study.

• Another major investment for AF in 2008 is in an optional subscription component to Sundaysandseasons.com that will provide ELCA congregations with contemporary Lutheran worship, music and media resources. While it is in development, it is being beta-tested by 80 ELCA congregations.

ELCA Seminaries
• In fall 2007, AF launched a beta test of “Seminary Hub” in partnership with Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg. This provides seminary students and faculty with free access to all of AF’s web-based resources for use in classroom, internship sites and contextual education sites. Our plan is to extend Seminary Hub to all eight ELCA seminaries by the end of 2008.

Ecumenical Partners:
• In 2007, AF-Canada took over the management of the Anglican Book Centre bookstore in Toronto. This provides us with an excellent opportunity for ecumenical partnership in Canada.
• Late in 2007, we signed an agreement with Church Publishing Inc. (Episcopalian) for the licensure of content and trade dress for The Episcopal Handbook based upon our bestseller, The Lutheran Handbook. In addition, CPI will distribute our already extremely successful 2008 vacation Bible school program, Rainforest Adventure www.thevbsplace.org

Financial Results for calendar year 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January–December 2007</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Sales</td>
<td>$44,500,000</td>
<td>$51,085,000</td>
<td>$6,585,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of goods sold</td>
<td>$18,789,000</td>
<td>$23,287,000</td>
<td>$4,498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross margin</td>
<td>$25,711,000</td>
<td>$27,798,000</td>
<td>$2,087,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>$25,460,000</td>
<td>$25,595,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating income</td>
<td>$251,000</td>
<td>$2,203,000</td>
<td>$1,952,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non operating income</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$314,000</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>$451,000</td>
<td>$2,517,000</td>
<td>$2,066,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our 2007 financial performance was strong, with significant increases in net sales and operating income over the levels in 2006. Sales of the family of Evangelical Lutheran Worship resources in the United States totaled over $13,000,000 in 2007, which greatly exceeded our forecasted sales of $6,500,000. Since inception, we have sold over $19,500,000 of ELW related resources. Subscriptions to our web-based products, including sundaysandseasons.com, herewestandconfirmation.org, akaloo.org, and newproclamation.com, increased by 26 percent from 2006 to almost 7,000 subscriptions at the end of 2007. Our balance sheet is very healthy, with reasonable cash reserves to finance our significant new product development and IT infrastructure investment plans in 2008.

One mission. One future. Together.

Our tagline is “One Mission. One Future. Together.” As the ministry of publishing for the ELCA, part of our story is helping our partners in ministry consider the stewardship implications of your purchasing decisions. We must be competitive in terms of quality, price & service. But, any income we make in excess of expenses does not go into “shareholder value”, but is reinvested into the development of new ministry resources for the ELCA and our ecumenical partners.

We request that you help us tell this stewardship story in your own places of ministry.


Vocation and Education
Submitted by Pr. Stan Olson

The Vocation and Education unit shall be responsible for development and support of faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God’s mission in the world; and shall assist this church and its institutions in equipping people to practice their callings under the Gospel for the sake of the world. (16.12.C05)

As usual, this report summarizes unit accomplishments since the November Church Council meeting under the headings of the unit’s three work groups.

Leadership Work Group

In the spirit of our collaborative work, the candidacy staff teamed up with the director for young adult ministries to produce the first in a series of new discernment resources, “Imagine Yourself….” Through profiles of young adults serving in a variety of callings in the church and the world, this print and web resource invites 18–22 year olds to vocational discernment.

Planning is now in process for a mid-summer collaboration involving the Vocation and Education (VE) multicultural leadership development team in partnership with the Multicultural Ministries unit and the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Chicago. Together we will host a Multicultural Summit/Teaching Theologians of Color gathering with the theme, “New Day Begun: Engaging our Wholeness”.

In February 267 candidates for ordination were assigned to regions. By the time these women and men are ready for second calls, synods will be handling much of mobility work through the Internet. In March, the Conference of Bishops saw a demonstration of the almost-complete online site to handle forms for rostered leaders and ministry locations. The target date is December 2008.

Resources for training synod candidacy committees are being developed. The first is a training utilizing the Board of Pensions “wellness wheel” to frame balanced and meaningful
developmental interviews. A second resource is being developed by a team of clinical psychologists to help committees understand the cultural dynamics present when interviewing candidates of color or candidates who speak a primary language other than English. Our regular reports show that candidacy numbers remain relatively constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Ministry</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaconal Ministry</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaconess</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2233</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>2573</td>
<td>2487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Partnerships and Institutions Work Group**

In February a consultation on seminary student debt gathered 24 leaders from synods, seminaries, colleges, the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the ELCA Foundation, the Mission Investment Fund (MIF), Vocation and Education, and Research and Evaluation, along with an observer from the Lilly Endowment. The consultation celebrated a $1.5 million gift from MIF to the Fund for Leaders in Mission. The gift launches a new matching gift program to provide seminary scholarships to future mission developers, sending them into their work without the baggage of excess debt and with a strong affirmation from this church.

Augsburg Fortress will issue in April the first publication for the Book of Faith Initiative: *Opening the Book of Faith: Lutheran Insights for Bible Study*. This small book is offered in response to widely expressed interest for a basic resource on the theme. The book describes and demonstrates Lutheran insights for Bible study, and will be offered free to voting members at the spring synod assemblies.

With its January-February 2008 issue, *Lutheran Partners* magazine began publishing with a completely new design, in full color, and with a fresh layout. A new editorial focus emphasizes a more narrative style, reflecting the magazine’s new purpose statement: “Lutheran Partners connects those serving in the public ministries of the ELCA by publishing the voices of real people doing real ministry in the real world.”

VE’s annual leadership training events for pastors in multiple staff congregations gathered 107 people in Delray Beach, Fla., in January. Work toward a more vibrant theological education network for lifelong learning brought 83 participants from various lifelong learning programs for a November 2007 consultation on non-degree theological study programs in the ELCA. The conference was named, *Reclaiming the ‘T’ Words: Theology, Teaching-and-Learning, Technology, and Trust*.

The Association of Teaching Theologians of the ELCA and ELCIC held a joint convocation with the bishops of the ELCA and ELCIC in January in Itasca, Ill., in conjunction with the Conference of Bishops’ academy. The theme of the convocation was “Accompaniment in Theology and Practice.”

Many mistakenly believe that schools related to the ELCA serve mostly suburban, middle class students. In fact the ELCA’s early childhood centers, elementary schools, and secondary schools serve significant populations of students who are persons of color or from economically deprived backgrounds. An excellent example is the school of Holy Family Ministries in Chicago, which is related to Holy Family Lutheran Church, located in the remnants of the Cabrini Green public housing projects. The school will dedicate a new building on June 3, 2008.
Youth and Young Adults Group

In early November, the campus ministry team hosted an orientation for local staff new to the work of campus ministry. In early April, campus ministry staff and ELCA college and university chaplains will meet jointly under the theme, “Re-sounding Campus Ministry.” The two groups hold their annual meetings together every three years.

In partnership with World Hunger, young adults in five synods led conversations for people of all ages around issues of social justice, advocacy, and root causes of world hunger.

The annual ELCA outdoor ministry conference brought together 135 outdoor ministry leaders from across the church for learning, networking, and renewal in November. The annual business meeting of Lutheran Outdoor Ministries, an independent Lutheran organization that relates to VE, also was held during this conference.

In partnership with candidacy, as mentioned above, the first of a series of new resources was produced to help young adults with a discernment process before they enter candidacy.

An innovative model for servant formation and seeking justice is taking shape for the 2009 Youth Gathering in New Orleans under the theme “Jesus, Justice and Jazz.” A promising process of review and reshaping of the Lutheran Youth Organization is underway within the youth leadership communities.

Planning for the unit’s future work

The social statement, Our Calling in Education, was adopted by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly and helpfully will shape the unit’s work for years to come. That has already begun. Implementing resolutions call upon the unit to convene “consultations throughout this church” about issues related to the mission of campus ministry, schools, and colleges and universities. To initiate planning for these consultations, three gatherings were convened in January with small groups of leaders related to each of three ministry areas. The January gatherings were supported by a grant from Thrivent Financial for Lutherans.

The staff of the Vocation and Education unit continues to pursue its strategic plan and overall goals for 2007-2009: grounding our work in the Lutheran conversation about vocation; nurturing networks within and beyond this church; and equipping leaders and those who call forth, support and prepare leaders. A year end review of the unit strategic plan shows appropriate progress. We are grateful for the efforts within the unit and for collaboration with many partners.

Women’s Organization

Submitted by Ms. Linda Post Bushkofsky

The Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, as the program unit for the women’s organization, shall enable its members to grow through biblical study, theological reflection, and prayer, cooperate with other units of this church in advocating for the oppressed and voiceless, urging change in systems and structures that exclude and alienate, and working for peace and justice as messengers of hope, provide for development and distribution of resources for and to its members, including a magazine, facilitate local initiative in creating programs and identifying alternative structural models that encourage and support flexibility, and design and implement a leadership development program for its members, assisting its members to identify, develop, and express their gifts for ministry.(16.41.A05)

The women’s organization, in its multiple expressions, celebrated its 20th anniversary in many ways during 2007. One of the most significant combined efforts was a special 20th anniversary offering collected throughout the year. During 2007 over $90,000 was received; gifts continue to arrive in this fiscal year. One-half of the offering goes to the ongoing ministries of Women of the ELCA, a practice established by the first triennium executive board. The remaining half is given equally to Stand With Africa for a water project in Zimbabwe and to
Augusta Victoria Hospital in Jerusalem. These recipients were selected because delegates to the 6th Triennial Convention (2005) had taken action in support of these ministries.

Registration opened on September 4, 2007, for the 7th Triennial Gathering of Women of the ELCA. The gathering, with the theme “Come to the Waters,” will occur July 10-13, 2008, in Salt Lake City, Utah. As of March 5, 2008, 1,748 people have registered for this event. Among the featured speakers are Sister Joan Chittister and Chris Grumm; Bible study presenter, Pr. Karen Bockelman; and preachers, Pr. Elizabeth Eaton, Pr. Heidi Neumark, and Pr. Marysol Diaz. Rounding out the activities are workshops, servant events, a collection of in-kind gifts, and an ELCA Board of Pensions-sponsored run/walk/roll. Bishop April Urling Larson will direct a volunteer choir and global musicians will lead the singing. Registration information is available at www.womenoftheelca.org. The 7th Triennial Convention of Women of the ELCA precedes the gathering, July 8-10, where nearly 400 delegates will conduct the business of the organization.

Women of the ELCA has met and exceeded a challenge presented by the ELCA Mission Investment Fund. As of February 29, 2008, 466 new individual accounts had been opened in the Mission Investment Fund challenge, and the total amount invested with MIF through those 466 accounts is $2,065,433.56. MIF staff and Women of the ELCA staff alike have been amazed by the results of this challenge. The real joy, however, is in knowing that women of this church have provided more than $2 million dollars for mission. This has been a significant partnership effort that has gained the attention of many. While the official terms of the challenge have been met, new accounts will continue to be accepted in the name of the challenge through the end of June. A complete report will be made at the July convention and gathering, and special thanks will be offered to the Mission Investment Fund and its staff.

Women of the ELCA continues to explore strategic collaborations that assist the organization in meeting its mission while best serving its constituents. Women of the ELCA has become a member of the Women’s Funding Network (www.wfnet.org), a community of domestic and international women’s and girls’ funds which is committed to improving the status of women and girls locally, nationally, and globally. WFN has a world-wide membership of 125 women’s and girls’ funds. Members support the solutions of women and girls through local, national, and international grants. WFN advances this movement by supporting these funds through innovative programs and capacity-building expertise.

Women of the ELCA has endorsed the work of the Good Deed Foundation (www.gooddeedfoundation.org), an organization providing simple ways to address poverty and climate change. Good Deed branded supermarket products (beginning with Cabot Cheddar Cheese in April 2008) that will enable consumers to help lift women and families out of poverty every time they shop, thus exercising pocketbook advocacy. Good Deed branded environmentally friendly light-bulbs can be purchased online (starting in April 2008), allowing consumers to make an environmentally friendly choice while supporting programs for women in poverty. Ninety percent of all Good Deed proceeds go directly to work combating poverty and improving the environment (2/3 to poverty, 1/3 to the environment).

As part of its health initiative, Raising Up Healthy Women and Girls, Women of the ELCA continues its support of the HEART for Women Act, currently in committee before the U.S. House and Senate. Women of the ELCA is a co-sponsor of this act that would bring about much-needed reforms concerning women’s heart health. Women of the ELCA is also exploring a strategic alliance with the American Heart Association that would allow the two organizations to share programming and resources.

So that the churchwide women’s organization could better understand participants in the organization, their use of existing resources, and their particular needs, last year the churchwide women’s organization began a research project. An informal online survey was conducted in August 2007 through the Women of the ELCA Website while a similar survey was conducted with those who attended a reception hosted by Women of the ELCA at the ELCA churchwide
assembly that same month. In September a significant research effort began through the ELCA Research and Evaluation section. This study does more than just provide a glimpse of the participants1 in Women of the ELCA. It offers an assessment of the recognition and use of many Women of the ELCA resources as well as our grants and scholarships programs. It helps predict future behavior regarding the delivery method of resources. It tells us of the strong interests of participants, upon which the churchwide staff may draw in planning future resources. It assists the churchwide staff in developing marketing language. Meanwhile, the study also helps us determine what other research needs to be done. That research will likely include participants as we seek more in-depth information. At the same time, additional research is anticipated involving women who are not currently participating in Women of the ELCA.

These are just a few highlights of the challenging and engaging ministries in which Women of the ELCA is engaged.

Service Units

Board of Pensions

Submitted by Mr. John Kapanke

The Board of Pensions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall manage and operate the Pension and Other Benefits Program for this church and plans for other organizations operated exclusively for religious purposes, and shall invest the assets according to fiduciary standards set forth in the plans and trust. (17.61.A05)

This summary report is a good opportunity to inform and update you on significant developments that will advance our vision to help people lead healthy lives and achieve financial security in the years to come.

In fact, 2008 has all the makings to be one of the more strategically significant years in the Board of Pensions’ 20-year history in serving the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. 2008 is the last year of our current strategic plan – a year in which we will adopt our next three-year strategic plan for years 2009-2011. Informing the development of our next strategic planning cycle are three major studies conducted by independent consultants over the first few months of 2008: ELCA financial services study, investment management opportunity study and comprehensive benefits study.

ELCA Financial Services Study: Project Mission ONE

Mission ONE (Opportunities Now Emerging) is a study Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson initiated with the three units that today provide financial services: the ELCA Mission Investment Fund; the ELCA Foundation; and the Board of Pensions. The consultant selected for this project is RSM McGladrey, Chicago office. The purpose of Mission ONE is to “work together to develop cooperative strategies, tactic and action plans to provide comprehensive financial services that both enhance the ELCA mission and bring unique value to our members, congregations, and institutions”. As our roles have changed over the past 20 years, there is a strong need for collaboration among the three units so that we are not competing with each other when we seek to grow our respective financial services for the ELCA.

---

1 Women of the ELCA constitutions identify congregational units as “members” of Women of the ELCA. Individual women who are part of a congregational unit are identified as “participants.”
Investment Management Opportunity Study

Another significant study under way is the Investment Management Opportunity Study. The consultant selected for this project is Casey, Quirk & Associates, Darien, Conn. This study is all about seeking ways to leverage one of our key core competencies – managing assets. We have built a strong investment team that applies disciplined and sophisticated strategies and philosophies to the field of money management. We have an excellent track record in managing assets and we have established a niche in managing Socially Responsible Investments, which we call Social Purpose Funds.

Comprehensive Benefits Study

The need for a comprehensive benefits study became very apparent in view of the changing environment in which the ELCA operates, including changes in demographics of plan members and sponsoring organizations. The primary objectives of this third study are to:

- improve the effectiveness of our current benefits program as we look to the future, and
- identify opportunities to expand our offering of new and existing employee benefit products and services within the ELCA and beyond.

The consultant selected for this project is Hewitt Associates, Minneapolis and New Jersey offices.

For clarity, the Mission ONE project is a four-way partnership with the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the Mission Investment Fund, the ELCA Foundation and the Board of Pensions. The other two studies involve only the Board of Pensions, but it is important that all three studies are coordinated and information shared among the three consultants. The findings of these three studies, including those from our annual consultations with bishops, seminaries and other churchwide leaders, will inform the development of our 2009-2011 strategic plan.

We have scheduled a special planning meeting for our Board of Trustees May 3-4, to weigh the findings from these three studies and begin crafting of our next strategic plan. We anticipate trustees will finalize our 2009-2011 strategic plan in November.

Benefits update

In 2008, the Board of Pensions took a bold step to transform the ELCA health plan. To help plan members (and their families) toward greater health and contain health care costs and accompanying increases in the cost of sponsorship, we added new features to ELCA-primary health coverage that reward members (and spouses) for pursuing wellness. All members with ELCA-primary health coverage (regardless of health condition) can now earn personal wellness dollars by taking a health risk assessment and other online health improvement activities, use a new flexible spending account and receive 100 percent coverage for preventive services.

Additionally, synods, seminaries, congregations, the churchwide office and other employers have a stake in the health and wellness of those who receive ELCA health benefits. We are offering a 2 percent discount on health contributions in 2008 to help ELCA employers encourage their employees and spouses to complete the Mayo Clinic health risk assessment. But to receive the discount, 75 percent or more of the eligible members and spouses receiving ELCA-primary health coverage need to take the health risk assessment. The discount is effective the month after reaching the 75 percent goal and only for the remaining months of 2008. For synods, all of the congregations and organizations in a synod will receive the 2 percent discount on health contributions for 2008 – starting the month after they collectively reach the 75 percent participation goal in their synod.

We estimate ELCA employers could save approximately $2.5 million in total for the year had they all reached the 75 percent participation goal by the start of 2008. Employers still have through September to reach their 75 percent goal and earn their 2 percent discount on the months remaining in 2008. A monthly listing of ELCA synod and organization progress toward the 75 percent participation goal can be found at www.elcabop.org.
2007 investment performance

2007 was a very interesting year that started out well enough, but ended with increased uncertainty and falling investment returns. In reflecting on economic events, our senior investment managers noted credit worries continued to dominate the markets as the Federal Reserve Board cut short-term interest rates. Inflation and recession worries persisted while the housing market tumbled and the nation’s Gross Domestic Product grew weaker. Consumer confidence measures dropped, unemployment hovered around 5 percent and retail sales fell in the fourth quarter.

Almost all asset classes experienced negative returns as the economic uncertainty accelerated in the fourth quarter of 2007, except those for investment grade fixed income and cash. And yet for the year as a whole, most asset classes still enjoyed good returns – all things considered. Non-U.S. stocks experienced double-digit returns because of growth outside the U.S., a lag on the credit fallout to non-U.S. markets and decline in value of the U.S. dollar. ELCA balanced funds in our Select Series fared well, overall, relative to their performance benchmarks, benefitting from diversification into additional asset categories not found in the Build Your Own Series. For the latest ELCA fund returns, visit our web site at www.elcabop.org.

As always, your comments and questions are welcome.

Church Periodical
Submitted by Mr. Daniel Lehmann

The church periodical, The Lutheran, shall be published by this church through the Publishing House of the ELCA and shall be identified as the magazine of this church. (17.31)

The magazine ended FY 2007 with an operating surplus of $219,573. This compares with surpluses of $266,262 in FY 2006 and $285,622 in FY 2005 (the first year of financial operations independent of Augsburg Fortress, Publishers). Income totaled $3.77 million and expense $3.55 million, as opposed to estimates of $3.482 million and $3.481 million, respectively. (The Lutheran is self-funded: the only mission support received from the ELCA is office space.) Expense of The Little Lutheran totaled $225,054 in FY 2007, while income totaled $67,922. The $157,132 difference came from income produced by The Lutheran. All was spent on promotion of the fledgling children’s magazine.

For FY 2008, income is projected at $3.64 million for The Lutheran and $184,811 for The Little Lutheran. Expense is projected at $3.49 for The Lutheran and $184,289 for The Little Lutheran. A surplus of $148,858 is projected for the combined operations of the magazines.

The magazine’s endowment (cash reserves) totaled $1.22 million as of December 31, 2007, nearly double its value for the same date in 2005 ($633,810). Some $200,000 of the FY 2007 surplus will be added to the endowment in the coming days.

Paid circulation of The Lutheran as of February 2008 stood at 289,971 and complimentary copies at 19,810. Circulation fell 2.3 percent during FY 2007, or 13,038 copies. This was a marked improvement over the past eight years, when losses ranged from 3.3 percent to 12.5 percent, or 25,053 copies to 60,453 copies. Through the first three months of 2008, circulation declined 10,059, compared to 13,824 for the same period the year prior, and 22,277 the year before that. If trends of the past few years continue, the loss for 2008 should hold around 10,000, resulting in a paid circulation base of some 290,000. Nearly two-thirds (61.5 percent) of
congregations that cancel subscription plans cite “budget” for the action.

The Lutheran now has congregational subscription plans in 5,032 of the denomination’s 10,470 congregations. There are 1,016 bulk plans (up from 300 in 2000) and 3,632 congregational plans (down from 4,997 in 2000). The average congregational subscription is 58 copies, compared to 62 in 2007 and 106 in 2000. This downward trend mirrors the decline in worship attendance in the ELCA.

The advisory committee for The Lutheran continues to meet in March and October. Carol A. McDivitt of Loveland, Colo., was elected chair and Dave Mowitz of Des Moines, Iowa, was selected as secretary. The Conference of Bishops named Bishop Harold L. Usgaard of the Southeastern Minnesota Synod as its representative to the committee.

Magazine staffers will attend 34 synod assemblies this spring. Synods will be asked to provide podium time for staffers to update voting members on the circulation challenge facing the magazine and to re-establish a relationship between the magazine and synods and congregations. The 33 synod assemblies missed this year will be attended in 2009, with the cycle repeating every two years.

A subscription program called the Synod Plan is being implemented. It will first be offered in synods that publish a supplement that is bound into the middle of the magazine. Most synods produce supplements four times a year, so The Lutheran will sell the magazine to congregations not already on some type of subscription plan the four times the supplement appears at a rate of $3.95 per subscription a year. Synods were once charged for the printing of these supplements, but all costs have now been assumed by The Lutheran. Synods wishing to produce one can receive up to four free supplements per year. In addition, all non-subscribing congregations will receive updated subscription information following the staff visits to synod assemblies. The magazine budgeted $205,000 for promotion in 2008, up from $175,000 in 2007.

Annual subscription plans for The Lutheran remain at $7.95 per subscription on the Congregational Plan and $11.95 per subscription for the Leadership Plan. Individual subscriptions are $15.95, still 30 percent less than the average denominational magazine. Rates were last increased in 2002. With declining circulation, a rate increase appears unavoidable in the next few years.

As this report is written, eight issues of The Little Lutheran have been mailed to the homes of children six and younger. Launched in July/August of 2007, the paid circulation for this newest ELCA publication stands at 10,860. Published 10 times a year, the magazine sells for $24.95—but is available for $12.95 for orders of six or more subscriptions (these can be mailed to different addresses but must be billed to one address). This publication fills a vacuum since many secular toddler magazines exist but none with religious content to tell children how much God loves them and that Jesus is their savior.

The Little Lutheran can be used as an evangelism and educational tool for congregations. Several ELCA congregations are ordering copies to be used for preschools, nurseries, children’s sermon resources, worship bags, baptismal gifts, and other creative purposes. In addition, single subscriber sales continue to keep pace with congregational subscriptions. The magazine features prayers; songs; stories based on Scripture; stories about saints, living or dead; global stories; rituals; activities, and colorful, lively art. Marketing efforts for this magazine continue to target both congregational and individual subscribers, with a minimum of $65,000 planned for promotion in 2008. The publication’s Web site, www.thelittlelutheran.org, will undergo a makeover in the next few weeks. The Lutheran plans to introduce a similar magazine for the ELCA’s full communion partners later this year; it will be titled The Little Christian.

The Lutheran’s Web site draws an average of 87,700 unique visitors who return three times monthly, with Web traffic boosting 585,000 page views a month. The front page of the site is refreshed with seven new, free-to-all stories every Tuesday, and discussion hosts change every Tuesday. The staff blog is updated daily, as is breaking news. Justin Baxter, a seminarian on internship, is the magazine’s first non-staff blogger. The site hosts 6,400 pages, with an average
of 52 new articles added monthly. Users have embraced article and blog commenting and, to a lesser extent, discussion forum participation.

A new site design with improved topical navigation was launched in November, accompanied by a simpler membership model that grants anyone with a print subscription (whether full price, volume discounted or roster gratis) full access to www.thelutheran.org.

The magazine also launched a congregational “green subscription” plan that allows environmentally concerned or tech-savvy congregations to offer Web-only subscriptions of The Lutheran to their members.

This year’s site goals are to increase the number (and range of opinions) of guest bloggers, as well as to redesign the companion Web site to The Little Lutheran magazine.

**Communication Services**

**Submitted by Ms. Kristi Bangert**

*The Communication Services unit shall interpret the work of this church, provide for this church’s presence in public media, and coordinate the communication activities of this church’s units.* (17.21.A05)

Major projects, productions, staffing changes and events have been front-burner issues for the Communication Services unit over the past few months.

Research results from the ad initiative pilot project are in, and they are very encouraging. All indications are that we accomplished the project’s primary goal of helping ELCA members own and tell this church’s story, the story of what God is doing in us and through us for the sake of the world. Both the content of the ads and the tag line, “God’s work, our hands,” were extremely well received. By mid-April we will have budget figures for the costs of a broader roll-out of the ad initiative. The figures will begin with the cost of the most modest roll-out (limited to one or two market areas) and proceed in various increments (adding more markets) all the way to a full-blown national roll-out.

ELCA.org continues to be a highly valued service to the church, averaging over 36,000 visits and 192,000 page views a day. The Web site has recorded 5-6 million page views a month since the 2007 churchwide assembly. CO staff is intensely involved in ELCA.org redevelopment efforts, working with IT to get new Web services up and running, refining the look and feel of the new site, and working with units to prepare their content for the new platform. All content is being converted to the Sitecore content management system, and the addition of NetCommunity software will allow members to login to manage their profile and communication preferences, donate online, and see personalized content across the rest of ELCA.org. The new site is intended to provide a more unified message, with compelling stories and calls to action throughout the site.

“In God’s Name,” the prime-time CBS television special that aired in December, featured Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson and 11 other prominent religious leaders from around the world. The program was seen by 3.96 million viewers nationwide. Photographs taken by the production team during filming are the subject of a book produced by National Geographic and distributed by Random House. The book and DVD of the program were released for sale through retail outlets in late March. CO worked with Ecumenical and Inter-religious Relations and Global Mission to develop a study guide for the program. It is available on the ELCA Web site.

The ELCA News Service staff prepared for the release of the draft *Social Statement on Human Sexuality*, and is looking forward to significant spring and summer events, such as the anticipated action of the United Methodist Church to adopt a full communion proposal with the ELCA, Women of the ELCA gathering and convention in Salt Lake City, the ELCA Global Mission event, La Crosse, Wis., and more. The staff will welcome a college student as an intern this summer, and will work collaboratively with new feature writers expected to join the ELCA Communication Services staff in the near future.
The news staff has responded to a number of media inquiries directed to the churchwide organization, and provided media assistance to congregations, synods and other organizations dealing with crises. Staff has conducted workshops on media-related topics and continues to teach media relations to synod communicators through a media-mentoring initiative. The news staff has concentrated its recent work on developing and “pitching” more mission and ministry stories for use by mainstream news organizations and by church news organizations.

The Public Media team completed filming the one-hour documentary, Uganda: Ready to Forgive, in November. This program provides insight into the plight of the Ugandan people and their incredible ability to forgive their enemies after 20 years of war, pain and torture. For information or to view the program, visit www.elca.org/readytoforgive.

Grace Matters, the radio ministry of the ELCA, hosted the first ever call-in pledge drive in November. The call-in format made it possible for the staff to connect with many listeners, raise funds and form priceless relationships. Grace Matters broadcasts are heard in 187 markets across the country and around the world. Listen, download podcasts and learn more at www.elca.org/gracematters.

In December we ended Mosaic Television’s 20-year run. We will continue to produce and deliver video as a means to interpret the mission and ministry of this church, but we will focus more on short-form video and features on the Web. The last issue of Mosaic was The Life of Apostle Peter with Rick Steves as host. This program and all past Mosaic programs continue to be available on DVD and can be viewed at www.elca.org/mosaic.

LutherLink (the online community of the ELCA) is being redeveloped in partnership with Lightworks New Media. This partnership will afford new features and more stability for the Ecunet platform.

CO staff was instrumental in the transformation of the National Training Center for Resource Center Directors into the Ecumenical Alliance for Resource Center Ministry, bringing together churchwide staff, resource center directors, seminaries and publishing houses from five denominations. The purpose of the Alliance is to support resource center directors by providing opportunities for theological education, professional training, advocacy and networking.

CO worked with the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin to launch the ELCA presence on http://elca.feautor.org, a Web site started as a result of a World Council of Churches consultation on “open source religious resources.” The site features almost 650 locally-produced resources from congregations across the ELCA and shared in the context of this global, ecumenical effort. Resources available for free download range from Acolyte training manuals to discipleship skits, to ideas for celebrating a church anniversary.

Brett Nelson joined the staff as audio/video producer and production manager in March. He came to us with 19 years of experience in video production and editing. We are pleased to have Brett on the CO staff and look forward to exploring with him new directions for video and new ways to help churchwide units meet their video needs.

Connie Sletto and Collen Dorner were adopted as members of the CO staff following the transition of publishing services functions from Augsburg Fortress to CO. Connie and Colleen provide editorial review and project coordination for print projects generated by the units of this church. We are pleased to have them on board and appreciate the experience and expertise they bring to their work.

Ben McDonald Coltvet has a new position description and title: managing editor for the Web. In April we will be adding two writers/storytellers to the staff. One of those positions will be dedicated to synodical and congregational relations. In February we reluctantly accepted the resignation of John Kho, director for marketing. In his 17-month tenure with us John contributed significantly to CO’s work, including development of the ELCA comprehensive communication plan, and management of both the ad initiative and the initial stages of ELCA.org redevelopment.

We look forward to the 2008 Communicators Conference, August 7-10. The conference will
be held in Chicago under the theme of “Network Power.” Keynote speakers include Presiding Bishop Hanson, Rick Klau and Clarence Page.

Mission Investment Fund of the ELCA
Submitted by Ms. Eva Roby

The Mission Investment Fund of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall have primary responsibility for the development, administration, and promotion of Mission Investments.(17.51.A05)

Finances
During 2007, the Mission Investment Fund (MIF) continued to grow and maintain financial stability. As of December 31, 2007, 783 loans with balances of over $447 million were outstanding, an increase of 75 loans and $65 million from December 31, 2006. Since the end of 2003, MIF has experienced loan growth of almost $226 million, or 102 percent. In addition to loans, MIF held $20 million in real estate for future use of new congregations.

The major source of funds to meet loan demand is the sale of Mission Investment Obligations. As of December 31, 2007, total investment obligations were $347 million, with 20,625 accounts for 11,742 investors, a growth of 602 investors and over $21 million since December 31, 2006. Funds of congregations and institutions of the ELCA comprise 71 percent of investment obligations with a value of $248 million for 3,941 investors.

Operations
MIF continues to provide lower-than-market interest rates to young mission congregations purchasing their first property site or constructing their first church building. As a result, new congregations are able to buy land and build earlier. The major loan growth, however, has been with established congregations and other ELCA-related ministries.

Over the past 3 years, MIF has received increasingly larger loan requests. As of December 21, 2007, there are 140 loans with balances in excess of $1 million, totaling $256 million. Growth in loans to other ELCA-related ministries also continues to be strong, closing the year with 50 loans totaling $63 million. MIF currently holds 21 loans with social ministry organizations and 16 loans with outdoor ministries. Increased awareness of MIF throughout the ELCA contributed to this growth.

The Health Savings Account (HSA), introduced in July 2007, is generating interest among social ministry organizations affiliated with the ELCA. Due to the prohibitive cost of employer-provided health insurance, many of these ministries now offer high-deductible health plans. The HSA Service Center on the MIF Web site enables qualified individuals to conveniently complete application forms online. Similarly, Individual Retirement Account applications may be completed online through our IRA Service Center.

Staffing
John Kho joined MIF in March 2008 as Vice President for Marketing after serving in the ELCA Communications Services unit as Director of Marketing and Public Relations. In December 2007, Michael McCorkle joined our staff as Director for Information Technology. Our search for a Vice President for Lending/Chief Loan Officer continues.

Marketing
MIF is working with TDH Advertising to develop a brand and product advertising campaign to build awareness of our products and increase participation in MIF by ELCA members. This campaign will build on the foundation and synergy of a branding effort recently created by TDH for the ELCA. To complement this work, MIF has hired Raddon
Financial Group, a leading provider of research data and strategic counsel for financial institutions, to assist us in better understanding the characteristics of our current customers so that we can improve our products and services and grow our customer base.

MIF’s challenge to Women of the ELCA has been a success. The challenge resulted in nearly $2 million in new investments by participants in the women’s organization. As a result, MIF will provide a gift to support the organization’s Triennial Gathering in Salt Lake City in July 2008.

Real Estate
On December 31, 2007, MIF held $19.1 million in real estate. Of that amount, $1.9 million was identified as excess property (property that will not be used for future ministries) and is to be sold. New purchases for the period of September 31 through December 31, 2007, included three properties totaling $3.3 million. MIF also liquidated three properties during this same period totaling just under $1 million. MIF currently has five properties under contract for purchase for a total of $1.5 million.

Partnerships
MIF recently announced a $1.5 million matching grant to the ELCA Fund for Leaders to establish the MIF Mission Developer Scholarship. The gift will provide scholarship assistance to eligible students who are enrolled in a qualified mission developer program at any of the eight ELCA seminaries. MIF’s gift challenges the Fund for Leaders to raise $3 million over a three-year period. Through the gift, MIF is furthering its ministry of supporting the growth of the church by helping to train pastors who will lead outreach efforts in new mission congregations.

MIF, the ELCA Foundation and the ELCA Board of Pensions are sharing a full-page advertisement in The Lutheran throughout 2008 to highlight the financial ministries of this church. Each unit will have four “advertorials” during the year that are branded with the units’ logos and the tagline “United in service to you and the ELCA.”

In a new agreement with the ELCA Vocation and Education program unit, MIF church building consultants will be evaluating the condition of campus ministry facilities. The consultants’ findings will help the V & E unit plan for the future capital needs of the buildings.

Over the past several years, the Mission Investment Fund has forged partnerships across the church; partnerships that benefit the related ministry while also supporting MIF and serving its core mission: To help build the church and advance in God’s mission by providing ministry loans, investment opportunities, and supporting services for ELCA members, congregations and partners.

Development Services
Submitted by Ms. Cynthia Halverson

The Development Services unit shall oversee and direct efforts for support of the churchwide ministries of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and coordinate the work of development for the churchwide organization.(17.41.B05)

A healthy year-end giving season, implementation of the strategic priorities, an audit, Mission ONE, and the Lutheran Malaria Initiative have been the focus of energy and work for the ELCA Foundation and Development Services staff in recent months.

We are thrilled to report that the total ELCA World Hunger Appeal gift revenue for fiscal year 2007 was $21.3 million against the fiscal year 2007 goal of $18.75 million. ELCA Disaster Response received over $3.1 million for international and domestic disasters. Part of the World Hunger Appeal revenue growth from 2006 to 2007 can be
attributed to significantly higher than average bequest income and strong individual giving. We received $2,195,859 in bequest income in 2007 compared to $843,690 in 2006. Similarly, we received 46 gifts from individuals of $10,000 and over compared to 31 gifts in 2006.

In 2007, $3,929,499 was given by ELCA constituents to support Missionary Sponsorship. Of this, $3,828,427 was given in support of the mission support general budget line item; the remainder was received through Level II projects designated as missionary support. While this giving represents strong support on the part of this church for global mission personnel, it continues to fall short of the $4,000,000 target.

An interesting phenomenon is noted in a sharp increase in Level II giving, as $2,943,675 beyond the Level II gifts noted above was received for designated gifts above and beyond the general budget. Approximately $223,000 was designated for the Mount of Olives Housing Project—a project approved by the 2005 Churchwide Assembly.

Income generated for the Fund for Leaders in Mission totaled $2,485,008 in 2007, exceeding the goal by $510,008. All areas of giving were strong, but it is worthy to note bequest income of $751,678 and synod partnership income of $578,446.

A matching challenge called “Leadership Rising” was launched in September 2007. Three families have pledged lead gifts totaling nearly $1 million to match other gifts to the fund on a 1:2 or 50 percent basis. The goal of the campaign is to double the Fund from $15 million to $30 million by 2010. The Fund was also challenged with a $1.5 million gift from the Mission Investment Fund of the ELCA. The gift, and the gifts it generates, will provide a scholarship resource for seminarians preparing to become mission developer pastors.

Although it’s too early to share any stated goals, the Fund is at the center of a discussion convened by Bishop Hanson around the issue of seminary student debt. Broader initiatives will be developed in the coming year in which the Fund will play a significant role.

The Fund for Leaders again will provide 32 new scholarships, two full scholarships, and two partial scholarships to students at each of the eight ELCA seminaries. Along with past years’ recipients and the students who receive scholarships through synodical partnerships, the Fund will support over 150 students in 2008-2009. Nearly $1 million is being distributed each year.

We are pleased to report that Vision for Mission, the churchwide appeal for undesignated support, exceeded its goal and reversed a downward income trend. Nearly $1.29 million in gifts and bequest income were received for the Vision appeal. In fiscal year 2007, the Vision for Mission program successfully lowered expenses by 63 percent over fiscal year 2006 while still raising 103 percent of budgeted income.

Although down somewhat from 2006, more than $28 million in irrevocable gifts flowed through the ELCA Foundation in 2007. It was a very strong year for bequests and matured life insurance gifts with over $11 million coming through the Foundation. Almost $4.0 million in cash gifts flowed to permanent ELCA endowment funds with distributions that will be passed through to ministries around the world. New planned gifts totaled just under $10 million, less than half of the record total from the previous year. Hardest hit was the gift annuity program which saw only 296 gift annuities written, the lowest number in eighteen years.

During 2007, Fund A of the Endowment Fund Pooled Trust grew by 56 new investor participant accounts with approximately $7.0 million in new investments. Almost $11.0 million in net additions were added by existing investor participants and four accounts totaling $0.8 million were closed. Contribution revenue for unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted endowments totaled $12.3 million compared to $10.2 million in 2006.

As of December 31, 2007, Fund A of the Endowment Fund Pooled Trust held 1,566 accounts totaling $347.5 million. Of total Pooled Trust net assets, $148 million were to
benefit the ECLA churchwide organization. The Pooled Trust’s investment performance (net of investment management fees) for the year was 5.77 percent vis-à-vis a benchmark of 5.56 percent.

During 2008, the Foundation is focused on implementing its strategic priority to “offer enhanced endowment management services and investment options to ELCA congregations, synods, agencies, and institutional investors and retain and grow assets under management.” The expanded endowment project team and the endowment software implementation team have been working in support of this priority. The project plan was completed in February and project implementation is underway.

We continue to strengthen and expand the ELCA Good Gifts brand. On September 26, 2007, the 2007-2009 edition of the ELCA Good Gifts catalog was widely distributed to over 320,000 households. At the same time, we also introduced the ELCA Good Gifts express giving form on the ELCA Web site.

At the end of February, a grant proposal and request for $2.6 million was submitted to the United Nations Foundation (UNF) on behalf of Lutheran World Relief, the ELCA, and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod for the Lutheran Malaria Initiative. We are confident that we will receive positive notification from the UNF before April 1 and the first installment of a two-year grant to begin planning and initial fund-raising for a $75 million campaign that will raise money and awareness among the broad Lutheran community in a global effort to end malaria. An important aspect of this initiative will be the inclusion of the HIV/AIDS strategy and a $10.0 million goal to support this important commitment of our church. With Church Council approval the ELCA will participate in this effort under the umbrella of the World Hunger Appeal and implement a limited pilot to test elements of this initiative until a comprehensive campaign strategy can be presented and approved by the Churchwide Assembly in 2009.
Unit Recommendations for Church Council Action

Augsburg Fortress, Publishers
Submitted by: Beth A. Lewis, president and CEO

[None]

Women of the ELCA
Submitted by Linda Post Bushkofsky, executive director

Category 1: Policies with an impact beyond the unit, which require Church Council approval

None.

Category 2: Policies related to the day-to-day functioning of the unit or to the specific mandate of the unit.

Regarding the Seventh Triennium (2005-2008):
• Received a report on the Mission Investment Fund Challenge (more than 466 accounts have been opened with more than $2 million invested) and acknowledged with gratefulness the gift of $25,000 from MIF to the triennial gathering and the gift of $8,000 from MIF to assist in the production of a new resource on money and spirituality.

• Regarding the Seventh Triennial Convention:
  • Received rosters for the business committees
  • Reviewed outline of board report to the convention; and
  • Approved sending a proposed FY2009 of $3,113,155 to the 7th Triennial Convention.

• Regarding the Triennial Gathering:
  • Heard that 1,760 registrations have been received as of March 15, 2008, including more that 525 who identify themselves as first-time attendees;
  • Received updates on exhibit hall highlights and for plenary session programming, including the addition of Chris Grumm as a speaker and Bishop April Larson as choral director.
  • Received an extensive research study conducted on the organization’s ministries, resources and participants, noted a 69 percent return rate, and learned how staff will use this data in strategic planning.

• Regarding finances:
  • Learned that regular offerings and Thankofferings were up in FY2007, bucking a multi-year downward trend; and
  • Approved a revised FY2008 budget of $4,617,180, which includes income and expenses for the Seventh Triennial Convention and Triennial Gathering.

• Received recommendations from the 2008 Conference of Synodical Presidents; reviewed and disposed of same.

• Affirmed a marketing effort designed to bring individuals into Women of the ELCA (“individual partnerships”) to be unveiled at the triennial gathering.

• Directed the executive director to move forward with efforts to create a strategic alliance with the American Heart Association.

• Engaged in anti-racism education on the subject of white privilege, led by Linda Ely, a member of the organization’s Today’s Dream, Tomorrow’s Reality anti-racism network.

Category 3: Other procedures and board actions

• Received a report on the 20th anniversary celebration of the organization, noting that the anniversary offering received in FY2007 exceeded $90,000, with ¼ going to Stand with...
Africa for a clean water project in Zimbabwe, ¼ going to Augusta Victoria Hospital in Jerusalem, and ½ going to the ongoing ministries of Women of the ELCA.

- Received a report from the board of directors of Church Women United.

**Board of Pensions**  
*Submitted by: John Kapanke, president*

The Board of Trustees of the ELCA Board of Pensions met on February 29-March 2, 2008, and approved the following actions:

**Category I: Policies with an impact beyond the unit which require Church Council approval.**

None.

**Category II: Policies related to the day-to-day functioning of the unit or to the specific mandate of the unit.**

- **Approved** amendments to the ELCA Medical and Dental Benefits Plan to clarify administrative procedure. (Approval by president).

- **Approved** amendments to the ELCA Survivor Benefits Plan to clarify that members whose disability benefits end due to reaching the maximum period of payment (not necessarily age 65) may continue coverage under the Survivor Benefits Plan. (Approval by president).

- **Approved** amendments to the ELCA Flexible Benefits Plan to clarify that dependent care flexible spending account (FSA) expenses may only be incurred until termination of employment. (Approval by president).

- **Approved** amendments to the ELCA Flexible Benefits Plan to clarify and simplify administrative procedure. (Approval by president).

- **Approved** amendments to the ELCA Flexible Benefits Plan to clarify that members may make mid-year election changes to the health FSA if the member has HIPAA special enrollment rights. (Approval by president).

- **Approved** a resolution for committee assignments of the two new Trustees. Bruce D. George will serve on Corporate Social Responsibility, Investment, and Products and Services committees. Ingrid S. Stafford will serve on Nominating, Finance, and Audit committees.

- **Adopted** the resolution relating to the execution of instruments pursuant to Section 9.4 of the bylaws of this corporate unit.

- **Approved** new ELCA social criteria screens document previously recommended by the Church Council for use by this corporate unit.

**Category III: Other procedures and board actions.**

None.
Report of the Task Force for ELCA Sexuality Studies

In the brief time since the fall Church in Society program committee meeting, the Task Force for the ELCA Studies on Sexuality finalized and published the Draft social statement on human sexuality. The task force met in January 2008 and devoted itself to reviewing draft material and giving final instructions to its writing team. At this meeting, Kenneth Inskeep, the director for the Research and Evaluation section, reported that the task force had received about 1,200 forms representing the opinions of more than 3,200 ELCA members in response to the task force's third study. This is about two-and-a-half times the number of responses typical for a study. Members of the task force collectively have read every response and received RE's report regarding overall patterns evident among respondents. In this way, response to the study has helped shape the task force's thinking as it has crafted the draft social statement.

The draft was made available to ELCA rostered leaders and selected others on March 12, 2008, and to the general public on March 13, 2008. The release date was chosen after taking into account the dates of early synod assemblies, the remaining milestones of the ELCA social statement process, and the church calendar. Plans for the rollout of the draft were modeled on the release of the 2005 report and recommendations from the task force.

The task force will receive comment from the church in three ways: individual reactions, the response form included with the draft booklet, and synodical hearings. At this time, fifty-two synods have decided to have at least one hearing on the draft social statement, bringing the overall total to about 80. Synods are responsible for convening, publicizing, and hosting these events. A representative of the task force will be present at each hearing and a separate summary report is provided to the task force by the synod.

The task force has employed Katie English full-time as of late February, 2008. She will coordinate and facilitate this year's hearings on the draft, serve as a communication coordinator, provide administrative support for task force meetings, and assist in updating and maintaining the sexuality studies Web site.

Attached is a timeline giving an overview of the remainder of the social statement process. It gives particular attention to the Church Council's role.

Timeline

2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 25-27</td>
<td>Task force met; final instructions for work on draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>Distribution of draft for discussion throughout the ELCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March to October</td>
<td>Synods hold hearings on draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11-13</td>
<td>Church Council receives report and holds hearing on draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2-7</td>
<td>Conference of Bishop holds hearing on draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Deadline for responses to draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7-8</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14-17</td>
<td>Church Council receives report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23-25</td>
<td>Final meeting of the Task Force for ELCA Studies on Sexuality; it will finalize work on a proposed social statement and implementing resolutions as well as recommendations regarding rostering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4-9</td>
<td>Conference of Bishops reviews work of the task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13-14</td>
<td>Church in Society program committee advises the program unit regarding the text of the proposed social statement and implementing resolutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27-30</td>
<td>ELCA Church Council acts to review text and place the recommended proposed social statement and implementing resolutions on the agenda for the 2009 Churchwide Assembly. It will also act on recommendations regarding rostering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Synods receive recommended proposed social statement, implementing resolutions, and recommendations regarding rostering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17-23</td>
<td>Churchwide Assembly considers proposed social statement and implementing resolutions. It will also receive and act on recommendations regarding rostering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justice for Women Report

The program for justice for women falls under all of the strategic directions of the churchwide organization’s Plan for Mission. Most specifically it assists in implementing the churchwide organization’s guidance to be a public church, to cultivate strong ecumenical and interfaith relationships, and to assist in leadership development across the church. Even more specifically, the justice for women program represents this church’s organizational commitment to “confront the scandalous realities of racial, ethnic, cultural, religious, age, gender, familial, sexual, physical, personal, and class barriers that often manifest themselves in exclusion, poverty, hunger, and violence” (strategic commitment 3).

The means of forwarding justice for women in church and in society through the churchwide expression of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is significantly different than it was in the first 17 years of this church. Two of the greatest strengths of the present programmatic structure are: 1) that the Plan for Mission’s four commitments for implementation call every part of the churchwide organization to address sexism and justice for women; and 2) that one intention of the restructuring is to encourage such responsibility across the churchwide organization and across this church at large. While there are numerous social and ecclesial issues that pertain to justice for women in church and in society, the deeply theological and systemic work that lies before this church to confront sexism and to make justice for women manifest is the present focus of the Justice for Women program.

Substantial work across this church is being done throughout all the units of the churchwide organization and is reported in detail biennially to the Churchwide Assembly. For example, especially significant work for justice for women across the churchwide organization includes the education, resource, and support that the consultant for clergy misconduct (Vocation and Education program unit) offers; the strategic planning and organizing among clergy women of color with which the director for ministry leadership (Vocation and Education) assists; and the intentional provision of international educational scholarships for fifty percent women that the Global Mission program unit provides.

In addition, one primary means of calling this church to understanding and action and communicating the programmatic priorities of the justice for women program was presented to the Church Council in April 2007 and to the 2007 Churchwide Assembly. This “invitation to action” provides a framework for the work of the justice for women program; it also offers an organizing principle for synods, congregations, groups, and networks.

Purpose Statement

The justice for women program of the Church in Society unit challenges and works with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in all its expressions, to eradicate sexism in this church and to promote gender justice in society at large.

Working definition of “justice for women”

Justice for women occurs when the ways in which women and girls are objectified are rejected and the imago dei of women and girls is affirmed through both theology and policy, in church and in society.

Goals

The goals of the invitation to address sexism in church and society are to help the ELCA understand, challenge, and respond faithfully to sexism through a transformation of how members see, think, feel, and act.

1. ELCA members understand justice for women and girls as a church issue.
2. ELCA members have theological ability to analyze church and society in terms of justice for women and girls.

3. ELCA members are equipped to challenge societal, theological, and ecclesial practices and beliefs that are unjust to women and girls.

4. ELCA members are able to respond by advocating for changes—in church practice and belief, and in social policy and practice—which bring about and reflect justice for women and girls.

**Objectives: Educate, Advocate, Lead**

In order to be able to understand, analyze, challenge, and respond, this church is invited to educate, advocate, and lead in making justice for women a reality.

**Educate, Advocate, and Lead for justice for women in church and in society.**

Faith + action = Change

- Educate for justice
- Advocate for change
- Lead into the future

Programmatic activity of the Justice for Women program is organized according to the three categories of the Invitation.

**Educate**

1. Educate about the nexus of theology and culture and how this affects women a. In process:
   - Educational opportunities (e.g., synods, Church Council, Global Mission events);
   - Bible study (e.g., Church Council, Web downloadable version)
   - “Dismantling sexism” education for churchwide organization
   - Lutheran feminist theologies conference (January 23-24, 2009)
   - Justice for women staff alliance
   - Web site

   b. To be developed:
   - Establish relationships with more synodical offices for educational and resource opportunities
   - Gain time for education sessions with the Conference of Bishops
   - Work with partners in Vocation and Education
   - Youth gathering (conversations begun)
   - Campus ministry
   - Chaplains
   - Build relationships and dialogue with seminaries regarding sexism vis-à-vis women and men leading in this church together.

   Intern working with director for ministry leadership began information gathering of already existing work among seminaries.

2. Equip stakeholders with basic theological tools
   a. In process:
      - Educational opportunities
      - Bible study
      - Lutheran feminist theologies conference
      - Justice for women staff alliance
      - Web site
Book of Faith initiative
b. To be developed:
   Establish relationships with more synodical offices for educational and resource opportunities
   Work with partners in Vocation and Education
   Youth gathering (conversations begun)
   Campus ministry
   Chaplains

3. Promote understanding and analysis of power systems from a Christian perspective.
   a. In process:
      Educational opportunities
      Bible study
      Justice for women staff alliance
      Web site
      “Dismantling sexism” training for churchwide organization
   b. To be developed:
      Establish relationships with more synodical offices for educational and resource opportunities
      Gain time for education sessions with the Conference of Bishops
      Work with partners in Vocation and Education
      Youth gathering (conversations begun)
      Campus ministry
      Chaplains
      Build relationships and dialogue with seminaries regarding sexism vis-à-vis women and men leading in this church together. Intern working with director for ministry leadership began information gathering of already existing work among seminaries.

4. Establish feminist, womanist, mujerista, and Asian theologies as mainstream theology in this church.
   a. In process:
      Educational opportunities
      Bible study
      Lutheran feminist theologies conference
      Justice for women staff alliance
      Web site
   b. To be developed:
      Establish relationships with more synodical offices for educational and resource opportunities
      Gain time for education sessions with the Conference of Bishops
      Work with partners in Vocation and Education
      Youth gathering (conversations begun)
      Campus ministry
      Chaplains
      Build relationships and dialogue with seminaries regarding sexism vis-à-vis women and men leading in this church together. Intern working with director for ministry leadership began information gathering of already existing work among seminaries.

**Advocate**
1. Advocate for women’s leadership and networks of male-female partnerships across the
churchwide organization and in this church:

a. Work with the justice for women staff alliance to influence work areas vis-à-vis justice for women and to consider areas of organizational policy and practice that positively and negatively affect justice for women.

b. Advise and collaborate with the director for ministry leadership regarding opportunities and challenges for women in ministry and means of fostering partnerships between women and men.

c. Confer with the director for ministry leadership on statistics on women in ministry.

d. Create opportunities for the academic and professional advancement of young women from diverse economic and ethnic communities (e.g., Educational Grant Program committee; nominations to National Council of Churches’ U.N. program; funding for attendance at conferences).

e. Confer with the Office of the Presiding Bishop

2. Contribute to public voice for gender justice

a. Further assist with communication and coordinated activity among staff members (CS, GM, MM, VE, WELCA) whose work involves commercial sexual exploitation.

b. Further develop relationships with Women of the ELCA staff members on advocacy issues.

c. Network with ecumenical partners to learn from and draw upon collective strength: National Council of Churches, justice for women working group, ecumenical peer group.

d. Collaborate as possible with the ELCA Washington Office on key legislative issues.

e. Confer with the Office of the Presiding Bishop

3. Advocate for this church’s continuing appraisal and action on sexism and gender justice:

a. Work with the justice for women staff alliance to influence work areas vis-à-vis justice for women and to consider areas of organization policy and practice that positively and negatively affect justice for women

b. Work with consultant for anti-racism education and training

c. Confer as needed with consultant for clergy misconduct and executive director of Vocation and Education regarding misconduct.

d. Report to and confer with the Church Council

e. Report to the Churchwide Assembly

f. Confer with the Office of the Secretary

g. Confer with the Office of the Presiding Bishop

4. Advocate for the incorporation of feminist, womanist, mujerista, Asian, and other women’s interpretive perspectives in the theological deliberation and educational ministries of the church:

a. Consultation on Book of Faith Initiative, January 2007

b. Global Mission Event—participating spring and summer 2008

c. Conversations with colleges and seminaries

5. Create fora within this church to discuss and promote theological, ecclesial, and social renewal away from sexism:

a. Justice for women staff alliance

b. Justice for Women consulting committee

c. Church Council

d. Synod staff relationships and synod educational opportunities

f. Network with ecumenical partners to learn from and draw upon collective
wisdom: National Council of Churches, justice for women working group, ecumenical peer group

6. Heighten awareness of and action on issues that are egregious effects of sexism
   a. Commercial sexual exploitation (including human trafficking)
   b. Domestic violence
   c. Clergy sexual abuse

Lead
1. Hold an established presence in this church
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ELCA Boycott Policy and Procedures

Introduction
This document sets forth churchwide policy and procedures for consideration, adoption, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and termination of boycotts. These policies reflect the mission of this church, expressed in the ELCA Constitution, Bylaws and Continuing Resolutions; they also are consistent with the ELCA’s churchwide advocacy procedures. The document begins with reference to the theological foundations of this church’s commitment to justice. It addresses the nature and history of boycotts. It concludes by identifying: (1) the key issues and criteria to be addressed in assessing the merits of ELCA support for any boycott and (2) the appropriate procedures for churchwide decisions in relation to such support.

Theological Foundation: Our Commitment to Justice
The mission of this church is grounded in the Scriptures, the ecumenical creeds, and the Lutheran confessions. We confess God as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of all, and Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. We believe in salvation by grace alone, through faith. We respond to God’s grace by practicing justice and working for peace and reconciliation in the care of all creation. Through the social policy of this church, we attempt to understand the meaning of our faith for life together in the present age. Any decision by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) to participate in a boycott on any level must be consistent with this church’s confession of faith and must be based upon principles articulated in its social policy.

The commitment to pursue justice and to be faithful stewards in all of life was reflected in the social statements of predecessor churches.

The ELCA constitution makes clear this church’s commitment to speak with its members and the wider society on justice issues, and to work for justice in the church and society, committing the ELCA to participate in God’s mission in the following ways:

4.02c. Serve in response to God’s love to meet human needs, caring for the sick and the aged, advocating dignity and justice for all people, working for peace and

---

1 As defined in detail later in this document, boycotts may be undertaken in response to the actions of private or public sector entities.
2 ELCA social policy is understood as the collected policy actions by the churchwide organization, e.g. social statements, messages, Churchwide Assembly resolutions, and Church Council resolutions.
3 For example, in 1976, The American Lutheran Church declared, in Manifesto for Our Nation’s Third Century, “We require that all social institutions—economic, governmental, educational, scientific, technological—be shaped to serve human needs.” “And so... the... church pledges itself ... to involvement in the social systems and structures, so that these become more responsive to God’s will for the world.” In 1980, the Lutheran Church in America adopted Economic Justice: Stewardship In Human Community. “It is in obedient gratitude for all gifts of God that we... commit ourselves in faithful love to struggle for economic justice as an integral part of the witness and work of God’s people in the world.”
reconciliation among the nations, and standing with the poor and the powerless and committing itself to their needs.

4.03g. Lift its voice in concord and work in concert with forces for good, to serve humanity, cooperating with church and other groups participating in activities that promote justice, relieve misery, and reconcile the estranged.

4.03i. Study social issues and trends, work to discover the causes of oppression and injustice, and develop programs of ministry and advocacy to further human dignity, freedom, justice and peace in the world. (ELCA Constitution 1997-2007)

The constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America ELCA constitution affirms advocacy as a way in which the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America ELCA works to promote justice in both “public” (governmental) and “private” (corporate) sectors of society. It assigns to the Division program unit for Church in Society (CS) a lead role in this mission of advocacy:

16.11. The Division 16.12. The program unit for Church in Society shall:
   i. direct and implement this church’s public-policy advocacy to national and international governmental bodies in consultation with other church-wide units, and coordinate its public-policy advocacy to state governmental bodies.
   j. give expression to this church’s concern for corporate social responsibility; both in its internal affairs and its interaction in the broader society.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America ELCA employs various means in its ministry of advocacy. In the public sector, it works through its own members with elected and appointed officials to influence policy and legislation in ways that are compatible with the beliefs and values articulated in its confession of faith and in its social statements. In the private sector, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America ELCA has developed corporate social criteria to be considered for the investment or expenditure of ELCA funds. The ELCA dialogues with corporation’s leadership to change corporation policies, and may file shareholder resolutions and cast proxy ballots on stocks held by the churchwide units that are not separately incorporated. In addition, the Church Council may make recommendations to the churchwide units that are separately incorporated concerning the filing of shareholder resolutions and the casting of ballots on stocks held by those units. (ELCA constitution – 14.21.14) employs various forms of shareholder negotiation with corporations, including the initiation or co-filing of shareholder resolutions that promote corporate social responsibility, and the development of corporate social responsibility criteria to be considered for the investment or expenditure of ELCA funds. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America ELCA and its members may also engage in selective purchasing and investing. Boycotts would be the final step in the continuum of private sector advocacy by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, ELCA, taken after other steps are exhausted and careful deliberation has been concluded.

**Boycotts: A Definition**

In general terms, a “boycott” may be defined as:

A collective effort to abstain from the purchase or use of products or services provided by a targeted firm, government, or other agency. The purpose of a boycott is to persuade the
targeted entity to cease certain practices judged to be unjust, and/or to perform certain practices deemed to be just.¹

Lutherans have historically been involved in social movements which used boycotts as a means of witness and reform in a wide range of areas, including the consumption of liquor and tobacco, business establishments open on Sunday, objectionable entertainment, goods produced with child or slave labor, gambling, and racial discrimination.² Martin Luther himself called for a boycott of the Fuggers, a merchant banking company.³

Although predecessor bodies adopted boycott criteria and considered participation, they did not endorse a boycott churchwide. Currently the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) engages in selective buying in terms of vendor selection, based on the advice of Project Equality, which certifies equal opportunity vendors.

**Ethical, Procedural, and Pastoral Considerations: Questions To Be Addressed**

In order to ensure thorough study and consideration prior to an ELCA commitment to any boycott, certain ethical questions must be addressed:

1. Does the boycott clearly address a significant issue of justice? That is, would the cause the boycott promotes be one that promotes human dignity, protects innocent life, and preserves conditions necessary for decent human existence?
2. Is the need for redress urgent? If the practices at issue are continued, are the human costs likely to be great?
3. Have appropriate prior measures such as negotiations and shareholder resolutions been pursued and proven ineffective? Have these alternatives been given a fair chance to succeed? Is there convincing evidence that the injustices in question cannot be corrected with less disruptive measures?
4. Is failing to address the injustices of the situation likely to result in consequences more undesirable than any injustices that might result from the boycott? Can the boycott be carried out in such a way as to recognize the human dignity of those against whom it is waged?
5. Is a boycott timely? Is it likely to generate broad support in the society?
6. Who organizes the boycott and whom do they represent? Do they have a legitimate right to represent the people they claim to help? Is there assurance that the boycott will be carried on with integrity?

A second set of questions is more procedural and institutional in its orientation:

7. Does this church have a clear position in its social statements on the issue to be addressed by the boycott?
8. Is there a significant chance of success if an adequate strategy and implementation plan are employed?

¹ A different and more technical definition would apply to organizations covered by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Church bodies are not covered by the NLRA.
³ Martin Luther, *On Trade and Usury*. Vol. 45: Luther’s Works.
9. Have local and regional church leaders in the area that will be most affected by the boycott been consulted?
10. Within this church, is there a willingness and capability to undertake the educational, interpretive, and organizational efforts required to acquaint ELCA members with the issues and rationale, and to organize effective participation?
11. Has a work plan been prepared to show how the boycott will be implemented, monitored, and evaluated?
12. How will the boycott be conducted as part of the strategy for continuing negotiation with the corporation? How does the boycott issue relate to an over-all assessment of the corporation?
13. Have measurable goals been articulated so that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) will be able to evaluate the effectiveness of its boycott strategy and to know when the boycott has succeeded or failed? Have the conditions under which the boycott will be suspended or terminated been clearly stated?

Finally, important pastoral questions must be addressed:

14. Can the boycott be carried out in such a way as to reduce as much as possible the suffering of innocent third parties? Has adequate consideration been given to how such people can be supported pastorally and economically and to the manner in which the church’s support of the boycott can be interpreted to them?
15. How will the boycott contribute to the prophetic mission of this church and how is it compatible with its advocacy ministry? Are there approaches which represent a more effective use of the resources available? Will the boycott unduly risk the closing of other appropriate avenues for addressing the issue? Will it distract attention from other more important issues? Will it be conducive to right relationships within and beyond this church?
16. Can and will the boycott be carried out in such a way that there are possibilities for reconciliation once the boycott is terminated?

The purpose of posing and addressing these questions in an open fashion, rather than stating flat requirements, which must all be met, is to assure that the difficult issues inherent in a boycott will be confronted, without imposing an unduly rigid requirement. The hope is that, under the particular circumstances, ELCA consideration of any boycott will integrate prophetic and symbolic roles with concerns for instrumental effectiveness and church credibility. There may be circumstances which would lead the church in its prophetic ministry to endorse a boycott even when some of these questions have ambiguous answers.

Procedures for Consideration and Decision
As appropriate, the executive director of the Division program unit for Church in Society (CS) or any member of the team the Cabinet of Executives may place the question of ELCA support for a given boycott on the agenda of the ELCA Inter-unit Advocacy Staff Team, which shall consider the pros and cons, including consideration of each of the questions set forth above. The inter-unit team is the proper forum where churchwide units may propose boycotts for consideration. The ELCA Church Council or its Executive Committee may refer synod resolutions proposing boycotts to the Division for Church in Society, whereupon the executive director may refer the issue to the inter-unit team, with a request that it transmit its advice to the board of the Division for Church in Society and the DCS Advisory Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility (ACCSR). Similarly, the Advisory Committee should transmit its advice on the matter to the board of the Division for Church in Society. The ELCA Church Council or its executive committee may also refer synod resolutions
proposing boycotts to the executive director of the program unit for CS for consideration. The executive director of CS then develops an inter-unit review group to consider the pros and cons, including consideration of each of the questions set forth above. Advice from the Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility (ACCSR) as well as the program committee for CS will be sought.

The director for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for DCS is responsible for conducting or coordinating the necessary research and providing the Inter-unit Advocacy Staff Team and the Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility an inter-unit review group and the ACCSR with the information required to consider the above questions and for advising the team group regarding implementation.

If the inter-unit Advocacy Staff Team review group is convinced that the answers to the above questions merit ELCA endorsement of a boycott, it may recommend such support to the board of the Division for Church in Society at a regularly scheduled meeting, executive director of CS. In that event, the executive director of the Division for Church in Society may seek the advice of consult the ELCA Cabinet of Executives for preparation of recommendations to the board. The board, in turn, may recommend participation to the ELCA Church Council, which shall have final authority.

In the absence of any ELCA position on a specific boycott, designated ELCA representatives to national ecumenical organizations may vote at their individual discretion on the boycott positions of those organizations, without their individual actions implying any corporate position of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America ELCA.

Boycott Information
The Division program unit for Church in Society CS is responsible for maintaining and providing information regarding various boycotts to units and expressions of the church and to members of the ELCA. Such information could include the social policy of the church on the issue and plans for the conduct of the boycott.

What Does ELCA Boycott Participation Mean?
ELCA endorsement of a boycott can involve a range of possible activities, which could be incorporated in a boycott implementation plan. This plan would address:

• the extent and nature of involvement sought by churchwide offices, synods, congregations, families, and individuals;
• the nature of participation in broader coalition efforts;
• development and dissemination of educational materials;
• the effect on purchasing practices;
• plans for approaching institutional purchasers outside the church; and
• appropriate communications by organizations and members of the church to the corporation in question.

ELCA endorsement of a boycott commits the churchwide offices to participate in the boycott. It also constitutes a recommendation to synods, congregations, and affiliated institutions that they participate in the boycott as institutions.

Whenever the ELCA supports a boycott, it is essential that appropriate measures be taken to ensure that the conduct of the boycott will be sufficiently accountable to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America ELCA and to provide for withdrawal of the endorsement when
it becomes advisable. If a coalition board is managing the boycott, accountability might be arranged by designating an official representative of the ELCA to serve on that board and report to the Division program unit for Church in Society CS, which will report to the Church Council.

Church Council adopted an ELCA Boycott Policy and Procedures, November 1989 (CC89.11.183)

Revision Recommended by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility, January 14, 2005

Revision Approved by Executive Committee, March 9, 2005 (EC05.03.09)

Revision Recommended by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility, January 11, 2008
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Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All

Background

The ELCA social statement “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” (ELCA, 1999) is a benchmark for our role as Christians in economic life. Because of sin, we have fallen short of our responsibilities to one another in this world, but we live in light of God’s promised future that ultimately there will be no hunger and injustice. This promise makes us restless with a world that is less than what God intends. In economic matters, this draws attention to:

- The scope of God’s concern: “for all”;
- The means by which life is sustained: “livelihood”;
- What is needed: “sufficiency”; and
- Long-term perspective: “sustainability” (pg. 3).

“The vantage point of the kingdom of God motivates us to focus on more than short-term gains. Humans, called to be stewards of God’s creation, are to respect the integrity and limits of the earth and its resources” (pg. 14). We are challenged to pursue policies and practices concerning sustainability. The multitudes around God’s global table are recognized as neighbors rather than competitors or strangers (pg. 17).

Sustainable development is about ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for generations to come. Thus it combines ecological, social, and economic concerns and offers business opportunities for companies to improve the lives of the world’s people (see for example, the World Business Council on Sustainable Development). The International Institute for Sustainable Development further develops the concept to include, “Sustainable production and consumption to mean using, disposing and transforming resources in a way that minimizes harm to the environment while supporting the well being of people.”

Although the concept of sustainability is evolving, several instruments, guidelines, and benchmarks have been developed and are now being used in the governmental and corporate sectors. The first of these is the G3 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines, a long-term, multi-stakeholder, international process whose mission is to develop and disseminate globally applicable Sustainability Reporting Guidelines. Many corporations have embraced these guidelines as a way to organize their voluntary reporting concerning issues of sustainability. Many industry sector supplements, including one for non-profits, have been developed so that corporations have similar understandings for reporting metrics for their particular industry.

In 2003, the 3rd edition of “Principles for Global Corporate Responsibility: Bench Marks for Measuring Business Performance” was released. Faith-based investor groups from Australia, Hong Kong, Canada, South Africa, Colombia, and the United Kingdom, as well as the U.S.-based Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, gathered to update these principles and offer a long-range view for corporations focused on protecting the environment, creating sustainable communities, and ensuring human dignity.

With these tools, corporations are able to look at a “triple bottom line”—the integration of social, environmental, and economic performances. This integrated, holistic approach is also referred to as a corporation’s sustainability performance.

1 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/economiclife/
2 http://www.wbcsd.ch
3 http://www.iisd.org
4 http://www.globalreporting.org/ReportingFramework/G3Guidelines
5 http://www.bench-marks.org
**ELCA Social Policy**

“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” (ELCA, 1999) develops this church’s vision of sufficiency and sustainability focusing on economic life of all, with an emphasis on those who are poor and disenfranchised. It particularly calls for companies to bear the wider social and environmental costs of what they produce (pg. 14). Numerous Church Council actions support standing with those who are poor and disenfranchised around a variety of environmental and social issues. ELCA advocacy plans have outlined a variety of taxation, environment, employment, globalization, and fair trade issues.

**Corporate Response**

In responding to many converging calls for disclosure, accountability, and transparency, many in the corporate world are responding by voluntarily reporting on sustainability and/or the triple bottom line. There has been a transition from a focus on individual ethics to corporations reviewing their corporate ethics and the impact of their operations on peoples and communities in a public and verifiable manner.

It is reasonable to ask companies to begin looking at this type of reporting if they are not already doing so. Additionally, companies might be asked to increase the quality and relevance of triple bottom line reporting and/or use the format established by the Global Reporting Initiative. These measurements and reporting mechanisms could help companies identify ways to run their operations more efficiently and identify problems that might result in liability for the company. A growing group of companies share their work with a variety of stakeholders for input prior to publication of such reports.

**Social Criteria Investment Screens**

None currently apply to this paper.

**Resolution Guidelines for ELCA**

1. We support public disclosure of information on corporate sustainability based on the format established by the Global Reporting Initiative.
2. We support the preparation of sustainability reports.
3. We support requests for policies reflecting the triple bottom line of environment, social and economic factors.

*Recommended by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility, September 6, 2003*
*Endorsed by Division for Church in Society Board, October 24, 2003*
*Approved by Church Council November 2003*
*Updated by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility January 11, 2008*
Corporate Social Responsibility Paper 6
For Peace in God’s World: Human Rights

Background

“We of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America share with the Church of Jesus Christ in all times and in all places the calling to be peacemakers” (“For Peace in God’s World” [ELCA, 1995], pg. 1’). We are called to promote respect for human rights by teaching, speaking out, and supporting effective ways to monitor and comply with human rights codes. Our church, through our predecessor bodies, has a legacy of peacemaking, and we are called to dedicate ourselves anew to pray and work for peace in God’s world. We have consistently supported the work of the United Nations in the area of human rights.

In 1948, the United Nations called for the recognition of the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family by adopting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This concern includes respect for human rights: “Human rights provide a common universal standard of justice for living with our differences, and they give moral and legal standing to the individual in the international community. We therefore will continue to teach about human rights, protest their violation, advocate their international codification, and support effective ways to monitor and ensure compliance with them."

In August 2003, the Sub-commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights adopted “Norms on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises with Regards to Human Rights.” These norms recognize that states have the primary responsibility to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights, but transnational corporations are also responsible for this promotion and protection.

ELCA Social Policy

In 1995 the ELCA adopted the social statement “For Peace in God’s World,” which calls the church to be a disturbing presence, a reconciling presence, and a deliberating presence to promote respect for human rights. This statement echoes the work of our predecessor church bodies expressed in “Human Rights: Doing Justice in God’s World” (LCA, 1978) and “Peace, Justice, and Human Rights” (ALC, 1972). The ELCA document also discusses the relationship between economy, justice, and human dignity. “Justice points toward an economy ordered in ways that: respect human dignity; provide the necessities of life; distribute goods and burdens fairly and equitably; and are compatible with a life-sustaining ecosystem. Sustainable growth and fair distribution are vital in creating economic justice. Both should enable all to participate in the economy. Global economic integration should enhance economic well-being among and within nations. Fiscal policy, business practices, investment policies, and personal life styles, including patterns of consumption, should contribute to economic justice and the long-term sustainability of our planet.”

The ELCA’s 1999 social statement, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” considers the relationship between corporations and politics: “The economic power of large transnational corporations continues to grow, making some of them larger than many national economies.

1 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/peace/
2 http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/lang/eng.htm
3 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/peace/
5 http://www.elca.org/jle/article.asp?k=315
6 http://www.elca.org/jle/article.asp?k=214
7 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/peace/
Along with this financial strength comes an inordinate potential to influence political decisions, local and regional economies, and democratic processes in society. The power they wield, enhanced through mergers and buyouts, can have positive effects, but it can also hold others captive to transnational corporate interests. The global community must continue to seek effective ways to hold these and other powerful economic actors more accountable for the sake of sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all.

In an effort to seek accountability, the ELCA and other investors have called for the establishment of informal and formal codes of conduct on human rights. Once the codes were created, the ELCA has joined others in teaching about these codes, speaking out about them, and supporting compliance with them.

Corporate Response

In response to the impact of economic globalization, there has been a growth of concern within a number of corporations for the human rights of those who are most vulnerable. While we have been accustomed to governments setting boundaries to prevent human rights abuse, many countries do not provide these safeguards. As noted earlier, corporations are now called to set principles to promote human rights within their own operations and within the societies in which they operate. Many corporations have developed policies that support the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the core conventions of the International Labor Organization (ILO). Corporations have addressed community engagement, safety and healthy working conditions, sustainable wages, and community engagement (especially with regard to indigenous community concerns). Some lay out criteria for selection of and withdrawal from a country of operation, as well as how their work in this area will be verifiable and transparent. These policies go beyond an individual work ethic to encompass the culture and ethic of corporate behavior.

Social Criteria Investment Screens

None currently apply to this paper.

Resolution Guidelines for ELCA

- We support asking a corporation for the development, adoption, review, or implementation of its policies related to human rights.
- We support review of a company’s operations in particular locations when our public policy position or partner churches and agencies express concerns about operations.
- We support requests asking a corporation to endorse the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.
- We support requests for reports on policy and the implementation of a corporation’s policy with respect to the United Nations norms on the responsibility of business with regard to human rights.
- We support requests for reports on policy and implementation of a corporation’s policy with respect to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- We support asking a corporation to endorse any of the following sets of principles: Bellagio Principles
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 32
- Wood-Sheppard Principles

---

8 [http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/economiclife/](http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/economiclife/)
9 [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/indigenous/declaration.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/indigenous/declaration.htm)
15 [http://www.gravesham.gov.uk/reep/principles.htm](http://www.gravesham.gov.uk/reep/principles.htm)
International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights\textsuperscript{11}
Beijing Declaration\textsuperscript{12}
International Labor Organization Conventions\textsuperscript{13}
\begin{itemize}
\item Convention 29, Forced Labour
\item Convention 87, Freedom of Association and the Right to Organize
\item Convention 98, The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively
\item Convention 100, Equal Remuneration
\item Convention 105, Abolition of Forced Labour
\item Convention 111, Discrimination [Employment and Occupation]
\item Convention 135, Worker representative shall not be subject to discrimination
\item Convention 138, Minimum Age for Admission to Employment
\item Convention 169, Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries\textsuperscript{14}
\item Convention 182, Prohibition and Immediate Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour
\end{itemize}

\begin{center}
\textit{Recommended by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility, January 6, 2004}
\textit{Endorsed by Division for Church in Society Board, February 27, 2004}
\textit{Approved by Church Council, April 16-18, 2004}
\textit{Updated by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility, January 11, 2008}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{11} \url{http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_cesrc.htm}
\textsuperscript{12} \url{http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/declar.htm}
\textsuperscript{13} \url{http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/convdisp1.htm}
\textsuperscript{14} \url{http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/62.htm}
Corporate Social Responsibility Issue Paper 7
For Peace in God’s World: Violence in Our World

Background

“We of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America share with the Church of Jesus Christ in all times and in all places the calling to be peacemakers” (“For Peace in God’s World” [ELCA, 1995], Introduction, pg. 1). To this end, the church is called to promote respect for human rights by teaching, speaking out, and supporting effective ways to monitor and comply with human rights codes. The ELCA, through its predecessor bodies, has a legacy of peacemaking and calls its members to dedicate themselves anew to pray and work for peace in God’s world. The ELCA has consistently supported the work of the United Nations in the area of human rights and in recognizing the inherent dignity of each person.

“Earthly peace means the relationships among and within nations that are just, harmonious, and free from war.”2 The social statement “For Peace in God’s World” calls church members to dedicate themselves to work for peace in God’s world. Because the culture of peace can underpin sustainable development, environmental protection, and the personal well-being of each person, the United Nations declared an International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World. Manifesto 2000, written by Nobel Peace Prize laureates, began the program, calling for active nonviolence, rejecting violence in all its forms—physical, sexual, psychological, economic, and social—in particular towards the most deprived and vulnerable, such as children and adolescents.3

Violence pervades all aspects of life in our world, and its presence is felt during times of war as well as during times when war is absent. On an international level, this paper addresses such issues as antipersonnel landmines and other weapons with nondiscriminative effects, as well as nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. At a domestic level, violence manifests itself in community violence, sexual exploitation, and workplace violence.

ELCA Social Policy

Historically the Lutheran church—the ELCA and its predecessor church bodies—have been committed to the support of human rights and the struggle against injustice. In terms of global issues of human rights, the ELCA social statement “For Peace in God’s World” (pg. 14) and statements of the predecessor church bodies—“Peace, Justice, and Human Rights” (ALC, 1972) and “Human Rights: Doing Justice in God’s World” (LCA, 1978)—support the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights,4 calling for respect and dignity for each person. This effort calls the church to be a disturbing, reconciling, and deliberating presence in word and deed in order to create an environment conducive to peace (see footnote 1, pg. 1). This statement on peace develops the global perspective for individuals and our church body to join with others in searching for what makes for peace (see footnote 1, pg.1).

In terms of domestic issues of violence, the ELCA Church Council has also adopted three messages that pertain to aspects of this issue. The 1994 message on “Community Violence”5 deals with such issues as proliferation of guns and the culture of violence. Depictions of violence in the media and mediation toward just and peaceful solutions to conflict are also addressed. The 1996 message on “Sexuality: Some Common Convictions”6 describes misuses of sexuality, including pornography and sexuality in media and advertising. And in the 2001

1 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/peace/
2 ibid.
3 http://www3.unesco.org/manifesto2000/
4 http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/lang/eng.htm
5 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/violence/
6 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/sexuality/
message on “Commercial Sexual Exploitation,” pornography and sex trafficking are examined, calling the church to look at corporations whose earnings come from making, selling, promoting, or profiting from the pornography industry. ELCA Churchwide Assembly actions have included other issues relating to violence.

Corporate Response
These issues address the variety of aspects of violence in all its forms: physical, sexual, psychological, economic, and social, both internationally and domestically. In order to counter the culture of violence that pervades the national culture and media in this country, all of society—including the corporate world—must find creative ways to work toward peace and nonviolence. Sometimes it is simple, such as a corporation having a policy not to display guns and ammunition in family friendly areas. Other times, especially when national security and weapons are involved, it is more complex. The call to corporations is to recognize their role in the problem and to work to become part of the solution.

Social Criteria Investment Screens
The social criteria investment screen on weapons, revised and approved by the Church Council in 2007, responds to this issue.
http://www.elca.org/advocacy/corporate/military.asp

Resolution Guidelines for ELCA
• We support requests to establish policies renouncing involvement in the production, sale, and use of antipersonnel landmines, cluster bombs, and other weapons with nondiscriminate effects.
• We support requests to establish policies renouncing involvement in the production, sale, and use of biological and chemical weapons.
• We support requests for reports describing involvement in the production of nuclear weapons.
• We support requests to establish policies to make arms sales open to public scrutiny and reduce the arms trade.
• We support requests for formal written workplace antiviolence policies.
• We support requests for reports on policies and procedures aimed at stemming gun violence.
• We support requests to report involvement in the pornography industry and policies to reduce involvement.
• We support requests to disclose policies aimed at stemming the production and sale of violent video media, including video games.
• We support policies aimed to eliminate slavery.
• We support policies aimed to halt commercial sexual exploitation.
• We support reports on policies to address the negative effects of gambling and programs to assist individuals who have a gambling addiction.

Recommended by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility, January 22, 2004
Endorsed by Division for Church in Society Board, February 27, 2004
Approved by Church Council, April 16-18, 2004
Updated by Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility, January 11, 2008

7 http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/sexualexploitation/
ELCA Mission Personnel Completed Service Report

Rostered and long-term mission personnel appointed by the Global Mission unit who have resigned from service: January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007. The recommended action is printed in the Church Council agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Bangsund</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>January 1, 1985</td>
<td>April 14, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Bangsund</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>May 1, 1997</td>
<td>April 14, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Bekedam</td>
<td>Mahlon</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>June 23, 1986</td>
<td>October 19, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>Cristel</td>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>March 1, 2002</td>
<td>August 31, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Fonner</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>July 7, 2002</td>
<td>November 20, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Gabe</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>June 16, 2000</td>
<td>July 31, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>July 9, 1999</td>
<td>November 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>July 9, 1999</td>
<td>November 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Gretebeck</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>February 1, 1990</td>
<td>September 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Gretebeck</td>
<td>Junko</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>February 1, 1990</td>
<td>September 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>McCallum</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>July 1, 2005</td>
<td>July 6, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>McCallum</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>July 1, 2005</td>
<td>July 6, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>July 5, 2000</td>
<td>September 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Nahoko</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>July 5, 2000</td>
<td>September 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>July 7, 2002</td>
<td>December 6, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>July 7, 2002</td>
<td>December 6, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Siler</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>June 25, 2003</td>
<td>October 31, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>February 11, 2000</td>
<td>February 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>February 11, 2000</td>
<td>February 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Weed-Fonner</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>July 7, 2002</td>
<td>November 20, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mission Associate</td>
<td>Huwiler</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>August 21, 2005</td>
<td>July 31, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on Multicultural Ministries
Spring 2008

Introduction

The following report on the progress of Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) multicultural ministries focuses on the implementation of the Multicultural Ministries unit strategic plan goals. Those goals are:

1. The Multicultural Ministries unit work will be centered on increasing the number of ethnic-specific and multicultural congregations and deepening the discipleship of congregational members.
2. The Multicultural Ministries unit will focus its resources on increasing and strengthening cohesiveness within and among ethnic-specific communities.
3. The Multicultural Ministries unit will equip congregations, synods, seminaries, and the churchwide expression to become an anti-racist, multicultural church.
4. The Multicultural Ministries unit will work to increase the number of rostered and lay leaders from the ELCA’s ethnic-specific communities in congregations, synods, seminaries, and the churchwide expression.

The ELCA constitution states that “the Multicultural Ministries unit shall guide the churchwide organization in the multicultural dimensions of its work. To fulfill these responsibilities Multicultural Ministries shall present annually to the Church Council and biennially to the Churchwide Assembly a program plan, including ongoing evaluation of the churchwide organization’s work in the area of Multicultural Ministries.” This report is a continuation of the report on the Multicultural Ministries strategy presented at the 2007 Churchwide Assembly. This report will outline the progress that has been made in representation of people of color or people whose primary language is other than English in synod assemblies, boards, and committees. This report will also give an overview of the programs and projects being carried out by Multicultural Ministries and other churchwide units that foster programs with synods, regions, and other agencies and institutions as they identify, develop, and strengthen the multicultural dimensions of their work.

Representation within synods

The Multicultural Ministries unit will work to increase the number of rostered and lay leaders in congregations, synods, seminaries, and the churchwide expression from the ELCA’s ethnic-specific communities.

At the October 2007 Conference of Bishops meeting Multicultural Ministries and the Research and Evaluation unit distributed a short survey asking about the processes synods were using to make the voting membership of the synod assemblies and the membership of the Synod Council and synod committees 10 percent or more people of color or those whose primary language is other than English. There was a good response to the survey.

What follows is a summary of the processes reported by synods. In response to the survey, the individuals listed were contacted and asked to describe their synod’s process. Some interesting strategies were discovered. Our hope is that:

1. This discussion will result in continuing discussion in the Conference of Bishops and in Synod Councils;
2. These ideas will be discussed and used by synods to improve what they currently are doing to become more inclusive; and
3. This information will be updated so that other synods can learn from the updated report as we learn about more synods and as new strategies are tried.

**Strategies including Synod Assembly goals**

*Southwest California Synod:* The baptized membership is currently 19 percent people of color or those whose primary language is other than English. The synod does not have a formal process; “it just happens.” Other goals (e.g., clergy/lay, women/men) also happen without a plan. Voting members from congregations can be from a racial or ethnic group that is different from the congregation’s majority group. At the synod assembly the credentials committee does report the percentage of the voting members that are people of color and those whose primary language is other than English.

For other positions, the nominating committee pays attention and tries to meet or surpass the goals for secretary, vice president, council members, endowment fund, and discipline committee. The membership of other boards and committees is more difficult because their members are named by conferences. Revisions of the current processes used for boards and committees are in process so representational principles can be achieved.

*Alaska Synod:* Alaska Native peoples and congregations make up to 25 to 30 percent of this synod’s membership.

*New Jersey Synod:* Because of the inherent diversity of the synod (7.3 percent of members are people of color and language), the synod has not paid strict attention to representation because it has at least 10 percent in the synod assembly. However, the synod will research what the percent actually was in 2007. The nominating process described in the synod continuing resolutions guarantees 10 percent people of color in elected leadership. This involves rotating inclusivity categories within the 16 clusters every two years. A synod staff member watches recruitment of volunteers for committees ensure multicultural representation.

*Indiana-Kentucky Synod:* The Indiana-Kentucky Synod is like many others in that the number of people who qualify as lay people of color is very limited, comprising less than two percent of the synod’s membership. The synod has had some dedicated lay people of color serve both on Synod Council and other committees and as voting members at the Churchwide Assembly. It is a constant struggle to identify them, recruit them (since many are already serving the church in multiple capacities), and get them to serve once elected.

An example: Three years ago the synod was facing this challenge once again of getting people of color who are clergy to run for the voting member positions for the Churchwide Assembly. First, some history: the synod previously tried to get two people who are lay people of color to serve as voting members even though it has had to use one at times. Since the formation of the ELCA, the synod’s practice had been to assign one conference on a rotating basis to come up with two candidates for the ballot at the Synod Assembly, primarily using conferences that had large metropolitan areas. The synod also considered positions designated for youth or young adult (ages 16 to 25), which it had not done previously. In addition, the officers had been assigned designated seats. After two years of work, the synod developed a new grid for electing voting members: one voting member from each conference (rotating clergy, lay female, and lay male), the four officers, two lay people of color, and two youth or young adult. The grid opened for the first time the lay people of color and youth or young adult positions to be at-large positions. The synod received sufficient responses for the ballot from excellent candidates in both categories. Each category had one lay male and one lay female. Most of the candidates and those elected had never served at the synod level in any capacity and they were excited to serve, did their homework ahead of time, came with thoughtful questions on procedures and issues, were always in their seats for plenary sessions, were thrilled to meet
church leaders, and were very interested in every phase of the assembly. Another plus is that they were all relatively young—three of the four were in their 20s!

The synod also is stressing that any seat on the council or at Churchwide Assembly can be held by a lay person of color, since they are no longer limited to designated seats. In the meantime, some of those who served as CWA voting members are now at work in other positions.

Southwestern Washington Synod: The process that the Southwestern Washington Synod uses for securing people of color or those whose primary languages are other than English is in the category of "suggestion" and "request." For voting members at the synod assembly, congregations are to consider a lay person of color; they can have an extra lay person of color, but that is not mandatory. Boards and committees are reminded to consider having a lay person of color on their board or committee. For elected positions, the nominating committee and congregations are reminded to consider lay people of color. There are no positions that are reserved for only a lay person of color.

Strategies for Synod Council and other committees

Southeastern Iowa Synod: This synod’s Synod Council created a multicultural ministry team and an anti-racism ministry team. These two teams provide support and learning opportunities for all parts of the synod. The Synod Council has two lay at-large positions, one for a female person of color and the other for a male person of color. There also are two rostered at-large positions for a clergy person of color and a female clergy person of color. Anti-racism training is a must for Synod Council, ministry chairs, and synod staff. Deans are encouraged to participate. Ministry teams recruit people of color onto their teams with assistance from synod staff members. Anti-racism training also is available free to congregations.

Florida-Bahamas Synod: This synod’s constitution includes the following provision: “To ensure inclusive representation of lay and ordained clergy members, male and female, Native Americans and people of color and/or people whose language is other than English, there shall be a number of members-at-large as determined by the Synod Council. The people so elected by the synod assembly shall be elected for a term of one year and shall be eligible for reelection.”

Arkansas-Oklahoma Synod: This synod has 15 people on the Synod Council, including officers, and seeks to ensure that at least one member is a lay person of color. The Synod Council currently includes two lay people of color. The nominating committee is informed about the constitutional requirement. If the synods, however, fails to elect at least one lay person of color, the bishop may appoint, with the concurrence of the Synod Council, an additional member who is a lay person of color.

Southeastern Synod: This synod has a Synod Council with one member elected by each of 14 conferences and six members at large, one of whom is a youth member. The remaining five members allow the synod to include people who are needed to meet the inclusivity goals. Regarding committee appointments, many of these are made by the assistants to the bishop who seek to make committees inclusive.

New England Synod: The synod as “slots” or quotas for Synod Council and other elections. The synod also has an active anti-racism program called “Healing the Wounds of Racism” that is building a multicultural community. The community meets regularly and is recruiting new synod and congregational leaders who are people of color or those whose primary language is other than English.

Sierra Pacific Synod: The synod practices a networking style. The nominating committee contacts the clergy of color or whose primary language is other than English to inform them of the various opportunities for service. The committee sometimes receives recommendations they
can accept, but sometimes nothing comes through. In the past, the process was more formal because of the Pastors of Color Informed Network, but it is inactive, so these individual calls are made. The synod also sends out announcements regarding various openings on particular committees.

Southwestern Texas Synod: Although the synod does have a specific plan, the division of the synod into conferences (including Rio Grande Valley) often helps the synod to meet the inclusivity intent without much effort. The synod’s Hispanic strategy clearly articulates that Latino voices are present on committees, task forces and other groups.

Northeastern Iowa Synod has a position on the Synod Council and boards titled “multicultural perspective.”

General Learnings

- Nominating committees play a major role.
- Every Synod Assembly’s credentials report should include a report of how well the voting membership meets the 10 percent goal.
- Multicultural committees and anti-racism training assist synods to understand why the 10 percent goal is important and to support the synod as it works to achieve the goals.
- At-large positions are used when other processes cannot provide for 10 percent people of color.
- Synod leadership positions that rotate through conferences provide a way to evenly distribute the opportunity to have leaders of color and language from each conference.
- The Congregational Leader Forms completed by congregations include the name, address, leadership responsibilities, race or ethnicity, and gender for every reported congregational leader. This information could be used to generate lists for each synod of their congregational leaders of color. Nominating committees would then have the names of congregational members who already are functioning as congregational leaders.

Leadership

*The Multicultural Ministries unit will work to increase the number of rostered and lay leaders in congregations, synods, seminaries, and the churchwide expression from the ELCA’s ethnic-specific communities.*

Regional Ethnic Association Meetings

Ethnic associations are key partners for the Multicultural Ministries unit. Regional meetings with members of the associations have been fruitful. Agenda for the meetings has included information on the “new” structure, the role of the Multicultural Ministries unit and associations in the “new” structure, and discussion about how members help to shape the association’s agenda as well as their influence on this church. The ethnic associations include: African American Lutheran Association, Asociacion Luterana de Ministerios Hispans, Association of Lutherans of Arab and Middle Eastern Heritage, Association of Asians and Pacific Islanders, American Indian and Alaska Native Association, and the European American Lutheran Association, the newest association. For example, when the Asociacion Luterana de Ministerios Hispanos held their last regional meeting in Atlanta, Ga., November 16-17, 2007, there were about 40 participants. The group was diverse and reflected the slogan of being a community of communities. Some of the participants were mission directors, pastors, lay people, and Latino/as from many different ethnic backgrounds. One of the main issues discussed was immigration and the ELCA’s response.
ELCA Leaders of Color Gathering and Database

The ELCA Leaders of Color Gathering (LOC) was a pre-event to the “Spirit of Wholeness in Christ” racial ethnic multicultural event. LOC was held July 11-12, 2007, in Los Angeles, California, and was sponsored by the Multicultural Ministries unit in partnership with a diverse group of leaders of color from the ELCA churchwide staff, regional staff, and congregations. The gathering brought together over 100 LOC participants. The participants included select churchwide program staff, deployed churchwide staff, shared staff, synod staff, Synod Council members, regional staff, regional governance boards, ELCA Church Council, seminary faculty, ELCA program committee members, multicultural advisory committee and Lutheran Youth Organization (LYO) board members, and synod LYO leaders. Bringing together leaders of color from all expressions of the ELCA, this was the first event of its kind. The gathering included opportunities for worship, Bible study, an address by Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson, acquiring new leadership skills, and strengthening old relationships while building new ones. There was an opportunity to discuss the future role of leaders of color while affirming their current roles and gaining a deeper understanding of their baptismal vocation as leaders in the ELCA.

The LOC event was a gathering that will bear fruit for the whole church, since a database from this gathering is being created to help the ELCA in its ministry. Multicultural Ministries continuously receives requests from synods and churchwide units for recommendations, nominations, and references for African American, Black, Arab and Middle Eastern, Asian and Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Latino men and women to fill committee, board, staff positions, and contracted assignments in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. As a result of these requests, Multicultural Ministries is creating and will maintain a multicultural leader’s information database.

At The Sound of Our Name: Gatherings for Women of Color in Ministry

The most recent event for women of color in ministry was held in 2000, when 30 clergywomen of color gathered in San Antonio, Texas. In December 2007, women nominated by the Multicultural Ministries ethnic directors were convened by Multicultural Ministries and the director for women in ministry (Vocation and Education) to consider the next generation of events to “build community in Christ, give testimony, and plan for the strengthening women of color in ministry and the whole mission of the ELCA.”

The planning group identified key strategies, building on the story of Mary Magdalene who “arose at the sound of her name” to be an apostle to the apostles and witness to the resurrection. The first element is continuity: the women developed a plan for three consecutive annual events that would encompass lead themes of testimony, advocacy, and legacy.

The second element is building a critical mass of key leaders by expanding the definition of women in ministry beyond clergy women. Women of color are serving in many spheres of influence across this church. The national gatherings would facilitate affinity and kinship groups to support growth in mission, aligned with the strategic directions of the ELCA, and expressed effectively at more local levels of ownership. A Thrivent block grant proposal has been approved to launch the first of these events, anticipated in October 2008. Additional granting sources need to be identified to sustain the project through 2010.

American Indian and Alaska Native Leadership

Leadership development is the number one concern of the American Indian and Alaska Native community. It is a challenge to recruit, mentor, and support leaders in vocations that will serve the whole church.
In November 2007 the director for American Indian and Alaska Native ministries provided a “becoming a leader” training event for American Indian and Alaska Native young people (ages 16-22). The emphasis of the event was to build self esteem, explore leadership gifts, and build skills that can be used in their home communities, congregations, and career planning. The event was designed for participants to look into their deepest selves and explore how to be a team player and leader. Planning recognized that everyone is the product of both home and community environments and asked both how our leadership would impact our community back home and how the training would lead us to answer the call that God has given to each of us. “We know that all things work together for good for those who love God, we are called according to his purpose.” Romans 8:28 NRSV

The director for American Indian and Alaska Native ministries offered counsel and support to the Alaska Synod as they wrote a successful proposal to identify, raise up, empower, and train leaders in each of the six Inupiat villages on the Seward Peninsula.

Two American Indian and Alaska Native TEEM candidates currently are enrolled in the program at Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary. Two additional people are in the discernment process and are considering an October 2008 enrollment.

Asian Leadership

The Asian strategy reads, “To have sufficient number of lay and ordained, male, female, and youth ministry leaders for the ministry in the Asian community” (Asian Strategy, p. 14). Nine more Asian pastors were added to the ELCA roster in 2007. They are:

1. Pr. Suk Y. Lee, Concord, Calif. (Korean woman)
2. Pr. Lin Qui, Honolulu, Hawai’i (Chinese)
3. Pr. Philip Mathai, Lanark, Ill. (Indian)
4. Pr. Reginald Mortha, Chicago, Ill. (Indian)
5. Pr. Soriya Roeun, Dakota City, Neb. (Cambodian), the first ELCA Lutheran Cambodian
6. Pr. Kiho Song, Houston, Tex. (Korean)
7. Pr. Vanson Tranh, Fountain Valley, Calif. (Vietnamese)
8. Pr. Petsamone Vannavong, Milwaukee, Wis. (Laotian)
9. Pr. Robert Waworuntu, Newington, NH (Indonesian)

Arab and Middle Eastern Leadership

Part of the Arab and Middle Eastern ministry strategy is to train at least five new Arab language clergy. The consultant for Arab and Middle Eastern ministries arranged a meeting on December 20, 2007, for a new candidate, Nizar Abu Awad, with Pr. Sherman Hicks, executive director of Multicultural Ministries, Pr. Ruben Duran, director for development of new congregations (EOCM), Pr. Mary Francis, assistant director for development of new congregations (EOCM), and Pr. David Daubert, director for renewal of congregations (EOCM), for a possible recruitment to serve among Arab and Middle Eastern communities in the United States. The MM and EOCM staff along with the Arab and Middle Eastern personnel will be looking for an appropriate synod placement for Awad.

African Descent Leadership

One of the Multicultural Ministries unit goals is to “increase the number of rostered and lay leaders [within the ELCA].” An objective in achieving this goal is “to reach out to people of color … in congregations to identify people who may have a call to rostered service, and get them placed in the candidacy process.” A recent event gathered 43 young adults (ages 19–35). Eighteen of the participants, all African Descent young adults, indicated a desire to contact their
pastor or synod office in order to investigate options regarding ELCA rostered ministries. A follow up in regions 7 – 9 with 25 in attendance was held in June 2007, continuing the conversation around baptismal gifts for serving the church and society (in general) and rostered service (in particular).

**Resources**

*The Multicultural Ministries unit will equip congregations, synods, seminaries and the churchwide expression to become an anti-racist, multicultural church.*

**Justice, Civil Rights, and the Media**

Progress continues on “Standing Together,” the media project formerly named “Indian Country in America.” A script writer has been hired, ELCA Archives has been scoured, and stories are being retold. The documentary is designed to be an historical teaching document related to civil rights and racial justice issues for American Indian and Alaska Native people. It will capture the work of the former National Indian Lutheran board and relate the impact of that work on the ELCA’s current and future work. The project is the direct result of the Indigenous Institute, which impacted the lives and work of 22 ELCA leaders in various roles in the church. “Standing Together” will be aired on the ABC television network October 12, 2008. Ava Martin, ELCA Communications Services, is negotiating with other broadcasting networks to expand the visibility of this documentary.

**Asian resource production**

“To have sufficient resources in Asian languages that will help nurture Christian believers. The goal is to have at least one Asian ministry resource produced in different languages every year.” (Asian Strategy, p. 15)

In January 2008 a resource called “Cheerful Giving: Asian Lutheran Stewardship” was printed in two more Asian languages, Indonesian and Laotian. Thus far, this resource is available in eight languages: Chinese, English, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Thai, and Vietnamese. The Cambodian and Hmong language version of the resource will be finished by summer 2008.

**Congregational development and redevelopment**

*The Multicultural Ministries unit work will be centered on increasing the number of ethnic-specific and multicultural congregations, and deepening the discipleship of congregational members.*

**African National Ministries**

African National Ministries is enhancing its mission based on the six strategic entry points devised and adapted by the advisory team of the ministry. These entry points into the mission field are: starting new churches, expanding fast-growth mission congregations, raising missional leaders, starting and strengthening stewardship programs, ministry resource development and distribution, and global connections.

The African National Ministries’ mission has grown by 21 new sites in the last few quarters. These sites are on different levels of mission development ranging from full-fledged congregations under development with a full-time mission developer (CUDs) to synodically authorized worshipping communities (SAWCs), and from worshipping fellowships to newly emerging house churches and new mission probing sites. These 21 new sites are serving communities from Sudan, Ethiopia, Liberia, Burundi, Eritrea, as well as French-speaking
communities from Togo, Benin, Angola, and Botswana. In addition to starting new ministries, the unit also is engaged in programmatic expansion of some fast-growth mission congregations, including starting services in English both for second-generation immigrants and neighboring communities as an outreach ministry effort. Through the initiative of moving from chaplaincy ministry mode to missionary mode, most of the mission sites strive to expand their ministries to the wider community surrounding their ministry sites. Intentional mission designs for ministry expansions are developed based on the mission reviews African National Ministries conduct across the country to redirect, adjust, and maximize the missional capacity of the ELCA’s mission outposts. Currently almost 20 new sites are identified as possible mission sites for the next two quarters. We are engaging mission directors and synods for action.

There currently are about 90 mission sites around the country. Most of these ministry sites are led by lay leaders, since there are less than 15 ordained African National leaders in the ELCA. A number of these lay leaders are being encouraged to enter seminaries, TEEM processes, and lay leadership training programs. In the last quarter African National Ministries have about 10 students who entered Luther, Philadelphia, and Gettysburg seminaries for theological studies. Most of the African National TEEM candidates are in the process through Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary. The stewardship and resource development teams are supplying stewardship, Christian education, worship, and outreach resources to congregations that worship in Oromo, Kiswahili, Arabic, and French languages. The greatest success has been the purchase of Kiswahili resources from Tanzania, Sudanese Nuer resources from Kenya, and 500 Oromo Bibles printed in Korea and purchased with the help of German Hermannsburg Lutheran Mission in Germany.

Through the global connections ministry strategy, most of the mission congregations are connected with their countries of origin, refugee camps, and churches of origin. This part of the work is connected to the Global Mission and Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations units and the relationships are going very well. Pr. Gemechis Buba went to Ethiopia for ten days in January 2008 as a result of the African National Ministries strategic effort in global connection. It was deeply enriching experience and he hopes to make more trips for experience, exchange, and resource development. Mission trips also are planned for mission directors, mission pastors, and the wider church to gain learning from and share insights with the fastest growing Lutheran churches in Africa, especially in Ethiopia and Tanzania.

The outreach work described below advances the work of the EOCM unit through the preparation and engagement of leaders, the formation of evangelizing congregations, and by the development of disciples for Jesus Christ.

**African American/Black Outreach and Leadership**

It is a pleasure to describe some of the activities undertaken in support of congregations and their missions. The book of Nehemiah particularly informs the activities described below and is guided by the EOCM purpose statement. This work is both for the good of all through raising leaders and for building a safe place to gather. It seeks resources from those who can help significantly.

**Partnering with a congregation and others to develop congregational leadership**

African National Ministries partnered with a congregation, its conference, the synod, and a community group to redevelop a fledgling congregation through the development of congregational leadership. The African Descent congregation, Our Savior in Dorchester (Boston), had experienced a steady decline in attendance and participation in worship and church activities while it had an interim pastor. In partnership with the entities identified above, the leadership and
African American/Black outreach offices along with the Multicultural Ministry unit developed a plan for redevelopment of Our Savior. In the process of working with the congregation, a leader was identified, and with mentoring and coaching, she will enter the TEEM program and has entered the process for assessment as a mission developer. The congregation has given its approval and support for this course of action and the conference and synod bishop have identified financial support for the redevelopment of Our Savior. The leadership office will be in continuous conversation with the congregation before it enters a formal redevelopment program. The interaction with Our Savior Lutheran Church has enlarged the vision of the leadership team’s role in EOCM and the wider church.

Other partnerships
Through a partnership between Region 3, Luther Seminary, and the Vocation and Education and EOCM units of the churchwide organization, a pilot project has been developed with the goal of helping African Descent students at Luther Seminary explore and experience vocational options in the church in relation to mission development or redevelopment. Through this project, students will be identified using EOCM’s normal assessment process for mission development or redevelopment, including the behavioral interview selection process.

During December 2007 and January 2008, behavioral interviews identified and recommended six candidates for missional work. Their names and recommendations were passed on to synod bishops, seminaries, and regional coordinators during the churchwide assignment consultation in February 2008. The EOCM leadership office coordinated the interview sessions at Luther and present the names to the assignment table. These activities support EOCM’s purpose relative to engaging leaders for the formation of evangelizing congregations.

Missional work plan for Region 9
Based on a rapidly growing African Descent population, the southeastern tier of the United States offers new opportunities and challenges as a mission field. Over the last 20 years, another great migration has been underway in the United States. This migration involves Region 9 of this church.

African Americans, African Nationals, African Caribbean (West Indians), and South Americans of African Descent—approximately 605,000 people annually—migrate into states comprising the southeastern tier of the United States. Although 300,000 people of African Descent leave the area annually, there is an increase of 305,000 each year. Despite rapid growth and an overall African Descent average of 20-30 percent within the states that make up Region 9, they make up less than two percent of the ELCA membership in this region.

In order to address the outstanding opportunities and challenges of this new mission field, a work plan is under development. Initially involving consultations with stakeholders in the region, including synods, conferences, local clusters, mission directors, and local leaders, and the African American/Black outreach strategy team, the elements of the plan include congregational and leadership training for evangelizing and outreach, Lutheran identity modules, prayer, and training for congregational redevelopment. After initial commitments, missional work will begin by spring 2009.

African Descent outreach strategies in Region 8
The unit, including members of the African Descent strategy team, has provided support to the Delaware-Maryland and Metropolitan Washington, D.C., synods for planning, developing, and articulating a strategy for outreach and evangelizing the African American, African National, and West Indian (African Caribbean) communities in the synod. Both synodical bishops were
present for sessions last fall that included how-to “workshops” and problem-solving sessions. The Delaware-Maryland African Descent outreach strategy plan will be brought to its 2009 Synod Assembly.

_African Descent congregational development_

One of the Multicultural Ministries unit’s goals is to “...[deepen] the discipleship of congregational members.” An outcome of this goal is that more people will be involved in evangelizing, advocacy, and service. Four regional consultations were held across the ELCA with members of the African American Lutheran Association (AALA). Major themes identified by participants were that the African Descent desk of the MM unit needs to initiate programs that will enable African Descent congregants to convene around issues related to best practices for evangelism and outreach and addressing issues related to social justice in church and society.

_Small Town and Rural (STaR) Ministry_

The small town and rural ministry staff of EOCM hosted a ‘Future of Small Town and Rural Ministry” meeting in Chicago that included approximately 40 people including mission directors, bishops, synod staff, churchwide staff, and rural and small town grassroots people.

The group identified the top issues facing the ELCA from a rural and small town context. Eight central issues regarding rural and small town ministry surfaced. From that, four taskforces were formed and they will provide recommendations for action within six months on these topics: immigrant experience and multicultural ministries; ministry in context: tension between stability and change; shared ministry best practices; and leadership development.

According to Sandra LaBlanc, director, “It’s been eight and one-half years since I’ve been in this call, and I’ve seen a great many changes happen in rural and small town ministry during that time. The changes have been positive, especially in terms of mindset from a theology of scarcity to more of a theology of abundance. It was this observation along with a grant from EOCM to provide funding for grassroots people to attend that spearheaded this meeting.

With the exception of Region 2, all ELCA regions were represented. Each of the grassroots participants are actively connected with their synods as well as various ELCA rural ministry networks.

In the following month, a meeting was held at the ELCA churchwide offices with Sandra LaBlanc; Pr. Stephen Bouman, executive director of EOCM; Evelyn Soto, associate executive director for EOCM; Myrna Sheie, Office of the Presiding Bishop; Pr. Sherman Hicks, executive director of Multicultural Ministries, and Pr. Stan Olson, executive director of Vocation and Education. This is the first time that these units and the Office of the Bishop have met to talk about ways we can communicate, collaborate, and cooperate on issues affecting rural and small town ministry. Several concrete steps and a strong willingness to work together came from this meeting.

One concrete outcome of this meeting is that Sandra LaBlanc is working directly with Pr. Everett Flanigan, director for African American/Black outreach and leadership and Pr. Gemechis Buba, director for African National ministries in EOCM on a strategy for the southeastern region of the United States. [Note previous information about the strategy on page X]. The team will consist of representatives from Vocation and Education, Multicultural Ministries, and Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission along with the synods, mission directors, and congregations. Other possible partners might be Lutheran Men in Mission and Mission Partners. The taskforce on immigration and multicultural ministries is working with the staff of MM to surface further names to work on the taskforce with them.
Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission and Multicultural Ministries staff make up the HOPE team (Hispanic Outreach Program Executives). The five team members are committed to collaborate, facilitate, celebrate, and work “en conjunto” with the Latino Evangelical Ministries of the ELCA. The Latino evangelical outreach goals are the foundation for the HOPE team’s work with ELCA synods. Those goals include:

- Support the mission statement of ELCA and EOCC.
- Work in collaboration with other Latino leaders of ELCA to interpret what we mean by Latino evangelical outreach.
- Strengthen partnerships with the ELCA units, regional staff, synod staffs, Latino congregational leadership, Latino ecumenical partners agencies, and institutions of the ELCA.
- Develop Latino evangelism prayer networks.
- Study new data about Latino outreach in the ELCA and explore other ecumenical statistics about Latino outreach.
- Model a Latino ministry outreach of “en conjunto” (accompaniment) theology.
- Promote Latino spirituality and ethnic-specific worship experiences from Latino, Mestizo, Hispanic, Mullato, and indigenous perspectives.
- Share with others the joy of the good news of Jesus from a Latino cultural perspective.

**Church planting**

*The Multicultural Ministries unit work will be centered on increasing the number of ethnic-specific and multicultural congregations, and deepening the discipleship of congregational members.*

During 2007 there were a total of 56 new starts, 42 congregations under development, and 14 SAWC’s (Synodically Authorized Worshipping Communities). Six congregations under development organized. This brings the total of congregations under various stages of development to 221.

EOCM has organized teams of people to work with mission directors and synods to encourage local planning and visioning for ministry in a variety of contexts such as African American, African National, Asian and Pacific Islander, Arab and Middle Eastern, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Latino as well as urban and emerging new starts teams.

There are currently 275 new congregations under development across the country. Additional new sites will be approved in March for entry in 2008. EOCM works with local and synod leadership to plan for, initiate, and nurture those new Word and Sacrament ministries. The greatest need is for additional leaders to become mission developers and redevelopers.

There is great energy in synods for increasing initiatives among ethnic communities, urban areas, and emerging young adults. Church planting teams have been developed in all these communities.
American Indian and Alaska Native new starts

The Saint Paul Area Synod has been working with the American Indian community to develop a worshipping space to address the needs of the East Metro area of St. Paul, Minn. Staff members of Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission (EOCM) and Multicultural Ministries (MM) are working on criteria for the development of new starts in the Indian community.

Asian church planting team

“To increase Asian congregations, ministries, and synodical authorized worshiping communities from 75 in 2001 to 115 by 2010, an increase of 40 in eight years. (Asian Strategy, p. 12)

To achieve this goal, the director for Asian and Pacific Islander Ministries has been working closely with the Asian church planting team and EOCM. This group has prepared the ground work for the new ministries in 2008 that will include:

- Chinese, Woodbury, Minn.
- Thai, Whittier, Calif.
- Pan Asian, Cupertino, Calif.
- Korean, Marietta, Ga.
- English ministry at Kalem Lutheran Church, Roslyn, N.Y.
- Chinese, Irvine, Calif.
- Tamil, Houston, Texas
- English ministry at Indian for Christ, Rockville, Md.

Issues of Multiculturalism

The Multicultural Ministries unit will focus its resources on increasing and strengthening cohesiveness within and among ethnic-specific communities.
Candidacy

The director for multicultural leadership development in Vocation and Education (VE) is working with the director of candidacy and the regional ministry leadership coordinators to advocate for people of color to be appointed to the synod candidacy committees.

In 2008 VE will be identifying people from the ethnic-specific communities to be trained in the candidacy process and recommended to the ELCA synod bishops for the committees. These people also may be invited to sit in on candidacy committees that do not have a person of color, especially when the candidate is a person of color or one whose primary language is other than English.

VE has been working with a team of clinical psychologists to develop cross-cultural training that will help candidacy committee members be more sensitive to cultural differences, especially as candidates who are people of color or whose primary language is other than English come before the committee for entrance. VE also is reviewing with the psychologists the assessment tools that are used in the psychological process to make sure that they are culturally appropriate. In 2008 VE will develop a database that will list all the psychologists of color or whose primary language is other than English who are available to do the testing.

VE is working on strengthening the multicultural center at Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago and improving the TEEM program so that it continues to serve the people of communities of color well. VE has begun conversations with Latino scholars to develop a clusterwide TEEM program with classes in Spanish. These courses also will be offered to lay mission leaders planting mission in the Frontera.

Internalized Racial Oppression (IRO)

Confronting the scandalous realities of racial, ethnic, and cultural barriers that often manifest themselves in exclusion is being addressed by internalized racial oppression (IRO) and White privilege in partnership with the coordinator for anti-racism education and training, Office of the Presiding Bishop, and the director for racial justice ministries, Multicultural Ministries.

The first “Overcoming Internalized Racial Oppression: Restoring Healthy Leadership” ethnic-specific consultation was held May 24-26, 2007, in Los Angeles, Calif. The second IRO ethnic-specific consultation was held January 17-19, 2008, in Atlanta, Ga.

The consultations are designed to accomplish two things. First, provide the participants with an interactive learning process that lends itself to critical thinking as they address the subject matter as individual ethnic-specific communities and together as a multi-ethnic community. Second, to gather information from the African Descent, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Latino and Latina communities for development of an ethnic-specific supplemental resource booklet for each community to accommodate and support the existing “Breaking the Bonds” resource for workshops on internalized racial oppression. During the second consultation Pr. Michael Russell served as the large group plenary facilitator.

Throughout the consultation there was time spent in community to identify places of commonality and differences. A final consultation will be held in late 2008 after the resource is complete.

There are plans during 2008 to offer two introductory internalized racial oppression workshops. The workshops are scheduled tentatively for late spring and late fall.

Anti-racism, racial justice, and White privilege education and training

ELCA churchwide anti-racism and racial justice orientation were held June 11, September 17, and November 19, 2007.
The 2008 two-day anti-racism training for all churchwide staff is scheduled February 11-12, April 29-30, September 23-24, and November 11-13, 2008. All staff is expected to register for one of the available set of dates during 2008.

Cultural proficiency education and training is being conducted with EOCM staff. New training dates for 2008 will be established.

ELCA employees were offered an educational opportunity to view and discuss “Traces of the Trade” on January 30, 2008. “Traces of the Trade” is the story of the DeWolf family’s journey to Bristol Road Island to trace their history as one of the largest slave owners in the United States.

Jointly planned and facilitated anti-racism and diversity training with TEEM students and mentors at the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary in Berkeley, Calif. was held October 2-4, 2007.

The synod anti-racism team survey was launched on January 23, 2008, through the ongoing partnership with the director for racial justice ministries and the coordinator for anti-racism education and training and Maggie Potapchuk, MP Associates. The survey will gather information that will help in planning for re-energizing the work of synods and synod teams where they exist.

ELCA Multicultural Ministries Ecumenical Partnerships
- Ecumenical justice partners meeting at the Lutheran Center, September 20-22, 2007.
- Churches Uniting in Christ (CUIC) racial justice taskforce met in Baltimore, Md. October 4-6, 2007, at the Maritime Conference Center.
- CUIC regular taskforce meeting met in Cleveland, Ohio October 18-20, 2007
- January 11-14, 2008, CUIC plenary held in St. Louis, Mo. The plenary brought together representatives from eleven CUIC-related communions for worship, work, and witness. Those in attendance were heads of communions, coordinating council members, the three CUIC taskforces, and other representatives named by the communions. Together the group confirmed its commitment to the nine marks to combat racism.
- Other networking and learning opportunities coming up are the ecumenical advocacy days and the ecumenical justice partners meeting being held in Washington, D.C. in March 2008

The ecumenical justice partners will be discussing a number of things at its next meeting, including follow-up on the creation of an anti-bias resources for children. The group is working on a joint Website site to be launched in the future.

Consultation with multi-ethnic (multi-racial) youth

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in 1988 challenged itself to become a multicultural church through which people of diverse ages and cultures serve the mission of God and where people respect each other and recognize the gifts that everyone brings. God has blessed this church with a group of leaders in its multi-ethnic youth and young adults. These second- and third-generation members are increasing rapidly in number. Data collected by the Research and Evaluation unit shows 12,261 multi-ethnic members in the ELCA, making them the fourth largest multicultural community. These young leaders are multi-ethnic and, through the experiences of family, church and society, have developed experiences, knowledge, and skills about how to live and work cross-culturally. This knowledge and experience can help the ELCA identify new and exciting information about how the ELCA can equip its future leaders with valuable cross-cultural skills.

Members from the multi-ethnic community will be invited to participate in a multi-ethnic leadership consultation. This will be the first time that multi-ethnic (multi-racial) leaders will participate in identifying their needs. The two-day consultation of 20-30 multi-ethnic high school
and college-age youth and young adults will identify the needs and concerns of the community as it responds to the leadership components of the various ethnic strategies and the evangelism strategy of the church. One need is to increase and strengthen cohesiveness within and among the communities of color, which must include honoring and affirming the multi-ethnic members. Special attention will be given to church vocations and congregational leadership. This project will begin a paradigm shift by creating new relationships, establishing strong networks, forming new alliances, and increasing the visible presence of multi-ethnic leaders as they move into full participation and integration within their contexts.

One Body, Many Members: A Journey for Congregations Reaching Across Culture, Race, and Class

“One Body, Many Members” is now available at www.elca.org/multicultural. This action-oriented, biblically-based online resource is for congregations in changing neighborhoods that want to reach out, but are confused and uncertain about how to get started and how to change the congregational culture to be one of welcome and authentic community. The resource presents information on change, culture, conflict, communication, and leadership. Resource participants have the opportunity to share stories of the struggle and learnings of congregations that have been engaged in the process. It addresses the dynamic process of invitation, welcome, and ongoing change in the life of the congregation.

Work with the “One Body Many Members” Website has just begun. Currently as many as 40 people have registered and are using the website actively. A marketing strategy is being put in place so that synod staff members, regional staff, and congregational leaders will receive information about this new congregational tool.

Asian Lutheran International Conference

“To establish a closer relationship between Asian communities in the ELCA and Asians in Asia through Global Mission and the Asian Lutheran International Conference network.”

(Asian Strategy, p. 16)

The Asian Lutheran international conference steering committee met in January in Bangkok to plan the next Asian Lutheran international conference. The committee decided that the fifth conference will be held February 4-10, 2009, in Hong Kong, China. The theme of the conference is “Asian Churches in Changing Societies.” The keynote speaker is Dr. Paul Rajashekar, academic dean at Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. The three sub-themes will be:

- Asian churches in the midst of cultural changes: Professor Thu En Yu, principal, Sabah Theological Seminary, Malaysia
- Economic transformation and Asian churches: Ms. Theresa Chow, business owner, Chicago, Ill.
- Church’s mission in changing societies: Professor Robinson Rajagukguk, Medan University, Indonesia.
- In addition, President Lam Tak Ho of Lutheran Theological Seminary, Hong Kong will present the context of church growth in China as a case study.

The ELCA’s Association of Asians and Pacific Islanders is the organizer of this event. The conference is open to all people. Forty non-Asians participated in the fourth conference in Bangkok last year.

Summary

Much work has been done, but much work still remains to be done. The ELCA is moving toward becoming a truly multicultural church where people of all races and cultures are welcome. There
are some hopeful signs, especially in the development of ethnic-specific congregations. Strides also are being made with synod candidacy committees. The development of ethnic strategies throughout the church is a foundation for outreach to people of color or whose primary language is other than English. Multicultural Ministries is thankful for the collaborations that make this progress possible. As Multicultural Ministries moves forward, additional staff will be needed to coordinate the enormous and complex task of becoming the church that reflects the culture in which we live.
Dear Friends,

In response to the proposal for Interim Eucharistic Sharing between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church, several voting members at the recent ELCA Churchwide Assembly stated enthusiastically, “It’s about time!” Lutherans and United Methodists have been well acquainted with one another. Our relationship, locally and nationally, has been forged through friendships, family ties, congregations, ecumenical councils, colleges, and seminaries. We are, in countless places, partners in ministry. Now that our two churches have committed to Interim Eucharistic Sharing, it is indeed about time, about discovering the gifts of the Holy Spirit in this particular kairos of our life together.

Lutherans and United Methodists have engaged in formal conversations over the last three decades. The First Round of dialogues (1977-79) explored the Sacrament of Baptism. The Second Round of the dialogue (1985-87) explored issues of Episcopacy. Significant convergence around these topics pointed toward a Third Round in order to explore the two churches’ understandings of Eucharist. In response to a formal invitation from The United Methodist Church, dialogue was resumed. In November of 1999 the two co-chairs and ecumenical staff members began planning for the next conversations. Third Round dialogue teams first met in September 2001.

For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, ecumenical relationships are described in a 1991 policy statement, Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. This statement describes the deep desire of the ELCA to “manifest the unity given to the people of God by living together in the love of Christ and by joining with other Christians in prayer and action to express and preserve the unity which the Spirit gives.” Four stages of ecumenical relationship are described: Ecumenical Cooperation; Bilateral and Multilateral Dialogues; Preliminary Recognition, including Interim Eucharistic Sharing; and Full Communion. For the ELCA, the characteristics of full communion are theological and missiological implications of the Gospel that allow variety and flexibility. These characteristics stress that the church act ecumenically for the sake of the world, not for itself alone. Full Communion includes at least the following: (1) a common confessing of the Christian faith; (2) a mutual recognition of Baptism and sharing of the Lord’s Supper, allowing for joint worship and an exchangeability of members; (3) a mutual recognition and availability of ordained ministers to the service of all members of a church in full communion, subject only but always to the disciplinary regulations of other churches; (4) a common commitment to evangelism, witness, and service; (5) a means of common decision making on critical common issues of faith and life; and (6) a mutual lifting of any condemnations that exist between churches.

Paragraph 2404 of The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church states, “The United Methodist Church strives toward greater Christian unity through its participation in councils of churches and/or covenantal relationships. The United Methodist Church may establish covenants with other Christian churches through bilateral or multilateral efforts.”

At the sixth plenary session of this Third Round of dialogue, August 24-29, 2004, members unanimously voted to submit a proposal for Interim Eucharistic Sharing for consideration by each church. In April of 2004, the Council of Bishops of The United Methodist Church
committed their church to Interim Eucharistic Sharing with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Shortly thereafter, in August 2004, the ELCA enthusiastically embraced the proposal for Interim Eucharistic Sharing. Now it is our pleasure to share with you the work of the Third Round of dialogue between Lutherans and United Methodists.

We have discovered a profound convergence in the witness of our two churches. The Lord’s Table, Baptism, and Word are at the heart of our churches’ life, precious gifts and fundamental means of Grace. We hope that in the seventy-one paragraphs of Confessing Our Faith Together you will be able to trace our joyful journey of discovery. We have learned that ecumenical conversation means giving up the demand that everyone speak only our language and use only our words. We have also found that ecumenical conversation leads to deeper understanding of our own faith tradition, while opening our eyes to the unending riches of the Holy Spirit’s work in and through the whole Church.

Now we who have explored this terrain invite our churches to the conversation. Over the next few years, we imagine ELCA Lutherans and United Methodists in joint conversations about their faith and history. We envision groups small and large, formal and informal, contributing to the dialogue. We hope this document will provide a helpful beginning to these conversations, and we hope the conversations will lead us to Full Communion. Moreover, we hope that Full Communion may strengthen our common witness in the Gospel for the sake of the whole world.

Finally, as co-chairs of this dialogue, we must offer profound thanks to the participants. To be in the company of these articulate and gracious theologians has been a wonderful gift. They have demonstrated unwavering persistence in clear and accurate expression of our traditions. Always seeking the truth in love, they have artfully complemented one another.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Dr. Kathryn L. Johnson
Louisville Presbyterian Seminary
Dr. Cynthia D. Moe-Lobeda
Seattle University
Dr. H. Frederick Reisz
Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary
Dr. Timothy J. Wengert
Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia
Rev. Paul A. Schreck
ELCA Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations

The United Methodist Church
Dr. Paul W. Chilcote
Duke Divinity School
Mrs. Judy Crain
Green Bay, Wisconsin
Dr. Sarah Heaner Lancaster
Methodist Theological School of Ohio
Rev. Lars-Erik Norby
Moss, Norway
Rev. Betty Gamble
GCCUIC The United Methodist Church

Now, we offer this work to you. May it enrich your journey of faith, and in some small way, may it lead to a deeper understanding of what we mean when we confess together one holy catholic and apostolic church, our Lord’s blessed communion of saints.

Bishop Allan C. Bjornberg
Rocky Mountain Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert
The United Methodist Church
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HOW TO START

Confessing our Faith Together: A Study and Discussion Guide is for use by members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) and The United Methodist Church (UMC) as they consider together the possibility of full communion for their individual and mutual faith, order, life, and work as communions. The two communions are considering the implications of full communion for national and regional expressions of the church. As congregations are a primary place for carrying out the church’s mission and ministry, it is among congregations of the ELCA and UMC that full communion will be expressed in its most fundamental sense. This study and discussion guide is meant to encourage congregational participation and feedback in a period of interim Eucharistic sharing.

For the ELCA and UMC, the characteristics of full communion represent theological and missiological implications of the Gospel that allow variety and flexibility. These characteristics stress that each church act ecumenically for the sake of the world, and not for itself alone. These characteristics will include the following:

1) a common confessing of the Christian faith;
2) a mutual recognition of Baptism and a sharing of the Lord’s Supper, allowing for joint worship and an exchangeability of members;
3) a mutual recognition and availability of ordained ministers to the service of all members of churches in full communion, subject only but always to the disciplinary regulations of the other churches;
4) a common commitment to evangelism, witness, and service;
5) a means of common decision making on critical common issues of faith and life;
6) a mutual lifting of any condemnations that may exist between churches.

Through this study, you are encouraged to work together in order to identify the possibility of full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church for their own mission and ministry. In a congregational study and discussion setting, this guide assumes:

1) Two congregations, one ELCA and one UMC, from the same community have agreed to engage with each other in this study and discussion, will meet for the five sessions, and will return the enclosed Evaluation and Planning Response Form by January 15, 2007.
2) Each congregation will be represented in the discussion by roughly the same number of people (eight to ten from each congregation will make a lively and diverse group).
3) Each participant will have a copy of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Study and Discussion Guide to which he or she can easily refer.¹
4) Sessions will be held weekly, with representatives of the two congregations sharing leadership as appropriate and jointly planning how discussions will be structured. Each session may last up to two and a half hours.

¹ This publication is available online at the ELCA Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations Web site at http://www.elca.org/ecumenical/bilateral/elca-umc.org and through the UMC General Commission on Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns Web site at http://www.gccuic-umc.org
5) Sessions will meet alternately in each congregation’s building and begin with worship led by the host congregation in a manner so as to express something of its authentic liturgical and devotional tradition.

6) Each congregation, under the guidance of their respective pastors where possible, will meet for the five sessions and return the enclosed Evaluation and Planning Response Form by January 15, 2007 to: Research and Evaluation, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 8765 West Higgins Road, Chicago, IL 60631.

This study and discussion guide is self-explanatory and requires few additional resources. However, plan carefully so that leadership may be shared between the two congregations, and participants may have the best opportunities to see what the possibility of a relationship of full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church may mean for each congregation’s witness.
Session One—Providing opportunity for participants to begin to know one another, this session also looks at a brief history of the two communions and their interactions, their understanding of the Triune God, and their authoritative documents.

Session Two—Participants examine their common understanding of justification by grace through faith, and how this relates to sanctification and perfection. Participants will discuss the United Methodist understanding of prevenient grace and how it relates to the Lutheran understanding of justification.

Session Three—in this session, participants explore the Lutheran and United Methodist understandings of the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Eucharist. Attention is given to the special emphasis the UMC places on the Holy Spirit’s work in conveying Christ’s presence in communion.

Session Four—Participants discuss the concept of “the Church” and how the ELCA and UMC have structured different forms of ministry to bear witness to the body of Christ. The similarities and differences of understanding regarding the work of ordained clergy and the office of Bishop will be discussed.

Session Five—The final session will begin with discussion of the world and how we understand our common Christian mission. The session concludes with a time for future planning and recommendations to both the ELCA and UMC.

Please note the full text of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue has been included in this document following Session Five.

Thank you for your participation, and God’s blessings as you begin your study and discussion!
SESSION ONE
INTRODUCTION

OBJECTIVES: By the end of this session, participants will have begun to:

1) Know each other as individuals and as people of faith.
2) Know each other’s congregation, identifying similarities and differences.
3) Understand something of the history of each communion and its historical relationship with the other.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE SESSION:
Prior to the start of the session, consider making the following preparations:

• About one week before the first session, ask participants to read the sections titled, “Preface,” “The Triune God” and “Our Authorities” in Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue (Paragraphs 1-18).
• Have simple refreshments available.
• Arrange chairs in a large circle so participants can easily see and hear each other.
• Have a nametag available for each participant.
• Have available a flip chart, paper, markers, masking tape (or a chalk board and chalk), overhead projector, computer access, or other technology.
• Have additional copies of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Study and Discussion Guide.
• The host congregation for this session should prepare a brief opening worship drawing on its authentic liturgical and devotional tradition. Finally,
• Have teams of two or three from each congregation prepared to introduce their congregation to the whole group (see Activity C).

ACTIVITY A—Opening Worship (15 minutes)
Representatives of the host congregation, after welcoming participants, should lead a brief worship period.

ACTIVITY B—Introductions (30 minutes)
With participants seated in a circle have each participant introduce him or herself, telling their name, congregation, and how long they have been a member, and sharing what they recall or know of their baptism and something of their personal faith journey.

When all have had the opportunity to introduce themselves, invite participants to discuss:

• What do we seem to have in common as individuals?
• How do we seem to be different as individuals?

Note these similarities and differences on the flip chart or chalkboard, or through other compatible means.

ACTIVITY C—Congregational Introductions (60 minutes)
Ask each team to introduce its congregation to the group. The introduction might contain some or all of the following:

• A brief history of the congregation.
• The congregation’s self-understanding of its mission and identity-defining core values.
• Something of the congregation’s programmatic ministry, including its support of and participation in denominational and ecumenical ministry.
• Something of the congregation’s organization and governance.
When the two teams have finished their introductions, invite participants to discuss:

- What do we seem to have in common as congregations?
- How do we seem to be different as congregations?
- What might we be able to learn or appropriate from each other as faith communities?

Again, note the similarities, differences, and possible learnings on the flip chart or chalkboard.

**ACTIVITY D**—Historical Background to Full Communion

(40 minutes)

Divide participants into small groups of about five participants each. Ask each group to review the sections titled, “Preface,” “The Triune God,” and “Our Authorities” in *Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue* (Paragraphs 1-18) and identify a) new or surprising knowledge and b) questions which the reading raises for them.

When the small groups have had time to discuss the reading, reconvene the whole group. Ask each small group to report first what it learned and briefly list them on the flip chart. Then ask each to report its questions, again listing each briefly on the flip chart. Then, invite the group to discuss how it will find answers to each of the questions raised and negotiate responsibility for finding answers.

**CLOSING**

(5 minutes)

Remind participants of the activities planned between the congregations and the meeting place for the next session. Have participants read the section titled, “Salvation by Grace through Faith” in *Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue* (Paragraphs 19-31). Close with prayer including a time for silence and petitions.
SESSION TWO
Salvation by Grace through Faith

OBJECTIVES: By the end of this session, participants will have:

1) A greater understanding of their common confession of faith.
2) Had an opportunity to explore apparent similarities and differences between the two communions expressed in sanctification and perfection.
3) Begun to deepen their personal and congregational relationships.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE SESSION:

- Have simple refreshments available.
- Arrange chairs in a large circle so participants can easily see and hear each other.
- Have a nametag available for each participant.
- Have available a flip chart, paper, markers, masking tape (or a chalk board and chalk), overhead projector, computer access or other technology.

ACTIVITY A—Introductions (15 minutes)

Unless people have gotten to know each other well, have participants briefly reintroduce themselves to the whole group.

ACTIVITY B—Worship (15 minutes)

Representatives of the host congregation, after welcoming participants, should invite a moment of silent reflection and then lead a brief worship period.

ACTIVITY C—Questions and Answers (90 minutes)

After everyone has had the opportunity to reacquaint him or herself with the section, “Salvation by Grace through Faith” (Paragraphs 19-31) in Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue, ask participants to reflect a moment on the following questions:

- How do you understand the reality of “grace” in your life?
- What is the connection between grace and what you have read about justification, sanctification, and perfection?

As you are discussing, make a list of all the questions on the flip chart, moving around the circle and inviting each to pose one question. Keep going around the circle until all questions have been listed.

After the questions are listed, take a moment to review the questions and decide where to begin. Begin working through the questions together, encouraging participants to explore possible responses and to draw on their own knowledge and experiences. Breaking into small groups may be helpful. If there are questions that “stump” the group, help them to identify how they might research an answer to present at the next session.

CLOSING (5 minutes)

Remind participants of the activities planned and the meeting place for the next session. Have participants read the section titled, “The Sacraments” in Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue (Paragraphs 32-46). Close with prayer including a time for silence and petitions.
SESSION THREE
The Sacraments

OBJECTIVES: By the end of this session, participants will have:

1) Studied the way in which the ELCA and UMC understand the sacraments of Holy Baptism and Eucharist.
2) Begun to reflect on how the differing sacramental emphases of the two communions might enrich and be expressed through the common life and witness of their two congregations.
3) Continued to deepen their personal and congregational relationships.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE SESSION:

• Read Paragraphs 32-46 of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement Toward Full Communion by the ELCA-UMC Bilateral Dialogue.
• As before, have refreshments, name tags, etc. available. Arrange the room with chairs in a circle, and have a flip chart and markers or other technological aides.
• Consider setting out instruments used in the sacramental acts of Holy Baptism and the Eucharist such as a baptismal shell and communion vessels. These will help focus discussion for the group.
• Read Activity C and prepare an explanatory handout as described therein.

ACTIVITY A—Introductions (10 minutes)
Unless you are sure participants have come to know each other’s names, invite each to briefly introduce her/himself. You may even choose to update others since your last meeting together.

ACTIVITY B—Worship (15 minutes)
Representatives of the host congregation, after welcoming participants, should lead a brief worship period.

ACTIVITY C—Explanation of Baptismal and Eucharistic Practices (60 minutes)
Have clergy or other appointed leaders from each congregation prepare an explanatory handout or overhead that parallels the Baptismal and Eucharistic services used at each congregation. Take time to explain the specific practices of each congregation to the whole group and then discuss the following questions:

• What are the similarities in the celebration of these sacraments?
• What are the differences in the celebration of these sacraments?
• What questions arise with respect to the celebration of these sacraments?

ACTIVITY D—Small Group Discussion (60 minutes)
Divide the whole group into small groups of 3-5 participants each. Make sure each group contains participants from each congregation. Ask each small group to discuss the section of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue assigned on “The Sacraments” (Paragraphs 32-46), posing the following questions:

• What did you learn about yourselves as a communion in this section?
• What did you learn about the other communion in this section?
• Are there any specific concepts or practices you would like to share with the other communion not covered in Confessing Our Faith Together and that you have not so far discussed from your own congregational Baptismal and Eucharistic practices?
• What have you discovered that might enrich the life and ministry of your congregation?
After the small groups have had ample time to discuss, gather the whole group and ask each small group to report its findings. Make particular note of any suggestions for enriching the life and ministries of the congregations.

CLOSING

(5 minutes)

Remind participants of the activities planned and the meeting place for the next session. Have participants read the section titled, “The Church and its Ministries” in Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue (Paragraphs 47-63). Close with prayer including a time for silence and petitions.
SESSION FOUR
THE CHURCH AND ITS MINISTRIES

OBJECTIVES: By the end of this session, participants will have:

1) Explored the roles of a) the Church, b) the Ministry and c) the Bishops.

2) Begun to reflect on how the theological perspectives of the two communions (expressed in their understanding of what it means to be “the Church”) might enrich the common life and witness of their two congregations.

3) Continued to deepen their personal and congregational relationships.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE SESSION:

- Read paragraphs 47-63 of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue.
- As before, have refreshments, name tags, etc. available. Arrange the room with chairs in a circle, and have a flip chart and markers or other technological aides.
- Identify 3-5 spaces where working groups can meet.

ACTIVITY A—Introductions (10 minutes)

Unless you are sure participants have come to know each other’s names, invite each to briefly introduce her/himself. Please share any additional and helpful information since your last time together.

ACTIVITY B—Worship (15 minutes)

Representatives of the host congregation, after welcoming participants, should lead a brief worship period.

ACTIVITY C—Small Group Discussion (60 minutes)

Divide the whole group into small groups of 3-5 participants each. Be sure each group contains participants from each congregation. Ask each small group to discuss the section assigned on “The Church and its Ministries” (Paragraphs 47-63) in Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue. Consider the following questions:

- What did you learn about yourselves as a communion in this section?
- What did you learn about the other communion in this section?
- Are there any specific concepts or practices you would like to share with the other communion not covered in Confessing Our Faith Together as part of your congregational understanding of what it means to be “the Church”?
- What have you discovered that might enrich the life and ministries of your congregation? Please be as specific as possible.

After the small groups have had ample time to discuss, gather the whole group and ask each small group to report its findings. Make particular note of any suggestions for enriching the life and ministries of the congregations.

ACTIVITY D—Generating Ideas for Action (60 minutes)

Divide participants into working groups of 3-5 persons each, taking care to be sure each group contains representatives of both congregations. Ask each group to build a list of ideas for how the two congregations together might continue to explore “Interim Eucharistic Sharing.” It will be helpful to make available the document: “Interim Eucharistic Sharing between the Evangelical
Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church\footnote{This publication is available online at the ELCA Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Relations Web site (http://www.elca.org/ecumenical/ecumenicaldialogue/unitedmethodist/InterimEucharisticSharingUMC_1.pdf).} for reference. Instruct the groups to note their ideas on newsprint (see that each group has a supply of paper and markers), writing enough about each idea so that others can grasp what the idea means.

\textit{CLOSING} \hfill (5 minutes)

Remind participants of the activities planned and the meeting place for the next session. Have participants read the section titled, “The World and Our Common Mission” in \textit{Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue} (Paragraphs 64-71). Close with prayer including a time for silence and petitions.
SESSION FIVE

THE WORLD AND OUR COMMON MISSION

OBJECTIVES: By the end of these sessions, participants will have:

1) Explored the section of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue dealing with the world and the common mission the ELCA and UMC share.

2) Begun to reflect on how this common mission might enrich and be expressed through the common life and witness of these two congregations.

3) Continued to deepen personal and congregational relationships.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE SESSION:
In addition to discussing “The World and Our Common Mission,” this final session is designed as a planning session. By this time, participants have come to know each other and their respective congregations relatively well and have, because of this knowledge and deepening personal relationships, begun also to sense possibilities for a future common life between the congregations, a common life that takes seriously the nature and mission of each. Likewise, take time throughout this session to be clear and further explore common Christian commitments in witness and service.

• Read Paragraphs 64-71 in Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue.

• As before, have refreshments, nametags, etc. available. Arrange the room with chairs in a circle, and have a flip chart and markers or other technological aides available.

ACTIVITY A—Worship (15 minutes)
Representatives of the host congregation, after welcoming participants, should lead a brief worship period.

ACTIVITY B—Small Group Discussion (60 minutes)
Divide the whole group into small groups of 3-5 participants each. Be sure each group contains participants from each congregation. Ask each small group to discuss the section assigned on “The World and Our Common Mission” (Paragraphs 64-71) in Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA—UMC Bilateral Dialogue, posing the following questions:

• What did you learn about yourselves as a communion in this section?

• What did you learn about the other communion in this section?

• What have you discovered that might enrich the life and ministries of your congregation? Please be as specific as possible.

After the small groups have had ample time to discuss, gather the whole group and ask each small group to report its findings. Make particular note of any suggestions for enriching the life and ministries of the congregations.

ACTIVITY C—Planning for Action (45 minutes)
Tell participants that they will have a chance to develop some of the ideas for how to “live into full communion” that were suggested in the last session. Do some “what, by whom, and by when” planning for implementing the idea as a large group. Plan at least one event in which both congregations are invited to participate together, with particular attention to the possibility of sharing the Eucharist together.

ACTIVITY D—Reporting (15 minutes)
Take the last fifteen minutes of this session to briefly give participants an opportunity to suggest comments for the evaluation and planning response form.

CLOSING (15 minutes)
Thank participants for their energy and creativity and close with prayer. You might consider working together to plan a brief service that incorporates specific aspects of each congregation’s worship practices to close this final session.
Preface

1) This proposed agreement for full communion between The United Methodist Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is noteworthy among such ecumenical statements. The United Methodist Church, an international church, already stands locally in full communion with other member churches of the Lutheran World Federation. Fellowship of Grace: Report from the Conversations between Church of Norway and the United Methodist Church in Norway (Oslo, 1994), has profoundly affected the current dialogue. Thus, this round of the dialogues started with a document already accepted locally by one dialogue partner (UMC) and by the Lutheran Church of Norway, which is already in full communion with the ELCA.

2) This round of dialogues leading up to the present proposal also had the benefit of two previous rounds of dialogue in the USA. The First Round study on Baptism (1977-79) concluded that Lutherans and United Methodists share “in one spirit and one baptism.” The Second Round of the dialogue (1985-87), focused on the office of bishop, and produced Episcopacy: A Lutheran–United Methodist Common Statement to the Church, emphasizing “that no particular structure of oversight is of the essence of the Church.” Moreover, our dialogue also used the document produced in the international dialogue between the World Methodist Council and the Lutheran World Federation, published as The Church: Community of Grace (Geneva, 1984). Taken together, these documents have provided the basis for the language and spirit of much of what follows in the statement of our common confession of faith.

3) The Third Round of the dialogue (2001- ) addressed additional topics of concern. In the fall of 2005 the dialogue team drafted “Confessing Our Faith Together” to articulate the high level of convergence we experienced around the Triune God, our authoritative documents, salvation by grace through faith, the sacraments, the Church and its ministries, and the world and our common mission.

4) As happened in the previous two rounds of dialogues, the participants quickly discovered that the two churches had much in common and much to recommend in the pursuit of full communion. Moreover, there were no historical condemnations requiring our attention, since one consequence of the separate contexts in which our churches arose is that neither church ever officially condemned the other. Distinctions between our churches, whether matters of style, history, or ethos, and even differences of theological expression, content and emphasis, need not be considered church-dividing. As one of the confessional documents of the ELCA, the Formula of Concord, reminded Christians of the sixteenth century (quoting the second-century bishop Irenaeus of Lyon), “Dissimilarity in fasting is not to disrupt unity in faith.” That is, in the face of agreement in the faith, “no church should condemn another because the one has fewer or more external ceremonies not commanded by God than the other has” (The Formula of Concord, Epitome, X.7). Likewise, John Wesley consistently distinguished between essential doctrines upon which agreement or consensus is critical and opinions about theology or church practices upon which disagreement is permissible (Sermon on Catholic Spirit).
5) Moreover, since the First Round of dialogues in 1979 dealt with the question of Baptism, much has transpired in our churches. In 1987, the merger of the Lutheran Church in America, The American Lutheran Church, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches created the ELCA. In 1996, the General Conference of The United Methodist Church adopted “By Water and the Spirit: A United Methodist Understanding of Baptism,” and in 2004 it adopted “This Holy Mystery: A United Methodist Understanding of Holy Communion.” These documents articulate the current United Methodist understanding of the sacraments and their spirit is reflected in this proposed agreement.

6) The present challenges and opportunities in the United States for the mission of Christianity demand higher and more serious levels of cooperation among churches. A full communion agreement such as this one allows for interchangeability of clergy, sharing common goals in mission, serving individual congregations with educated, well-equipped, and ecumenically minded leaders, and, above all, demonstrating to the world in a concrete way the unity given to us in Christ through the gospel and sacraments. In fact, the diversity of gifts, history, and self-understanding in the UMC and the ELCA indicates that each communion needs the other. Our distinct theological perspectives, growing out of different historical contexts, will enrich each church’s understanding of the gospel of Jesus Christ. We may support and encourage one another in our unique ministries and mutually edify one another, as we seek to bring the living gospel of Jesus Christ to a broken world.

7) Both of our churches began as reform movements within the Western church, and even now, as separate denominations, we have unique, reforming voices for our world. We especially note the ELCA’s strong commitment to justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ, to the efficacy of the sacraments in daily life, and to the distinction between law and gospel. We also celebrate the UMC’s unwavering confession of the work of the Holy Spirit in the renewing of Christian life, the need to translate faith into action, and the necessity of Christian engagement in this world. Together, our churches can raise their voices to proclaim God’s Word of mercy and to work for those things that make for peace in this world.

8) We commend our growing life together as Christian churches and understand that this agreement will succeed precisely as each church takes seriously its responsibility for mutual admonition and accountability, as we discover what practical consequences this agreement holds for us. Full communion is not the end of a process but rather an invitation to grow together in Christian faith and love, commending to one another and the world the hope that is in us. Thus, in approving this agreement both churches commit to continue the process by holding regular talks, working responsibly through any issues that may arise, and providing resources to congregations and other groups.

9) In this regard, we also call upon local judicatories and congregations to begin the process of realizing more fully what this agreement will mean for their life together. For this agreement to make a difference in the lives of our churches and our society, leaders at every level within our churches must explore how to remain faithful within their respective churches while at the same time finding new ways to implement the higher level of cooperation envisioned here. The goal of full communion must not simply be theological rapprochement but honest, committed cooperation for the sake of Jesus Christ and God’s mission in the world.

10) We confess with Christians of all ages that the Triune God, invoked in our baptism and confessed in our creeds as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is the one true God, who created the heavens and the earth, who in Jesus Christ, the eternal Word of God, became a human being, suffered, died, and was raised for our salvation, and who as the Holy Spirit is our comfort and guide in this life and for the world to come.

The Triune God
11) Doctrine is essentially practical and shapes our lives in the world. The doctrine of the Trinity teaches that there is communion within the divine life. To confess the Trinity is to ground all expressions of unity in the character of the Creator. Since we are made in God’s image, we find fullness of life in relationships of love and service. This is reflected in family and friendship, in society, and above all in the church. This doctrine also leads us to value variety and diversity. The unity we celebrate is genuine communion, and the life we live is meant to be a glorious dance of fellowship and love.

Our Authorities

12) Together we confess that Jesus Christ is the living Word of God in our midst, and therefore the foundation of all authority. Scripture reveals the Word of God and is the primary and authoritative source and norm of our proclamation, faith, and life. Both of our traditions and their founders gained impetus for their work in the church from their encounters with God in Scripture.

13) Our traditions also understand that Christians never encounter the Scriptures without witnesses, which shape our faith today and which point the way into God’s Word. Thus, with Christians around the world we confess and bear witness to the common apostolic faith using the Apostles’ and the Nicene Creeds.

14) Our churches arose in their own unique circumstances and therefore name as authoritative different witnesses to the faith. These testimonies, too, have called and continue to call our churches to faithful witness to the gospel in today’s world.

15) The ELCA accepts the Apostles’, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds as true declarations of the faith and the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a true witness to the gospel. Other texts of The Book of Concord (the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Treatise, Luther’s Large and Small Catechisms, and the Formula of Concord) also are valid interpretations of the faith of the church.

16) In the UMC, The Twenty-five Articles of Religion (of the Methodist Church) and The Confession of Faith (of the Evangelical United Brethren Church) represent the inheritance of ancient and Reformation faith and are formally endorsed as doctrinal standards. The General Rules of the Methodist Church, a statement of the nature and design of Wesley’s original “United Societies,” are an honored part of the Methodist theological inheritance. John Wesley’s Standard Sermons and Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament, historically described as the Wesleyan Standards, reflect distinctive Methodist emphases.

17) We acknowledge that other documents and people continue to shape our traditions today. We both recognize the importance of the early church and its writers and leaders for shaping our faith. Martin Luther and John and Charles Wesley, among others, continue to inspire our communities by their witness to the faith. Our worship resources and especially our hymnody, much of which we share in common, are important sources for our faith. We also acknowledge the importance of contemporary ecumenical agreements in providing further witness to the unity we receive from Christ.

18) The question of authority with regard to matters of faith looms large in our day. It reaches into the life of every congregation and touches the hearts and minds of faithful Christians within both our churches. We are called to make faith-based decisions every day that affect our lives on many levels. This is an important issue in our particular traditions, perhaps in part, because our early histories reflect tension and confrontation with positions of authority in our communions of origin. It was critical then and remains important in our own time to recognize the authority of Scripture as the rule and guide for faith and practice. Our traditions understand this authority to be something dynamic that requires attentiveness to both the received faith tradition and the guidance of the Holy Spirit.
Salvation by Grace through Faith

A. Our Common Confession of Faith

19) The ELCA and the UMC agree that, in accordance with the Scriptures, human beings are justified by God’s grace in Christ received freely through faith alone. The essence of this faith is a sure trust and confidence in God and God’s promises, born of God’s Word and empowered by the Holy Spirit. Persons as sinners, estranged from and in rebellion against God, are justified by God’s gracious mercy and love in Christ and not on the basis of human efforts or worthiness. Beginning in Baptism and continuing throughout the life of faith, God declares sinners forgiven and righteous by virtue of Christ’s righteousness alone, and the Holy Spirit uses the judgment of the law and the comfort of this very promise to engender trust in God.

20) Justification depends upon Christ’s incarnation, death, and resurrection. In Christ, God reconciled the world and conquered the evil forces that dominate human life and the rest of the created order. In justification, God forgives sin, liberates us from its enslaving power, comforts sinners, moves us toward lives of faith made effective through love, and imparts new life in Christ. Therefore, to obtain such faith God has given the Word and sacraments, through which the Holy Spirit nourishes and strengthens the believer, as well as evoking faith and the experience of pardon. Throughout their lives, Christians are in need of God’s forgiving grace. At the same time, God’s creating and sustaining grace is also continuously present in the world and in human life.

21) The ELCA and the UMC agree that sanctification, being made holy, is the gracious work of God’s Holy Spirit. On the one hand, this holiness is complete in the forgiveness of sins, when God justifies and reconciles human beings through Christ. On the other, it is God’s continuous work in the Christian life through the power of the Holy Spirit, calling, gathering, and equipping us to live as those dedicated to the care and redemption of all God has made. Through daily renewal of God’s baptismal promises and growing into conformity with Christ’s image, the old creature is put to death and the new is raised to life, being drawn closer to God in faith and to the neighbor in love.

22) The ELCA and the UMC agree that good works are the natural and spontaneous fruit of faith. These works do not save us and do not earn God’s grace or favor. Instead, they arise from true faith and are most accurately called by St. Paul “fruits of the Spirit” in contrast to “works of the law.” They consist not merely of religious actions but any action that serves God, loves the neighbor, and cares for creation. Christians do not place their trust in these works but only in God’s grace in Christ, which provides genuine consolation for the weak and troubled. This living faith is ever active in love, enabling the faithful to rejoice in God’s will, to serve the neighbor, and to strive for justice and peace in all the earth.

23) The ramifications of salvation by grace through faith are manifold. Many people both outside and inside the church are burdened by the assumption that they must earn God’s love. Even those who know the language of grace may never have experienced the freedom of the gospel in their lives, or may forget this good news in times of difficulty and doubt. Surrounded daily by people and institutions that place conditions upon acceptance, many strive to prove themselves worthy through frenetic activity, while others capitulate to apathy and cynicism. The heart of the gospel is the liberating message of God’s unconditional mercy.
B. Our Unity in Diversity

On Prevenient Grace

24) The UMC confesses that the prevenient grace of God prepares human beings to receive God’s mercy in Christ and also affirms justification by faith alone as the foundation for full redemption in Christ. United Methodists define prevenient grace as the divine love that surrounds all humanity and precedes any and all of our conscious impulses (The Book of Discipline, ¶101). Through this grace God fosters a sense of right and wrong and the recognition of fallen life as under the judgment of God. Since all life is enveloped by the wooing activity of the Holy Spirit, God draws people to the saving grace given to us through Word and sacrament and received by faith in Jesus Christ.

25) The ELCA maintains that in creation God graciously gives human beings material goods necessary for our living and governs all creation. God also opposes forces that would destroy creation. In the redemption that comes through Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, God gives to people the fruits of Christ’s saving work when the Holy Spirit comes to them through the Word and sacraments with forgiveness of sins and eternal life. The Holy Spirit engenders the courage for participating in God’s activity for the sake of the world.

On Justification, Sanctification, and Perfection

26) The ELCA confesses that the Christian is at the same time righteous and sinner (simul iustus et peccator). This means that believers are declared totally righteous by God because of Christ’s righteousness alone, which is received through faith. However, at the same time, looking at themselves in the light of the law, they recognize that they remain sinners, for they continually turn to false gods and do not love God or their neighbors with the love that God commands. Thus, Christians depend at every moment in their lives upon God’s justifying grace and forgiveness. Although Lutherans do not customarily use the language of perfection, the Augsburg Confession (XXVII.49) defines Christian perfection as fearing God earnestly with the whole heart, having confidence in God’s grace because of Christ, expecting help from God in all affliction, and diligently doing good in our various callings.

27) The UMC confesses the work of the Holy Spirit in justification and new birth and emphasizes how the regenerated Christian can live in ever deepening and more fruitful love of God and neighbor. The UMC sets no limit to God the Holy Spirit’s activity and power in this present life. Thus, especially according to John Wesley, Christians may earnestly hope to receive perfect love of God and neighbor in this life, not according to their works or merit but by God’s grace alone. This optimism concerning the Holy Spirit’s work is always held in tension with a deep theological suspicion of a human being’s best efforts and a genuine awareness of the depths of human sin.

28) The ELCA also confesses the power and activity of the Holy Spirit in this present life and understands that the Christian life flows from baptism as daily dying and rising (recognizing and confessing sin and calling upon God’s forgiving grace) and as faithful following of Christ in joyful obedience. The law still orders and restrains daily life and judges sin, driving believers to a renewed trust in Christ’s righteousness as the only ground of salvation, life and confidence.

C. Appreciating our Differences as Gifts

29) With regard to distinctive emphases related to the doctrine of salvation within the UMC and the ELCA, there is little question that the primary area of difference revolves around Lutheran insistence upon the enduring pervasiveness of sin and the Wesleyan concept of sanctification as a process leading to “perfect love” in this life.

30) Those ordained into the ministry of the UMC are asked whether they believe themselves to be “going on to perfection” and whether they “expect to be made perfect in this life.” These questions bear witness to a strong teleological orientation in the Wesleyan way of salvation (via salutis) aimed at the full restoration of the image of God in the Christian believer. Yet, the goal of Christian perfection toward which
the process of sanctification moves is a gift every bit as much by grace through faith as is the gift of justification. The goal of the Christian life is to love as Christ has loved, and the UMC confesses an optimism in the power of God’s grace to realize this ultimate gift in the faithful Christian. The UMC, therefore, offers to the ELCA a dynamic vision of redeemed human existence as faith working by love leading to holiness of heart and life.

31) In turn, the ELCA offers to the UMC a vision of the Christian life that is defined by the Sacrament of Baptism (see ¶¶32-38 below) as well as God’s decisive action for us in the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. The ELCA stresses that the restoration of the image of God occurs fully in Baptism and that human beings cannot achieve any status in relation to God other than that which is given in and with the Sacrament, namely, justified sinner. Being careful to distinguish between the “works of the law” and the “fruits of the Spirit,” Lutherans describe the regenerate life not simply as freedom from the accusation of the law but as led by the Holy Spirit and engrafted into Jesus Christ, being conformed to the will of God in a free and joyful spirit (Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, VI.17). Since those reborn in Baptism, however, continue to rebel and give themselves over into the power of sinning, i.e., not trusting in God, the battle between the old and the new creature continues in them down to the grave.

The Sacraments

A. Holy Baptism

32) The First Round of dialogue formulated agreement on the Sacrament of Baptism. Both the ELCA and the UMC accept as valid all acts of Baptism in the name of the Trinity using water according to Christ’s command and promise.

33) Baptism is the sacrament of entrance into the holy catholic Church, not simply a rite of entrance into a particular denomination. Baptism is therefore a sacrament that proclaims the profound unity of the church. Baptism is a gift of God for building up the Christian community.

34) Baptism is intended for all persons, including infants. No person should be excluded from Baptism for reasons of age or mental capacity.

35) God gives the Holy Spirit in Baptism to unite us with Jesus Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection; to effect new birth, new creation, and newness of life; to offer, give, and assure us of the forgiveness of sins in both cleansing and life-giving aspects; to enable our continual repentance, daily reception of forgiveness, and our growing in grace; to create unity and equality in Christ; to make us participants in the new age initiated by the saving act of God in Jesus Christ; and to place us into the Body of Christ where the benefits of the Holy Spirit are shared within a visible community of faith.

36) In Baptism, God enables the Christian to rely upon this gift, promise, and assurance throughout all of life. Such faithful reliance is necessary and sufficient for the reception of the benefits of Baptism.

37) Baptism embraces both the prior gift of God’s grace and the believer’s life of faith. Baptism looks toward a coming “to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to maturity, to the measure of the full stature of Christ” (Ephesians 4:13). In faith and obedience, the baptized live for the sake of Christ, the church, and the world that Christ loves. In Baptism, the church witnesses to the faith and proclaims to the world the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

38) Baptism has practical ramifications for the Christian life. Through the Holy Spirit Baptism gives us our true identity. People struggle with that most central of questions in life: Who am I? The church proclaims boldly in Baptism that we become forgiven children of God and members one of another. In Baptism we are reminded of who we are and to whom we belong in life and in death. By welcoming us freely into the Body of Christ, the Sacrament also points to the central commitments in the Christian life, including the mandate of the family of God to make disciples of Jesus Christ. Every celebration of Baptism is a reminder of our responsibility to one another. Baptism is connected intrinsically to mission. The Sacrament not only proclaims who we are, it frees us for our primary vocation in life, to love God and neighbor as agents of God’s reign of peace, justice, and abundant life for all.
B. Eucharist

39) The Lord’s Supper is one of the fundamental means of grace. Christ himself instituted this meal and commanded us to continue to celebrate it until he comes again. He himself promised to be present in this meal, and through the Holy Spirit he establishes and strengthens our faith there.

40) Like Holy Baptism, the Lord’s Supper is an efficacious sign of God’s grace. This means that Holy Communion is not only a visible sign that points to God’s presence in the world, but it includes and gives real participation in Christ. In this sharing (κοινωνία), Christ offers his life-giving body and blood through bread and wine to all who take part in the celebration of this meal (1 Corinthians 10:16). In the words of Christ that institute this meal stands a promise that he himself is truly present for us. These words in the Supper call us to faith.

41) The entire eucharistic celebration expresses the real presence of Christ. In a special way, Christ’s word (“Do this in remembrance of me”) draws all participants into God’s saving act, carried out once and for all in Christ’s death and resurrection, by joining them to Christ’s presence in the meal. Furthermore, this same presence of Christ comes to expression by emphasizing the Holy Spirit’s activity for us in the Supper. It is by the living word of Christ, empowered by the Holy Spirit, that the bread and wine become the sacrament of Christ’s body and blood.

42) Together, both churches affirm the special emphasis that the UMC has placed on confessing that the Holy Spirit conveys Christ’s presence in communion. The ELCA also confesses that the fullness of God is given through the real presence of Jesus Christ in the sacraments. Both churches also confess that, according to Christ’s promise, all receive his body and blood in the elements of communion, without attempting to explain this sacramental mystery. Both churches agree that Christ is truly present, that he is shared and received in the forms of bread and wine in the Eucharist, and that the blessings of this Supper are received by faith alone.

43) In the Lord’s Supper, believers receive the benefits of Christ’s life, death, and resurrection. This means that in communion we receive the forgiveness of sins and all the other blessings that Christ has brought us, such as life and salvation. We also believe that the grace of divine forgiveness offered in the sacrament is received with the thankful offering of ourselves for God’s service. This meal strengthens and transforms us in faith, hope and love, and sends us out into the world bearing Christ’s promise of peace, justice and reconciliation.

44) Our churches have come to stress that the Holy Spirit uses the Supper to express and realize the communion of the people of God with Christ and with each other. We view Holy Communion as an anticipation of that final feast when God will be all in all. At the same time, our Lord’s gifts of forgiveness and reconciliation in this meal seal and empower us to challenge injustice in the world. We long for and live toward a world where people truly are reconciled with each other and with the rest of creation, and share God’s gifts justly.

45) Both churches also emphasize the dimension of thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) in communion in their liturgies. In the Sacrament, we give thanks to God for everything we have received in creation, in redemption and among God’s faithful people of all ages, until the day when God will create a new heaven and a new earth. By extension, we understand the entire action of the supper as a sacrifice of praise, in which we celebrate with God’s created gifts of bread and wine in the presence of Christ all that God does.

46) On the most practical level the eucharistic feast delivers what all meals signify to us in our lives. The Sacrament is a meal in which God provides for us what we need to be healthy and whole. As we eat Christ’s body and blood, we become the Body of Christ for the sake of the world. This meal unites us with God and with one another; the more time we spend at the Lord’s table, the more we come to love one another and appreciate the Giver of every good and perfect gift.
The Church and Its Ministries

A. The Church

47) The ELCA and the UMC both affirm that the church is the community of Jesus Christ called into being by the Holy Spirit. In the life of this new community of love Christ has overcome the divisions that separate us from one another and binds all of God’s people together. In the words of the Nicene Creed, we confess “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church.”

48) For both of our traditions, the assembled worshiping community is the central generating reality of the church. In worship, empowered by the Spirit, we hear and celebrate what God has done in creation and redemption and offer in response our thanksgiving through communal praise and prayer. Given this fundamental understanding, both define the church as the assembly of the faithful in which the Word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered.

49) Beyond this common foundation, however, our distinct histories reveal a kindred vision regarding the life of the community of faith. Both of our traditions brought gospel-based criticisms to the communions of their origin, seeking reform, yet hopeful in their efforts to avoid schism. Both have a rich history of preaching. Both share a common journey toward a richer realization of the importance of the sacraments in regular worship. In the dialogue itself we have discovered a rich treasure in the hymnody of both churches. Through hymns we proclaim the gospel, teach the faith, and sustain believers in Christ. Both believe that faith is not a “private” matter but communal. Both emphasize that the church is not simply an invisible reality but is embodied necessarily in God’s creation.

50) Our traditions also have lifted up different emphases in our theologies and styles of manifesting the Body of Christ to our mutual benefit. United Methodists have emphasized the centrality of mission, prophetic action, and the realization by faith of God’s reign on earth as in heaven. Lutherans can benefit from this rich tradition of sacrament-centered worship and passion for the reality of God’s liberating grace.

51) Both churches yearn for and seek ecumenical outreach and hospitality. In its Book of Discipline the UMC affirms that “Christian unity is not an option; it is a gift to be received and expressed.” The ELCA states: “The unity of the church, as it is proclaimed in the Scriptures, is a gift and goal of God. Ecumenism is the joyous experience of the unity of Christ’s people and the serious task of expressing that unity visibly and structurally” (Ecumenism: The Vision of the ELCA, 1991).

52) John Wesley asserted that there is no such thing as a solitary Christian. Martin Luther described the church as a holy Christian people. The church as a body, a living organism, is of critical practical importance. We need one another in order to grow “to the measure of the full stature of Christ” (Ephesians 4:13). Moreover, in a culture that is infectiously individualistic (speaking from a North American context), the church calls us with compelling force away from any path leading to narcissism and privatized spirituality. In both of our traditions courageous men and women have reminded us that the church is a family for others, called to offer its life for the life of the world. As we live into these convictions with the support of the community, the practical dimension of our faith is perennially before our eyes.

B. The Ministry

53) Both the ELCA and the UMC emphasize the ministry of the whole people of God. Ministry is an activity of the entire church and of each individual within it. Whether described as “the priesthood of all believers” or the “ministry of all Christians,” both churches insist that the mission of God is carried out through both laity and clergy, who are called to ministry by the Spirit in Baptism. The forms of this ministry are diverse in locale, in interest, and in denominational accent, yet always universal in spirit and outreach.
54) Both churches acknowledge God’s gift of the ordained ministry, exercised by women and men alike. For both of our traditions, there is a called, ordered, representative, and public office of ordained ministry for the proclamation of the Word, the celebration of the sacraments, the exercise of pastoral care, and service to the world. Maintaining that the New Testament prescribes no particular form of ordained ministry or church order, both churches have developed patterns of ministry distinctive to our histories, global identities, and changing contexts. Both have adapted the ordering of ministry to remain faithful and effective in the stewardship of God’s creative and redemptive mission in the world.

55) The UMC provides for two forms of ordained ministry: deacons are called to ministries of Word and service, and elders are called to ministries of service, Word, sacrament, and order. The ELCA has established one office of ordained ministry of Word and sacrament. In both churches persons who are ordained are called to an exemplary life in Christ as a gift from and a witness to the community of faith. In ordination, the church publicly affirms an inward call of God and continues the apostolic ministry through persons empowered by the Holy Spirit.

56) Both churches authorize (or have authorized in the past) other specific forms of ministry as well. Whether described as “deaconesses,” “diaconal ministers,” “home missionaries,” or “associates in ministry,” these lay offices are established by both bodies through either “consecration” or “commissioning.” We recognize and applaud the venerable history of these historic ministries.

57) Both churches also vest bishops with the authority to “license” lay candidates to serve with full ministerial privileges in local congregations. Whether called “probationary members,” “local pastors,” “authorized” or “licensed ministers,” the bishop is responsible for the supervision of those who serve in these pastoral roles. Both traditions are seeking ways to balance our commitments to pastoral leadership for all congregations with high standards for preparation and oversight.

58) Both churches are called to work together in equipping the whole people of God for our common vocation in the world. It is increasingly important to stand together in proclaiming and living the gospel so that our testimony to the world will be one of healing, reconciliation, wholeness, and unity in the body of Christ. We recognize that together we can give greater attention to cooperation regarding ecumenical shared ministry, supervision, and spiritual formation and theological education.

59) Both churches are discovering anew that all of God’s people possess gifts to be used in ministry. Because of this, many members within our respective denominations are experiencing the joy of faithful service to God with the affirmation of the church. Christian vocation is not a privilege possessed by the few, but God’s gift to all. The false dichotomy between the clergy and the laity, an issue central to the origins of both our traditions, is once again giving way to an integral vision of mission. Perhaps no issue is of greater practical significance today than the renewal of the ministry of the whole people of God.

C. Bishops

60) Both the UMC and the ELCA regard oversight (episcopé) as fundamental in the life of the church. Historically, both of our traditions had forms of oversight, often called “superintendents” or bishops, and subsequently both have adopted and adapted the “office” of bishop. While this office is not regarded as essential to the church, both churches have come to value the superintending function of this office and recognize ordination under either Lutheran or United Methodist discipline as having continuity with the apostolic tradition. The UMC “consecrates” bishops for life (or for terms in some parts of the world) and the ELCA “installs” bishops for a stated period of time subject to reelection, but neither view the episcopacy as a separate order of the ordained ministry.
61) The bishops’ length of service, their mode of selection, and their role in the governance structures of the church vary between the two churches (and even inside them given their global context), but their primary responsibilities are strikingly similar. In both traditions bishops are elected from among the ordained clergy who are called to the ministry of Word and Sacrament. Both affirm the primary pastoral role of the office. Bishops are given authority to preach, teach, and uphold the apostolic faith of the church; to lead all persons entrusted to their oversight in worship and in the celebration of the sacraments; to supervise and support the church’s life, work, and mission throughout the world; and to consecrate, commission, ordain, or authorize the ordination of persons for the ministries to which they are called.

62) Bishops are a crucial link in the network of relationships and processes that position men and women strategically in local congregations for ministry. Both our churches rely upon bishops to encourage and enable ecumenism on multiple levels within the life of the church. Bishops also stand in unique positions within the larger body of Christ to express God’s gift of unity in the church and to extend the ministry and mission of the church. To many outside the life of the church, they are the “face of the church” to the world.

63) Both churches look to Jesus Christ as the shepherd and “bishop” of our souls (1 Peter 2:25). In service to this Christ ELCA and UMC bishops play a crucial leadership role. Not only do they encourage ministry and uphold the gospel, they also exercise courageous and prophetic leadership in the cause of justice. Full communion between our two churches will enhance their oversight of the church in a number of ways. It will enable them to cooperate in the supervision of congregations and pastors in common geographical areas, to consult with one another and cooperate in new mission strategies and disciple-making initiatives, and to oversee the mutual interchange of ordained and lay ministers. Perhaps most critically, it will enable them to bear witness to the unity in the body of Christ, and it will enable our churches to be more effective in our common mission and prophetic vocation.

64) Both the ELCA and the UMC affirm that God’s self-revelation in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ summons the faithful to God’s mission in the world through the Holy Spirit as a gracious gift and challenging responsibility. Both affirm that the church is a people formed by God in Christ, empowered by the Holy Spirit, called and sent to give thanks for what God is doing in the world, witness to it, and participate in it. We are created and sustained for God’s mission in the world. Our common mission includes hearing and proclaiming the gospel and encouraging faithful response to it; baptizing and nurturing new believers; celebrating the Lord’s Supper; responding to human need through loving service; caring for God’s creation; challenging and seeking to transform unjust structures in society; and working toward peace in all the earth.

65) Evangelism constitutes a critical aspect of the church’s life in the world. The UMC declares that making disciples of Jesus Christ is its primary mission. In the ELCA the all-encompassing emphasis on the proclamation of the gospel in Word, Sacrament, and deed constitutes an eminent evangelistic impulse. The early followers of Martin Luther sought to rediscover the apostolic witness and mission of the church in sixteenth century Europe and the Methodist revival originated as a missional movement within the Anglican Church. Both emphasized the liberation and deliverance implicit in God’s evangelistic call of love and the offer of forgiveness that entails the response of repentance, faith, and obedience in love.

66) Both churches recognize the intimate connection between Baptism and discipleship. It is in Baptism that God makes us part of the church, the body of Christ on earth committed to God’s mission. They value catechesis and life-long learning as essential aspects of the church’s mission that nurture the Christian’s desire to be filled with all the fullness of God (Ephesians 3:19), and that equip the Christian for the life of discipleship. Both churches are deeply rooted in a Trinitarian theology of mission, bearing witness together to the one God who calls us all into the mission of the Son for the sake of the whole world in the power of the Holy Spirit.
67) God’s mission is most perfectly revealed in the life of Jesus who came “not to be served but to serve” (Mark 10:45), and “to bring good news to the poor . . . proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor” (Luke 2:18-19). Our baptismal vocation demands our bearing witness to and participating in God’s creating, redeeming, and sanctifying activity in the world. It particularly involves responding to human need and suffering wherever it is found. The ELCA and the UMC have extensive, and frequently shared, histories of compassion for the poor and humanitarian aid in the midst of human tragedy. One of the three “General Rules” from the early Methodist movement is to “do good and be merciful according to your power as far as is possible to all.” Lutherans have been guided by Martin Luther’s principle of the value of each person’s calling to serve God and neighbor in all walks of life. Thus, doing good to one’s neighbor always includes living justly in this world (Small Catechism, Fifth Commandment).

68) The ELCA and the UMC believe that faithfulness to God’s mission involves seeking to disclose, challenge, and dismantle unjust structures in society. Both affirm that all persons are equally valuable in the sight of God and are bound, therefore, to work for a world in which every person has the necessities for life with dignity. The UMC has a legacy of concern for social justice and has often taken forthright positions on controversial issues involving Christian values. The “Social Principles” of the UMC are a prayerful and thoughtful effort to champion justice, peace, and human well-being on the basis of biblical and theological foundations. The ELCA affirms that “the church is to witness to God’s call for justice in every aspect of life, including testimony against injustice and oppression, whether personal or systemic,” and “expects its ordained ministers to be committed to justice in the life of the church, in society, and in the world” (Vision and Expectations, p. 15). Both churches have repeatedly renewed their commitment to be faithful witnesses to the gospel message of shalom in their common life and work.

69) The Word of God speaks in creation, God’s saving love embraces the entire creation as it longs for fulfillment (Rom. 8:19-22), and the breath of God daily “renew[s] the face of the earth” (Psalm 104:30). Both the UMC and the ELCA affirm that God’s intimate involvement with the earth makes care for the earth an integral dimension of the church’s mission. Human devastation of God’s earth and its web of life is a sin that demands repentance and conversion. Both of our faith communities have begun to address ecological destruction, offering rich theological perspectives, biblical interpretation, and moral teaching. Restoration of a biblical view of life calls for deepening that commitment. The church in our time is called to promote lifestyle and systemic changes in society that enable a more ecologically just world. We are called to offer the unique resources of our faith traditions to the universal human task of building an ecologically sustainable and nourishing relationship between humankind and our generous planetary home, God’s good earth.

70) No area of our common faith bears more directly upon our lives in practical ways than God’s mission. Every aspect of this mission—the proclamation of the gospel through word, sacrament, and deed, the ongoing nurture of Jesus’ disciples, the service of all in need, the commitment of the community to peace with justice, and the stewardship of our fragile earthly home—is the responsibility of every Christian. Mission defines the life of the believer. This mission is both empowered by God’s gift of unity within the church and implements and makes visible the church’s unity for the world to see and believe. The unity of the church in this common witness, anticipating the final triumph of God’s Word in human affairs, emboldens the ELCA and the UMC to manifest the life of the gospel in the world and to serve as a prophetic sign of the reign of God.

71) In 2005, the Council of Bishops of The United Methodist Church unanimously recommended and the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America overwhelmingly adopted “Interim Eucharistic Sharing” between our two churches. In light of the convergence we have discovered and experienced in our conversations together, and given the absence of church-dividing differences, this bilateral dialogue recommends full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church, longing for that glorious day when all are one.
Return this completed form by January 15, 2007 to Research and Evaluation, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 8765 West Higgins Road, Chicago, IL 60631. Thank you for your participation.

☐ We are completing this response form as: (please enter number of persons)

_____ laypeople

_____ pastors

☐ This response comes from a study group composed of: (enter number of persons)

_____ Methodists and/or

_____ Lutherans and/or

_____ other(s): ________________________________________________

1) Which (if any) paragraphs (please cite numbers) of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA–UMC Bilateral Dialogue were unclear to you?

Please explain.

2) Please rate and explain what you found most helpful in each section of Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA–UMC Bilateral Dialogue.

“Preface,” “Triune God” and “Our Authorities” (Paragraphs 1-18):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Helpful</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:
“Salvation by Grace through Faith” (Paragraphs 19-31):

Not at all Helpful Very Helpful No Opinion
1 ○ ○ ○ 5 ○ ○
2 ○ ○ ○ 4 ○ ○
3 ○ ○ ○ 3 ○ ○
4 ○ ○ ○ 2 ○ ○

Please explain:

“The Sacraments” (Paragraphs 32-46):

Not at all Helpful Very Helpful No Opinion
1 ○ ○ ○ 5 ○ ○
2 ○ ○ ○ 4 ○ ○
3 ○ ○ ○ 3 ○ ○
4 ○ ○ ○ 2 ○ ○

Please explain:

“The Church and its Ministries “(Paragraphs 47-63):

Not at all Helpful Very Helpful No Opinion
1 ○ ○ ○ 5 ○ ○
2 ○ ○ ○ 4 ○ ○
3 ○ ○ ○ 3 ○ ○
4 ○ ○ ○ 2 ○ ○

Please explain:

“The World and Our Common Mission “(Paragraphs 64-71):

Not at all Helpful Very Helpful No Opinion
1 ○ ○ ○ 5 ○ ○
2 ○ ○ ○ 4 ○ ○
3 ○ ○ ○ 3 ○ ○
4 ○ ○ ○ 2 ○ ○

Please explain:
3) Is it clear from Confessing Our Faith Together: A Statement toward Full Communion by the ELCA–UMC Bilateral Dialogue how the communions complement each other?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Please explain.

4) What specific steps can your congregation take to make full communion visible in your community?

5) Please make any suggestions to the ELCA-UMC bilateral dialogue that will improve the Confessing Our Faith Together document.

6) Do you favor the establishment of a relationship of full communion between the ELCA and the UMC, as outlined in the “How to Start” section?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Why or why not?
APPENDIX A

POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTING RESOLUTION FOR FULL COMMUNION
BETWEEN THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA AND THE UNITED
METHODIST CHURCH

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) and The United Methodist Church (UMC) hereby agree that in their legislative bodies there shall be one vote to accept or reject, without separate amendment, the resolutions which follow. If adopted by both churches, each church agrees to take the following measures to establish a relationship of full communion:

WHEREAS Jesus Christ calls us to unity so that the world may believe; and

WHEREAS the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church share a common heritage of faith and a commitment to mission; and

WHEREAS “Confessing our Faith Together,” the report of the ELCA-UMC bilateral dialogue, affirmed that there are no church-dividing differences precluding full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The United Methodist Church hereby:

1) recognize in one another the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic faith as it is expressed in the Scriptures, confessed in the Church’s historic creeds, and attested to in the Lutheran Confessions and the doctrinal standards of The United Methodist Church;

2) recognize the authenticity of each other’s Baptism and Eucharist, and extend sacramental hospitality to one another’s members;

3) recognize the validity of our respective ministries, including:
   • each other’s ordination of persons to the Ministry of Word and Sacrament;
   • the authentic diaconal service of ordained deacons in the UMC and rostered lay ministers in the ELCA; and
   • each other’s polity and ministries of oversight (including the interpretation of church doctrines, discipline of members, authorization of persons for ordained and lay ministries, and provision for administrative functions);

4) recognize the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament, subject to the constitutionally approved invitation for ministry in each other’s churches;

5) authorize the establishment of a joint commission to:
   • coordinate the implementation of these resolutions;
   • assist joint planning for mission;
   • facilitate consultation and common decision-making through appropriate channels in fundamental matters that the churches may face together in the future; and
   • report regularly and appropriately to each church;
6) direct this joint commission to:
   • develop worship materials to celebrate our churches’ full communion;
   • foster on-going theological discussion;
   • formulate joint educational materials; and
   • encourage continuing education opportunities for lay and clergy leaders regarding full communion;

7) applaud one another’s ecumenical conversations with other church bodies acknowledging that each church remains free to pursue additional full communion agreements as each deems appropriate, so that the world may believe.
25 Articles of Religion – Upon recognition of American independence in 1783, John Wesley realized that the Methodists in America should become an independent church. Wesley furnished the American Methodists with a liturgy (The Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America) and a doctrinal statement— the Articles of Religion. Wesley revised the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion into twenty-four articles and the church in America revised them into the Twenty-Five Articles of Religion. (2004 Book of Discipline, page 50)

Associate in Ministry – An Associate in Ministry (AIM) is called to serve in one of the officially recognized lay ministries of the ELCA and works collegially with ordained clergy in a congregational or other recognized ministry of the ELCA.

Authorized/licensed Minister – In the UMC, persons who are not ordained as elders but who are appointed to preach and conduct divine worship and perform the duties of a pastor are licensed by the annual conference boards of ordained ministry. (2004 Book of Discipline, para. 315)

Bilateral – Pertaining to two communions or churches in dialogue, and to joint statements on agreements and differences resulting from dialogue. In line with its predecessor church bodies, the ELCA has pursued full communion through bilateral dialogues for the past forty years.

Book of Concord – Published June 25, 1580, fifty years to the day after the initial presentation of the Augsburg Confession, the Book of Concord is a collection of ten foundational documents for Lutheran theology: the three ecumenical creeds, Augsburg Confession, Apology, Smalcald Articles, Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope, Small Catechism, Large Catechism and Formula of Concord. It became the official standard of doctrine for most Lutheran churches.

Book of Discipline, The – A fundamental book outlining the law, doctrine, administration, organizational work, and procedures of The United Methodist Church. Each General Conference amends The Book of Discipline, and the actions of the General Conference are reflected in the quadrennial revision. Often referred to as The Discipline. (Sharing God’s Gifts Glossary of United Methodist Terms http://umcgiving.org/content/glossary.asp)

Commissioned ministers/ Commissioning – in the UMC, commissioned ministers are probationary members of the annual conference who are preparing for ordination as elders. The probationary period begins with a commissioning of the candidate for leadership and service in the name of Jesus Christ. (2004 Book of Discipline, para. 325)

Communion – A grouping of churches having common origins and traditions and in communion with each other nationally and/or internationally. The Lutheran World Federation is a communion of churches.

Confession of Faith, The – A statement devised by The Evangelical United Brethren Church. At the time of union in 1968 with The Methodist Church, the Confession of Faith was included in the Book of Discipline as one of the historic doctrinal statements of The United Methodist Church.
Consecration – In the UMC, elders who are elected to the office of bishop are consecrated, or set apart, for service. The Order for the Consecration of Bishops (Book of Worship, page 700) includes the sign- act of the laying on of hands by other bishops. Laying on of hands is a sign of episcopal unity and collegiality, signifying the bishop-elect’s empowerment by the Holy Spirit and admission to the duties of the office.

Coordinating Committee – Coordinating committees are instrumental in a full communion relationship with respect to the area of “reception.” Through a bilateral dialogue, the purpose of the coordinating committee is to find and initiate multiple ways in which both communions will learn about the nature of the full communion relationship, grow into the relationship, and facilitate a vision for the future of the relationship.

Churchwide Assembly – The biennial churchwide assembly is designated as the “highest legislative authority” in the ELCA. Synodical assemblies elect the clergy and lay voting members who will represent the Synod at the assembly that deals with the purposes, functions, and directions of ELCA ministries. The assembly also addresses issues that affect the life of the entire ELCA.

Deacon – In the UMC, a deacon is an ordained clergyperson who is called to serve all people, particularly the poor, the sick, and the oppressed, and to equip and lead the laity in ministries of compassion, justice, and service in the world. In this capacity, he or she leads the church in relating the gathered community to their ministries in the world, thus connecting the church’s worship with its service in the world. A deacon has the authority to teach and proclaim God’s Word, to lead in worship, to assist elders in the administration of the sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, to perform the marriage ceremony where the laws of the state permit, and to bury the dead. (Source: InfoServ)

Deaconess – In the UMC, a laywoman who, in response to God’s call and on recommendation by the General Board of Global Ministries, is commissioned by a bishop to share faith in Jesus Christ through ministries of love, justice, and service. Deaconesses serve the church in any capacity not requiring full clergy rights. They are related to the General Board of Global Ministries. A lifetime commitment to mission is presumed. (Sharing God’s Gifts Glossary of United Methodist Terms)

Dialogue – An exchange of traditions and ideas or opinions on particular issues, with a view to reaching an agreement or settlement. In the context of this document, dialogue is the conversation process in which teams of ELCA and UMC persons wrote this common confession.

Ecumenical – Pertaining to the “whole inhabited earth.” It is now used to describe the movement to restore unity to all Christians or to describe openness and self-examination shared with other Christians to the end that Christ’s prayer for unity might be fulfilled. It is sometimes used to describe any cooperative venture between communions.

Ecumenism: The Vision of the ELCA – Published in 1991, this document presents the ecumenical vision and a declaration of the ELCA’s ecumenical commitment. It is also available online (http://www.elca.org/ecumenical/vision.html). The UMC is said to be “constitutionally ecumenical,” because paragraph six of its constitution declares that the UMC will seek and work for unity at all levels of church life. See the website for the General Commission of Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns at www.gccuic-umc.org
**Elder** – In the UMC, an elder is a person ordained to a lifetime ministry of service, word, sacrament, and order. He or she is authorized to preach and teach God’s word, to administer the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, and to order the life of the church for mission and ministry. (*Sharing God’s Gifts Glossary of United Methodist Terms*)

**Epitome** – Written by Jacob Andrea in 1576, the *Epitome* is a summary of the work of Lutheran theologians who met at Torgau, Germany, to discuss theological controversies within Lutheranism. The *Epitome* is the first part of the *Formula of Concord*.

**Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA)** – This denomination was formed in 1987 by the merger of the Lutheran Church in America, The American Lutheran Church, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches.

**Formula of Concord** – The *Formula of Concord* (FC), written in 1577, is composed of two parts, the Solid Declaration and the Epitome. The twelve articles comprising the FC are a restatement and exposition of the Augsburg Confession that resolved the major controversial issues within early Lutheranism and formed the foundation for the *Book of Concord*.

**Full Communion** (from the biblical term *koinonia* meaning to share, to act together, to be in fellowship) – A relationship between two distinct churches or communions where each maintains its own autonomy and recognizes the catholicity and apostolicity of the other. The term often refers to an agreement of pulpit and table fellowship and includes mutual respect and consultation in teaching. For more characteristics of Full Communion see: [http://www.elca.org/ecumenical/FullCommunion/characteristics.html](http://www.elca.org/ecumenical/FullCommunion/characteristics.html)

**General Conference** – The highest legislative body in The United Methodist Church. The voting membership consists of an equal number of clergy and lay delegates elected by the annual conferences. General Conference convenes every quadrennium (four years) to enact legislation and to establish the general ministry of the church. It is the only body that can speak officially for the denomination. (*Sharing God’s Gifts Glossary of United Methodist Terms* [http://umcgiving.org/content/glossary.asp](http://umcgiving.org/content/glossary.asp))

**General Rules of the Methodist Church, The** – A set of rules devised in 1738 by John Wesley for his societies. According to *The Book of Discipline* (2004, page 48), “the General Rules were originally designed for members of the Methodist societies who participated in the sacramental life of the Church of England.” The three-fold rules connect faith and life, as John Wesley taught it. The rules are summarized this way: first: by doing no harm…; second: by… doing good of every possible sort…; and third, by attending upon all the ordinances of God. In 1743, Wesley published these in a pamphlet entitled *The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies*. The *General Rules* were approved by the American Methodist Church in 1785 and continue to be published as a part of *The Book of Discipline*.

**Koinonia** – a Greek word meaning to share, to act together, or to be in fellowship with one another. *Koinonia* occurs at least twenty-two times in the Bible. A unifying term, *koinonia* may be translated in a sense of communal *sharing* and activated *caritas* in the vital life of fellowship, Gospel, in Christ’s body and blood, in salvation, and in mission. In its most appropriate and unifying sense, Christians are a *koinonia* (i.e., a Christocentric and universal fellowship of sharing) called in Christ by and for the Gospel. In terms of method, *koinonia* ecclesiology is at heart Christocentric; in terms of vocation, Christians of every stripe share in a broad, global *koinonia*. In terms of unity, Christians are called to fellowship with one another from the linguistic and semantic ground of the Gospel. Finally, *koinonia* language in the New Testament is not a unity that assumes a former brokenness. Rather, Christians are
called from the healthy sinews of a living Gospel, recasting the ecumenically popular John 20:17 “That they may all be one,” as a phrase to be heard anew not from this side of our centuries-old ecclesial brokenness, but on the far first side of this divide, in the original and informative, unfractured ground of Gospel hope for unity in the world.

**Interim Eucharistic Sharing** – Interim Eucharistic sharing is a stage in official bilateral dialogue where two communions reach substantial agreement without unsettled issues considered church dividing. In a time of interim Eucharistic sharing, both communions have an opportunity to get to know one another. Congregations and other ministry contexts are encouraged to spend time together in study, praxis, further local discussion, and in sharing the Eucharist in worship. Interim Eucharistic sharing is understood as an important step on the way to a full communion relationship. For a view of the ELCA-UMC agreement on interim Eucharistic sharing, please visit:

**Local Pastor** – In the UMC, a local pastor is not ordained but is licensed and annually authorized by the district committee on ordained ministry to perform all duties of an ordained minister, including the sacraments, while assigned to a particular charge under the supervision of a district superintendent. A clergy mentor oversees the local pastor’s work in the course of study for ordained ministry and advises on matters of pastoral responsibility. (Sharing God’s Gifts Glossary of United Methodist Terms http://umcgiving.org/content/glossary.asp)

**Luther, Martin** – The founder of the Lutheran movement. Martin Luther (1483-1546) was born and died in Eisleben, Germany. Luther is known as the Father of Protestantism. He had studied to become a lawyer before becoming an Augustinian monk in 1505, and was ordained a priest in 1507. While continuing his studies in pursuit of a Doctor of Theology degree, he discovered significant differences between what he read in the Bible and the theology and practices of the church. On October 31, 1517, he posted a challenge on the church door at Wittenberg University to debate 95 theological issues. Luther’s hope was that the church would reform its practice and preaching to be more consistent with the Word of God as contained in the Bible.

What started as an academic debate escalated to a religious war, fueled by fiery temperaments and violent language on both sides. As a result, there was not a reformation of the church but a separation. “Lutheran” was a name applied to Luther and his followers as an insult but adopted as a badge of honor by them instead. Lutherans still celebrate the Reformation on October 31 and still hold to the basic principles of theology and practice espoused by Luther, such as Sola Gratia (saved by the grace of God alone), Sola Fide (Salvation is through faith alone), and Sola Scriptura (The Bible is the only norm of doctrine and life).

**Lutheran World Federation** – The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) is a global communion of Christian churches in the Lutheran tradition. The LWF currently has 138 member churches in 77 countries all over the world, with a membership of nearly 65 million Lutherans.

**Means of Grace** – The practice of Word and Sacrament ministries as understood by the ELCA. For an in depth discussion, see: Principles for Worship: Renewing Worship Vol. 2. Augsburg Fortress, 2002. It is also available online: http://www.elca.org/dcm/worship/worship/sacraments/umg.html

**Prevenient Grace** – For United Methodists, prevenient grace is “the divine love that surrounds all humanity and precedes any and all of our conscious impulses. This grace prompts our first wish to please God, our first glimmer of understanding concerning God’s will, and our ‘first slight transient conviction’ of having sinned against God.” (2004 Book of Discipline, page 46).
Probationary members – In the UMC, probationary members are candidates for ordination. Ordinarily, probationary members have completed all of the educational and other requirements for ordination and are recommended for a probationary or review period (minimum of 3 years) before ordination.

Round – The bilateral dialogue teams of ELCA and UMC persons met in three rounds of study and conversation. Each round lasted several years. The most recent round began in 2001 and involved several meetings of the participants.

Solid Declaration – Theologians met at Bergen Abbey in Germany in 1577 to discuss the formulations of the Lutheran Theologians at Torgau (see Épitome above). The Solid Declaration became the product of these negotiations and the second part of the Formula of Concord.

Standard Sermons – John Wesley’s standard sermons, preached between 1746 and 1760, are collected in the first four volumes of Wesley’s Sermons on Several Occasions. Although the precise number of sermons (about 53) is disputed between British and American Methodists, the sermons serve as a doctrinal authority because they lay out John Wesley’s unique understanding of the way of salvation.

Unaltered Augsburg Confession – The first version of the Augsburg Confession (AC) was written in 1530 by Philip Melanchthon and presented to Charles V at the Diet of Augsburg as a statement of Lutheran beliefs. This is the version found in the Book of Concord. In 1540, Melanchthon revised some of the articles of the AC into an “Altered Augsburg Confession.” The 1540 version is also known as the variata.

United Methodist Church, The (UMC) – This denomination was established in 1968 by the union of The Evangelical United Brethren Church and The Methodist Church. It has more than 10 million members in sixty-three Annual Conferences in the United States and nearly forty conferences outside the United States (Africa, Europe, and the Philippines). (http://www.umc.org)

Wesley, John – The founder of the Methodist movement within the Church of England. John Wesley (1703-1791) was born at Epworth, England, the son of a Church of England clergyman. He graduated from Christ College, Oxford. A priest himself, John was, for a brief period, a missionary to Georgia. A prolific preacher and writer, his writings provided a core of standard doctrine and interpretation to guide the new Methodist movement. In 1784, he sent instructions to America for the formation of a separate Methodist church for the United States. (A Dictionary for United Methodists, Alan K. Waltz, Copyright 1991, Abingdon Press. Used by Permission.)
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This proposal and all attachments are proprietary information for use by the United Nations Foundation, its donor organizations, the ELCA and the LCMS.
1. **Organization and Project Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name: Lutheran World Relief</th>
<th>Submission Date: February 29, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contact Information:**

- Primary Contact Name: John Arthur Nunes
- Primary Contact Title: President and CEO
- Address: 700 Light Street, Baltimore, MD, 21230
- Telephone: 410-230-2811, Fax: 410-230-2882
- E-mail address: jnunes@lwr.org, Website: www.lwr.org

**Proposed Grant Information:**

- Project title: The Lutheran Malaria Initiative
- Project Duration: 3 years
- Geographic location: United States
- Proposed grant amount: $2,599,946

**Project Description (Please limit to 200 words or less):**

The Lutheran Malaria Initiative is a partnership between Lutheran World Relief, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. Through an intensive education, advocacy and fundraising campaign the LMI partners plan to mobilize eight million U.S. Lutherans to combat one of the world’s most debilitating diseases. The minimum fundraising goal for this campaign is $75 million over five years. Funds raised will be programmed through existing and expanded partnerships in malaria affected areas, primarily in Africa. Resources will also be shared with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, creating new partnerships and roles for faith-based organizations in the field of global health.

Activities during the first phase (years one through three) of the LMI will include hiring fundraising counsel to provide guidance for the creation of the campaign, hiring joint and partner specific LMI staff, conducting joint U.S. based pilots to test messages and materials before the official launch of the campaign, soliciting LMI contributions from donors, educating and raising awareness through existing communication channels, receiving final approval from both church body governance structures and officially launching the LMI.
2. **Questionnaire:** In keeping with UNF standards of practice, the following questions must be answered. Please check the appropriate box, yes or no. If you have checked YES for any question, please provide an addendum explaining the circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project will involve collaboration with for-profit companies (i.e. consulting companies or other vendors)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project will involve use or creation of intellectual property?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proposal contains proprietary information? (If the answer is yes, please answer the following three questions. If no, please proceed to question #4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) Is the proposed research likely to lead to any materials that could be copyrighted, trademarked or commercially exploited?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b) Is the proposed project and related IP subject to any agreements (e.g., licenses, collaborations, research or funding agreements or any other form of agreement) with commercial, academic, or other organizations, including other funding entities, subgrantees or subcontractors?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c) Does your organization plan to assume responsibility for production and dissemination of the project materials?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Project will involve the collection and analysis of identifying medical, personal, or lifestyle information?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does your organization or any organization to be supported by these funds conduct lobbying?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Executive Summary**

The Lutheran Malaria Initiative (LMI), a proposed partnership between Lutheran World Relief (LWR), the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), and The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS) – coordinated and led by LWR – was devised and developed through repeated discussions between the partners and the United Nations Foundation (UNF). Results of an LWR LMI Campaign Feasibility Study, which demonstrated U.S. Lutherans’ interest in joining LWR in the fight to combat malaria, resulted in LWR submitting a concept paper to UNF. LWR was subsequently invited to submit a full proposal for the LMI.

At the heart of the LMI is the desire to end one of the world’s most debilitating diseases by engaging the power, unity and strength of eight million U.S. Lutherans. LWR predicts that U.S. Lutherans will readily come together around a common cause – a focus on eradicating malaria – in ways that will show unprecedented results. By entering into the global malaria campaign, the LMI partners will be able to draw on the previously untapped potential of their domestic and international partnerships and networks. Additionally, LWR and the church bodies will come together on a powerful, global rallying point – an opportunity to tackle, together, one of the Millennium Development Goals.

In recent years, world-wide efforts – led in great part by the UNF – to combat malaria have created innovative strategies that continue to gain attention, energy and results. The LMI partners seek to bring their U.S. constituencies, overseas field staff and partners, and network of church and faith-based organizations (FBOs) into the global malaria movement. Additionally, the LMI partners view malaria as an entry point as well as a complement to engagement, organizing, fundraising and programmatic work on the full continuum of global health issues, including HIV/AIDS. Other health issues can and will be addressed through the infrastructure created for malaria.

The overarching goal of the LMI is to raise resources and create structures to combat diseases of global health. Specific goals for the first phase of the campaign are to increase the capacity of the LMI partners to launch a fundraising campaign to raise approximately $75 million over five years to combat malaria, and to a lesser extent, HIV/AIDS; and to implement a coordinated effort by the LMI partners to educate and raise awareness among U.S. Lutherans about malaria and other global health issues, resulting in constituent engagement with the LMI through leadership, outreach and advocacy activities. Resources raised will also be shared with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, creating new partnerships and roles for faith-based organizations in the field of global health.

The leadership structure of the LMI will be a Governing Committee comprised of one representative from each of the LMI partners and chaired by the Executive Vice-president of LWR. The Governing Committee will be charged with ensuring communication to and from LMI and the leadership of each partner. This will ensure that the leadership of the partners — the Presiding Bishop of the ELCA, the President of the LCMS, and the
President of LWR — as well as the respective boards of directors, church councils and executive teams of the partners understand the direction of LMI, provide input to it, and support it. There will also be four staff positions, based in Baltimore, shared jointly by the three partners.

Activities during the first phase (years one through three) of the LMI will include hiring fundraising counsel to provide guidance for the creation of the campaign, hiring joint and partner specific LMI staff, conducting joint U.S. based pilots to test messages and materials before the official launch of the campaign, soliciting LMI contributions from donors, educating and raising awareness through existing communication channels, receiving final approval from both church body governance structures and officially launching the LMI.

Potential challenges include campaign coordination, coordinating outreach to donors, and the lack of a precedent for a campaign of this nature. Given the distinct structures of the two church bodies the LMI will not be officially and comprehensively launched until July 2010, though LMI activities will begin immediately. It will be a challenge to engage some Lutherans on the issue of malaria early, and then maintain their interest until the official launch of the campaign. Additionally, since there is considerable overlap between LWR’s donors and those of the ELCA and the LCMS, there is potential for donors to be contacted by multiple LMI partners, leading to donor fatigue. There is also potential for conflict when crediting contributions, particularly major gifts, towards each partner’s campaign goal. The LMI partners acknowledge these challenges and are working closely to find appropriate solutions.

LWR and its partners are requesting $ 2,599,946 from UNF for the first three years of the campaign. These funds will be allocated for activities in years one and two, with funding for activities in year three raised through other sources. Additionally, each of the LMI partners will use existing resources to cover a portion of LMI costs. These include costs associated with current and new staff, feasibility studies, communication and outreach materials and programming in the field.

After decades of neglect, the world is turning its attention to malaria. Individual, separate techniques to prevent, treat and eliminate malaria have been proven on a small scale. The challenge now is to integrate these techniques into a consistent pattern and implement them in countries of greatest need. The global fight against malaria needs more resources and more attention to succeed. Powerful faith-based organizations like Lutheran World Relief and its related church bodies are well-positioned to mobilize these financial, human, political and grassroots resources.
4. **Background and Rationale**

4.1 **LMI Partners’ History, Mission and Prior Experience with Malaria**

4.1.1 **Lutheran World Relief**

LWR is an NGO founded in 1945 to respond to the needs of communities devastated by World War II. Since then, it has evolved from a relief agency to an organization that works with partners worldwide to respond to emergencies, seek lasting solutions to rural poverty and promote peace and justice for all.

LWR works in 35 countries, helping communities increase and expand the resources they need to live productive, healthy and empowered lives. LWR’s development programs contribute to socially, economically and environmentally sustainable rural communities through primary health care, improved livelihoods, access to potable water, increased food security and sound management of scarce natural resources and physical assets. LWR is also acknowledged as a leader in the field of gender equity for its work to involve and empower women in the development process. LWR concentrates its programs in highly impoverished and marginalized rural areas. Each region – East Africa, West Africa, South America, Central America, South Asia and Southeast Asia – is served by a regional office and country-based program managers with expertise in program design, monitoring, financial management and key technical areas.

LWR works with and through local FBOs and community-based organizations (CBOs), providing grants, technical assistance and organizational capacity-building. LWR’s accompaniment approach promotes intrinsically motivated and sustainable development within remote, forgotten, or marginalized communities. By working in partnership with organizations that are part of the existing social fabric, LWR is acknowledged and respected by communities as an effective and trusted advocate in their development process. LWR’s efforts are designed to ensure equal access to services and full participation of everyone involved.

LWR has an annual budget of approximately $35 million funded primarily by the two major Lutheran churches in America, individuals and individual congregations, and U.S. government and foundation grants.

4.1.2 **LWR’s Constituent Base**

LWR is able to undertake the work described above due to one of its greatest assets: its supporters. Deeply rooted in communities, many international FBOs and their networks have the trust of a loyal constituency built through decades of effective programming in the field, strong values and effectiveness; LWR is a leader among them.

Recently completed general audience research showed that constituents consistently and overwhelmingly use three themes to describe their relationship with LWR: trust, loyalty, and “that’s [LWR] where I put my faith into action.” As a ministry of the two largest Lutheran denominations in the U.S., the ELCA and the LCMS, many of LWR’s supporters come from its relations with the two church bodies and their combined 7.2
million members. The two church bodies provide institutional support, are represented in the governance of LWR, and many of their individual members and congregations have a long history of actively engaging in and supporting LWR’s work.

Since LWR’s earliest days, Lutherans across the country have engaged with the organization by making handmade quilts, school and health kits, and layettes that LWR uses primarily in chronic emergency and refugee camp settings. Lutherans have also responded enthusiastically to other opportunities to get involved with LWR and actively support its mission: LWR’s Fair Trade program for congregations is so successful that it has become a model for other FBOs, and LWR’s efforts to involve constituents in advocacy have empowered Lutherans to put their faith into action by engaging with their elected officials on issues of justice while also having a significant, positive impact on many U.S. policy debates. Through its Fair Trade campaigns, parish projects, study tours, speakers bureau and community action groups, LWR has proven that there is untapped interest in global issues among U.S. Lutherans, and that once engaged, these networks can be very powerful.

As a Lutheran organization, LWR has the ability to connect with its constituents in ways that other development organizations might not. From within the Lutheran faith context, LWR’s organizational theology directly affects how our constituents hear issues of justice and global relationality and how they act in that global context. In other words, our Lutheran understanding of God’s intentions in the world matter profoundly for how we regard humanity.

LWR sees the Lutheran Malaria Initiative as part and parcel with our mission: to create a world where each person and every generation lives in justice, dignity and peace. Our uniquely Lutheran expression of faith equips us to empower constituents in distinctive and invigorating ways of showing God’s mercy in the world. And our constituents’ empowering understanding of vocation makes them a potent force for change on local, national and global levels.

4.1.3 LMI Partners: The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod

The LCMS is the second largest Lutheran church body in North America and is made up of 2.4 million members in 6,155 congregations in 35 districts. The LCMS has ten colleges, two seminaries, a network of preschool, elementary and high schools, over 300 recognized service organizations and national women’s and men’s organizations.

Internationally, the LCMS conducts missions or maintains relations with churches in more than 80 different countries. The LCMS is a member of the International Lutheran Council (ILC) and is in altar and pulpit fellowship with 30 partner Churches.

LCMS World Relief and Human Care (WRHC), the mercy arm of the LCMS, works through a broad network of diverse partners, developing mutual capacities and enabling
partners to address human suffering as part of their ministry. Partners also equip people with the necessary capacity to build self-sufficiency following natural and man-made disasters or emergencies, and in the midst of enduring human care needs.

For decades, WRHC has supported LWR’s work. In addition, through bilateral relations between WRCH and LWR, communities receive assistance improving agriculture, nutrition and education; attaining sources of healthy water; and introducing or enhancing literacy, education or vocational training. WRHC also helps meet emergency needs when drought or other natural disasters, epidemic or conflict disrupts a community's normal economic activity. During the past three fiscal years, $20 million was contributed each year, including $5.5 million for tsunami relief efforts and $13.5 million for Katrina/Rita relief efforts.

The LCMS Foundation has assisted the LCMS in numerous fundraising campaigns and is currently involved in a campaign to raise $100 million to be used for planting new congregations, revitalizing existing congregations, supporting mission initiatives in districts and providing resources for national and international LCMS World Mission (WM) projects. The timeframe for raising the funds is from 2004 to 2010.

*The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*

The ELCA is made up of 4.8 million members in 10,500 congregations in 65 synods (many of which have direct relationships with companion synods in other countries). The ELCA has 28 colleges, eight seminaries, a network of elementary and Sunday schools, national women’s and men’s organizations and a host of related agencies. Additionally, the ELCA is a member of Lutheran Services in America (LSA), an alliance of the ELCA, the LCMS, and their related social ministry organizations.

The ELCA participates in global mission through its Global Mission unit, which expends over $30 million annually, out of a total church budget of over $100 million. ELCA Global Mission accompanies Lutheran churches in other countries by providing grants and sending mission personnel for specific tasks identified by those churches. In 2006, $5.5 million in grants support the churches’ work in health care, education, relief, and sustainable development, in addition to evangelism, leadership development, communication, and administration. Over 250 ELCA international personnel work at the request and under the supervision of companion churches in 48 countries, a substantial number of whom service in health care work.

Each year, the ELCA’s World Hunger Appeal raises approximately $20 million through designated offerings and donations from ELCA members, congregations and friends to support partner organizations that carry out international relief and development on the ELCA’s behalf and to support education and advocacy efforts. This includes annually disbursing approximately $12 million in World Hunger Funds for international health, development and relief programs sponsored by LWR, the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), ecumenical agencies and 74 companion churches around the world. The Presiding Bishop of the ELCA, Mark Hanson, currently serves as president of the LWF, which has 67 million members in 78 countries.
The ELCA Companion Synod programs provide opportunities for synod-to-synod and even congregation-to-congregation relationships, building deep people-to-people relationships and sharing resources. For example, ELCA synods in North Dakota and eastern Texas/Louisiana Gulf Coast and related Lutheran organizations have built relationships with the ELCA’s companion church in the Central Africa Republic. They provide support for special projects, such as Village Education, HIV/AIDS outreach, women’s scholarships, the renovation and operation of a health clinic in Gallo, that complement the work done by the national church. Though these and countless other financial and programmatic exchanges are not quantified in the ELCA’s financial records, they represent significant amounts of additional support for programs overseas.

The ELCA engages in major fundraising efforts through a number of different avenues, all managed by its Development Services unit. A network of ELCA Foundation Regional Gift Planners across the U.S. encourages lifelong stewardship in support of the ministries of the ELCA. Since 1988, the ELCA foundation has raised $436 million in outright and deferred gifts; currently manages 5,600 life income agreements with a gift value of $187 million, making $10 million in income distributions to individuals in 2005; and has 1,461 endowment accounts with a market value of $319 million. The ELCA is currently planning a broad fundraising campaign that will be launched in 2008 and will seek substantial support for all ELCA priorities. The LMI and HIV/AIDS will be major components of this campaign.

The ELCA’s Fund for Leaders in Mission is another significant fundraising operation within the ELCA. The Fund seeks to provide support to all qualified students preparing for ordained or rostered lay ministry through one of the eight ELCA seminaries. Over the past six years, the Fund has awarded 200 tuition scholarships totaling over $2,200,000 and has received more than $28 million in gifts and deferred gift commitments.

4.1.4 LMI Partners’ Approach and Experience with Malaria

LWR’s approach to global health and rural development is grounded in several core themes that the LMI partners believe are uniquely suited to address malaria. These include:

- Mobilizing communities in rural, underserved areas to improve their own access to services;
- Working predominantly through existing local partners and networks to build sustainable ownership and capacities;
- Identifying existing skills, resources and assets upon which global health and development initiatives can be built; and
- Developing strong and long lasting relationships with targeted communities.

LWR believes for communities to be productive and sustainable, they need healthy foundations. If people cannot work due to illness, such as malaria, the community’s asset base is eroded, increasing the obstacles to development. LWR’s experience and strength is not to address global health issues in a technical or purely curative fashion, but rather
to incorporate knowledge and practices supportive of healthy outcomes into an integrated community-based approach that links food security, income generation, advocacy and rights and community organizing into mutually reinforcing elements of a broad series of interventions and support.

For details about current malaria programming for the LMI partners, see section 9.3.

4.2 Planning Phases of the Project

4.2.1 LWR’s Relationship with the United Nations Foundation

LWR met the United Nations Foundation through various networking opportunities, during which LWR spoke about its experience in mobilizing U.S. Lutherans on issues of global importance. Through the course of several months, the foundation came to understand LWR’s experience with U.S. Lutherans as well as its international programming.

4.2.2 The LMI Campaign Feasibility Study

To assess the leadership and support of its constituency to engage in a major fundraising campaign to support a malaria initiative, LWR (with the support of the UNF) retained Community Counselling Service (CCS), an international fundraising and management consulting firm, to conduct a Campaign Feasibility and Planning Study (Appendix C). For the study, CCS interviewed 94 of LWR’s leading constituents, including LWR board members, donors, friends and key leaders in the LCMS and ELCA, to determine whether a campaign for the LMI would be possible and to begin to determine what sort of structure, goal, and timetable would be necessary to conduct a successful effort.1

According to CCS, the results of the study demonstrate a significant positive response to LWR and the LMI. When presented with the key opportunities of the LMI – partnership on a massive scale and the potential for Lutherans to impact a major global health issue to such a great degree – respondents referred to the campaign as essential. One respondent replied, “We have to do this!” Below are examples of interview questions and responses that demonstrate this support.

• What is your reaction to a proposed campaign to fund this initiative?
  o 82% of respondents stated their reaction is favorable

• The goal of LWR is to raise $75 million. Do you think this goal is achievable?
  o 56% of respondents answered “yes”

• Would you make a gift to a campaign?
  o 88% of respondents answered “yes”

---


This proposal and all attachments are proprietary information for use by the United Nations Foundation, its donor organizations, the ELCA and the LCMS.
• Would you be willing to solicit a gift?
  o 50% of respondents answered “yes”

• Should Lutheran World Relief conduct a campaign for malaria?
  o 79% of respondents answered “yes”

4.3 Purpose of the Grant and Proposed Activities

With this initiative LWR will work with the ELCA and the LCMS to build the outreach and fundraising capacity of the Lutheran community and to mobilize investment and action for the international fight to end malaria, a disease with devastating impact on global health. Over the period of this grant, the partners will mobilize and empower Luthers and partners to reduce the level and impact of malaria in the world’s poorest countries through a focused and fully integrated fundraising and communication campaign, active involvement in awareness raising and political action and through investment in proven strategies in the field. LWR, in collaboration with the LCMS and the ELCA, will work with the UNF and the Global Fund through a comprehensive, integrated campaign aimed at generating and investing significant funds toward this effort. For this fundraising initiative, the minimum objective would be $75 million (over five years). The tentative goals per partner are $25 million for LWR, $30 million for the ELCA ($20 million for malaria and $10 million for HIV/AIDS) and $20 million for the LCMS. LWR, the ELCA and the LCMS will engage a wide range of partner agencies and related networks in this campaign.

4.4 Program Alignment with the Goals and Mission of UNF

The LMI is aligned with UNF’s mission to implement partnerships to address the world’s most pressing problems – in this case malaria. Support for the LMI will develop new partnerships, not only between UNF, the Global Fund and LWR, but also between LWR and its supporting church bodies – the ELCA and the LCMS. Implementation of the LMI will increase the capacity of these Lutheran entities, as well as the constituency of Luthers throughout the U.S. and beyond, to support UNF’s objective of improving global health by eradicating malaria. The LMI will transform LWR, ELCA and LCMS supporters from a group with a common interest in their faith, to one that also shares a common interest in improving global health.

More specifically, the LMI will help UNF reach its objective of decreasing childhood mortality through community based programs. Field programs supported with funds raised through the LMI will change the behaviors of children and their caretakers to not only prevent malaria, through such means as the distribution of insecticide treated bed nets, but also to be better able to recognize the signs and symptoms of malaria early and to seek the appropriate care.
4.5 Benefits for the LMI Partners

4.5.1 Increased Fundraising Capacity
Through the LMI, the fundraising efforts of LWR, the ELCA and the LCMS, especially for major gifts, will expand exponentially due to clearer identification of major donors and a more in-depth knowledge of their capacity and interests. Careful coordination, collaboration and creation of joint resources and resource templates and communication and fundraising efforts will ensure the LMI works both as a joint effort and as a way to build each individual institution’s capacities. Together, the church bodies and LWR will be able to bring unprecedented numbers of annual fund donors, grassroots advocates and volunteers to the malaria campaign each year.

4.5.2 A Rhetoric of Mobilization: Putting the “L” in the Lutheran Malaria Initiative
LWR’s professional qualitative and quantitative audience research (completed separately from the LMI feasibility research in September of 2007) demonstrates that engagement, mobilization and contributions all increase when LWR’s constituents, U.S. Lutherans, are called to support particularly Lutheran initiatives. LWR’s audience research shows that people were drawn to LWR for two key reasons: because it is Lutheran and because individuals trust LWR’s expertise in acting where they do not feel equipped to do so. Most audience research participants reported that they knew there were other organizations doing relief and development work, but they chose to support the work of LWR and/or that of their representative denomination because they wanted to be directly connected to and involved in the “great work Lutherans are doing around the world.”

Since more than 90 percent of LWR’s supporters are Lutheran and since those supporters indicated that the “Lutheran-ness” of causes and organizations they support is important to them, the partners will benefit from a malaria awareness-raising and engagement campaign that speaks specifically to Lutheran identity, motivation and theology. The LMI will create its own specifically Lutheran rhetoric of mobilization and engagement. Doing so will enable the LMI partners to mobilize Lutherans throughout the U.S. and beyond to become a core constituency in the fight against malaria. Additionally, it is anticipated that once these populations are joined and organized, they will be easily mobilized for future initiatives.

4.5.3 Lutheran Church Bodies Come Together
Through the LMI the Lutheran church bodies and LWR will come together as never before on an all-Lutheran effort in the fight against malaria. The process of producing the initial concept paper for UNF facilitated communications and organization between the three partners that had been difficult to achieve in the past. It is anticipated that through the LMI, relationships between the three partners will be strengthened, leading to greater and more effective collaboration in the future.

4.5.4 Expanded Relationships with Ecumenical Partners and Alliances
The LMI will coordinate a strategy to involve partners outside the U.S., including the LWF and ACT Development. LWR comprises 67 million members in 78 countries. ACT Development is a recently formed alliance of churches and church-related
development organizations aimed at eradicating poverty, injustice and the abuse of human rights. Both LWF and ACT Development have expressed interest in building on the momentum from the LMI to mobilize Lutherans and other Christians around the globe to combat malaria. Conversations are at the early stage, but LWR has been invited to present LMI to the Executive Committee of ACT Development.

### 4.5.5 Malaria and Global Health

The LMI partners view malaria as a new entry point to engagement, organizing, fundraising and programmatic work on the full continuum of global health issues, complementing its ongoing work in this arena. Other health issues can and will be addressed through the infrastructure created for malaria, even as malaria work can and will be furthered through the use of existing health infrastructures. The three partners envision the LMI not just as an initiative to combat malaria, but rather a vehicle for mobilizing and empowering Lutherans in the U.S. and beyond for a long-term response to issues related to global health.

### 4.5.6 Partnership with the Global Fund

The LMI will contribute a percentage of the funds raised for malaria to the Global Fund. To the extent possible, this funding will be directed to those countries where LMI partner programming is underway or where U.S. constituents suggest a priority. Funding will also be prioritized to support Global Fund engagement with civil society and faith-based efforts.

For the LMI, supporting the Global Fund provides an economy of scale to reach more people with more services than the LMI could reach on its own. It also provides a platform of partnership that will enable the LMI to increase its skills and capacities in program design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation and bridge the current gaps between State actors, civil society, and Government agencies. Additionally, the Global Fund offers a source of future funding for churches and FBOs that is currently not accessible to them.

Partnership with the Global Fund will give the LMI increased voice and leverage through which churches and FBOs can participate within and influence the Global Fund. Partnership with the Global Fund is likely to open the door for partners in the field to participate in the Global Fund's Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs) whereby they are recognized in their own countries as important players in the provision of health services. Over time, partnering with the Global Fund, and participating in the CCM process will increase the capacity of the churches and increase their ability to compete for funds from the Global Fund.

Additionally, the LMI proposes to develop and engage the Advisory Committee of the Global Fund. Though government contributions to the Global Fund cannot be earmarked, individual contributions can. However, aside from (PRODUCT)RED, there are not yet mechanisms in place for earmarking these contributions. The LMI would create a mechanism within the Global Fund whereby the Advisory Committee would recommend
projects directly to the LMI for funding, further elevating the role of the LMI, and thus FBOs, within the Global Fund.

LMI’s active partnership with the Global Fund will send an important message that churches can and do play an active role on the international stage and serve as a catalyst for other such efforts. By actively partnering with and supporting the efforts of the Global Fund, the LMI can be a more powerful advocate and connected part of the solution to the world’s most pressing global health challenges than it could on its own. Recognizing that only six percent of Global Fund resources have gone to FBOs to date, LWR and its partners consider FBOs an under-utilized resource for the fight against malaria. The LMI looks forward to working with UNF and the Global Fund Advisory Committee to strengthen the connection between the Global Fund and FBOs.

5. Proposed Goals

5.1 Goals of the First Phase of the LMI

The overarching goal of the LMI is to raise resources and create structures to combat diseases of global health. Goals specific to the first phase of the LMI campaign include:

**Goal 1:** Increase the fundraising capacity of the LMI partners to launch a fundraising campaign to raise approximately $75 million over five years to combat malaria, and to a lesser extent, HIV/AIDS.

**Goal 2:** Implement a coordinated effort by the LMI partners to educate and raise awareness among U.S. Lutherans about malaria and other global health issues, resulting in constituent engagement with the LMI through leadership, outreach and advocacy activities.

5.2 Objectives of the LMI

**Objective 1:** Conduct outreach and solicit donations through direct mail as well as major gift work.

**Objective 2:** Conduct four pilots, limited in time and geography, in representative areas throughout the U.S. to produce and test messages, activities and materials to be used for the nationwide launch of the LMI.

**Objective 3:** Use pre-established events and communication mechanisms to educate over 600,000 U.S. Lutherans about malaria and the LMI, and engage them in furthering the goals of the campaign.

**Objective 4:** Gain approval from the two Lutheran church body governance structures and officially launch the LMI.
Objective 5: In conjunction with UNF, form a program advisory committee to provide high level advice, coordination and planning to LMI actors and strengthen relationships with the Global Fund.

6. Program Design and Leadership Structure

The LMI is conceived as an effort through which many parties – individuals, congregations, groups, agencies and church bodies – will contribute their time, talents and resources to containing and eliminating malaria. Co-visioned and co-designed by the core members of the LMI (LWR, LCMS, ELCA), the campaign will reflect the different identities of each of the campaign’s institutional actors as well as their need to work in ways that are most effective and appropriate within their system. At the same time, the LMI will seek to mobilize often interlocking networks of constituents in a strategic and synergistic way, building on the strengths of each of the three core LMI partners.

6.1 Campaign Design and Methods

Employing a “federal” approach, the core group will encourage maximum creativity while agreeing to common standards, visual identity and campaign themes. LMI may look different as the different partners implement it. At the same time, many aspects of the LMI will be standardized, such as educational materials and data collection for monitoring and evaluating projects. The LMI will develop a clear timeline of separate and common activities that maximizes the potential within all three of the systems and avoids duplication of effort and confusion among common Lutheran constituents.

During the first two and a half years of the LMI, the partners will engage in U.S. based pilots, limited in time and geography, to develop and test messages, activities and materials to be used for the nationwide launch of the LMI. Pilots will be an effective activity for the LMI to test and refine the approach to implementing the campaign on a small scale before rolling it out on a national scale. By evaluating and learning from the pilot experience, a smooth launch of the official campaign will be ensured. In addition, since the ELCA and the LCMS need the approval of their governing bodies before launching a church-wide campaign, engaging in a pilot phase will allow the LMI to begin in select areas to create momentum and excitement among Lutherans before the campaign is officially adopted by the church bodies.

The three partners will agree on criteria to be used for the selection of pilot areas, and will jointly choose the four geographic areas in which to run pilots. Criteria for selection might include a diversity of audiences with which to test messages and activities, such as both large and small congregations; colleges, universities or seminaries; Lutheran elementary, middle or high schools; active men’s and women’s groups; companion synod or partner church relationships in Africa; and a good representation of both ELCA and LCMS congregations as well as congregations or individuals involved with LWR. Pilot areas will also have the support of the synod bishop (ELCA) and district president (LCMS) as well as buy-in at the congregational and individual level. Another
consideration might be the presence of individuals with major gift capacity. Some potential pilot areas include Texas, Minneapolis-St. Paul, North or South Carolina, Delaware/Maryland, Pennsylvania and Southern California.

Pilots will be designed to both inform Lutherans about the scourge of malaria and actively involve them in the solution. The LMI partners will work with counsel, as well as with leaders in the pilot areas to determine specific outcomes and learnings needed from the pilot projects in order to prepare for the launch of a nationwide campaign.

While the pilots are being conducted, the LMI partners will begin soliciting contributions from donors and reaching out to U.S. Lutherans through existing communication channels, such as newsletters and direct mailings, as well as pre-established events, such as annual meetings of women and youth groups. These introductions to the LMI will begin the process of educating U.S. Lutherans about malaria so they are prepared to participate in the initiative immediately after it is launched.

After the national launch of the LMI, education, fundraising and advocacy activities will increase. Additionally, there will be new emphasis on programmatic activities in the field – those activities that will directly impact malaria. Funds raised through the LMI will support existing and emerging programs to address malaria through such means as the procurement and distribution of bed nets, enhancing local health infrastructures to provide immediate care to those with malaria, and other means to control the spread of the disease. LWR has deep programmatic relationships throughout Africa, Latin America and Asia, which complement the church-to-church and multi-lateral church relationships of the LCMS and the ELCA in those regions.

Resources will also be channeled to the Global Fund, the world’s largest funder for malaria programs. This effort plays a critical role in mobilizing and organizing country level plans, drawing in a wide range of multilateral, governmental and civil society efforts.

6.2 Governance

The LMI Governing Committee, convened by Lutheran World Relief, will comprise one representative from each of the LMI partners (ELCA, LCMS, LWR). The grant agreement from UNF to LWR and LWR’s sub-agreements with the ELCA and the LCMS will form the basis for the bylaws of the Governing Committee, with subsequent working rules to be developed by the group itself. The Executive Vice-president of LWR will serve as the chair of the Governing Committee and each church body will name its representative to the group.

The Governing Committee will be charged with ensuring communication to and from the LMI and the leadership of each partner. This will ensure that the leadership of the partners — the Presiding Bishop of the ELCA, the President of the LCMS, and the President of LWR — as well as the respective boards of directors, church councils and
executive teams of the partners understand the direction of the LMI, provide input to it, and support it.

A meeting schedule will vary over the life of the initiative. The committee will meet face-to-face twice a year, with conference calls or video conferencing every month on average. Any member of the group may request a meeting. Joint LMI staff will typically participate in Governing Committee meetings, but the group may meet in executive session.

6.3 Staff Positions

There will be four staff positions shared jointly among the LMI partners. These staff, preferably based at LWR headquarters in Baltimore, will develop close working relationships with peers in the church bodies and LWR to both develop common efforts and to mobilize and maximize efficient use of partner-specific resources dedicated to the LMI. They will also ensure that the activities of the various partners do not contradict those of other LMI partners. Each LMI partner will also hire staff specific to their organization.

6.3.1 Campaign Executive Director

This will be a full time position for the full three years of the grant. This person has overall responsibility for the development, implementation and reporting of all aspects of the U.S. based campaign. S/he is accountable to the Governing Committee for achievement of the objectives of the U.S. based campaign. S/he will also be responsible for developing a case for the LMI, to be tested in the pilots. On a daily basis, s/he reports to the Executive Vice-president of LWR. S/he supervises the three joint directors below. The Campaign Executive Director will be selected by the Governing Committee, and will have had extensive experience in complex campaigns. It is anticipated that this person will be on the staff of the fundraising counsel selected.

6.3.2 Public Relations and Marketing Director

This person is responsible for developing and implementing the joint public relations and marketing strategy of the U.S. based campaign. S/he will relate with the partner-specific public relations and marketing staff and coordinate and mobilize those resources. This will be a full time position for the full three years of the grant.

6.3.3 Education Director

This person is responsible for developing the joint education and communication resources for the U.S. based campaign. This will be a consultant at approximately 50 percent full time equivalent (FTE) from the 6th month to the 18th month of the grant.

6.3.4 Fundraising Director

This person is responsible for developing and implementing the joint fundraising strategy of the campaign. S/he will relate with the partner-specific fundraising staff. This will be a full time position for the last 18 months of the grant.
6.3.5 **LCMS Major Gift Officer**
This person is responsible for coordinating and conducting the LMI campaign to and with LCMS districts and congregations. This will be a full time position beginning the second year and lasting until the end of the grant.

6.3.6 **LCMS Field Representatives**
Two people are responsible for coordinating the LCMS work around international program pilots. The first year will include further assessment work and the development of delivery systems in a field pilot location.

6.3.7 **ELCA Major Gift Officer**
This person will focus on identifying, cultivating, soliciting and stewarding major donor prospects for the LMI. This will be a full time position beginning the second year and lasting until the end of the grant.

6.3.8 **LWR Major Gift Officer**
This person will identify, cultivate and solicit major gift prospects for the LMI through current gifts and multi-year pledge commitments. S/he will also work with current LWR donors and friends to identify and gain access to additional prospects and prepare regular activity reports and updates on activities that clearly indicate progress on LMI campaign goals related to major donor cultivation. This will be a full time position beginning the second year and lasting until the end of the grant.

6.4 **Volunteer Positions**
The LMI will recruit and train "super-level" volunteers to carry out LMI pilot activities in their regions. Approximately ten volunteers per pilot will be trained, for a total of 40 volunteers. Specific responsibilities will be identified and agreed upon by the LMI partners and the leadership of each pilot area during the pilot planning process. Volunteers will be trained during a one day training session with LMI staff in each of the four pilot areas in spring of 2009, where they will be introduced to the preliminary "LMI toolkit" of communication materials developed over the previous months and trained on key messaging points to promote the LMI. Supervisory structure will be determined during the planning phase, but volunteers will have access to shared LMI staff as well as corresponding staff at LWR, the LCMS, and the ELCA.

6.5 **Outside Staffing or Consultative Support**

6.5.1 **Fundraising Counsel**
The Lutheran Malaria Initiative will hire fundraising counsel for the three-year period of the grant. A single firm will be hired to provide coordinated counsel to all three partners. As currently envisioned, the Campaign Executive Director will be from counsel, and through that person LMI will access the technical resources (human, print, electronic) of the firm.
6.5.2 Donor Database Analysis
An independent third party vendor will conduct data analysis on the LMI partners’ respective database files to determine areas of strengths (geographic concentrations and gift size), and level of donor engagement based on recency, frequency and monetary value (RFM).

6.5.3 Support for the Pilots
The following consultants will be used to implement the pilots:
- **Web Designer:** S/he will work with the LMI creative team and relevant staff of the LCMS, LWR and the ELCA to create and launch an interactive pilot LMI website. Estimated length of contract is three to six months
- **Graphic Designer:** S/he will assist with branding the LMI with a cohesive visual identity for all LMI materials, including logo development, color palate, graphic standards, document templates, etc. Estimated length of contract is six months
- **Video Producer:** A freelance video producer will travel to East Africa to film ongoing malaria work and produce an approximately ten minute video for use in the LMI pilots. Estimated length of contract is six months
- **Meeting Facilitator:** S/he will facilitate the "lessons learned" workshop at the end of the pilot period. Estimated length of contract is two days.

6.5.4 Vacation Bible School (VBS) Materials
LCMS WM and WRHC will partner with Concordia Publishing House (CPH) to produce malaria related VBS materials for use in the summer of 2010. VBS offerings will be designated to support the LMI. This contract will begin in winter of 2009 and be completed in the fall of 2009.

7. Activities and Milestones

**OBJECTIVE 1:** Conduct outreach and solicit donations through direct mail as well as major gift work.

**Activity 1.1:** Create and enact the LMI Governing Committee. (Spring 2008)
- **Milestone 1.1:** LMI Governing Committee meets in person biennially and via conference once per month.

**Activity 1.2:** Create policies and systems for collecting financial contributions from U.S. Lutherans to avoid donor overlap and appropriately credit contributions to each LMI partner. (Spring 2008)
- **Milestone 1.2:** An agreement, describing how contributions to the LMI will be received, recorded, acknowledged and distributed, is signed by all three partners.

**Activity 1.3:** Conduct data analysis, through an independent third party vendor, on the LMI partners’ respective data files to find areas of strengths (geographic concentrations
and gift size), depths and level of donor engagement based on recency, frequency and monetary value (RFM). (Spring 2008)
- **Milestone 1.3:** Institutional and individual prospects lists are created for each partner.

**Activity 1.4:** Hire three Major Gift Officers. (Spring 2009)
- **Milestone 1.4:** At least one Major Gift Officer is hired by each partner.

**Activity 1.5:** Conduct an ELCA direct mail campaign to solicit contributions for the LMI.2 (April 2009 – March 2011)
- **Milestone 1.5:** LMI contributions solicited from approximately 90,000 U.S. Lutherans.

**OBJECTIVE 2:** Conduct four pilots, limited in time and geography, in representative areas throughout the U.S. to produce and test messages, activities and materials to be used for the nationwide launch of the LMI.

**Activity 2.1:** Agree on criteria for pilot areas and specific goals/outcomes. (Spring 2008)
- **Milestone 2.1:** Four pilots sites are selected based on agreed upon criteria.

**Activity 2.2:** Gain approval from bishops/presidents and synod/district governing bodies. (Spring 2008)
- **Milestone 2.2:** Pilots are announced or approved in principle at synod assemblies and district conventions.

**Activity 2.3:** Meet with synod/district leaders in each pilot area. (Summer 2008)
- **Milestone 2.3:** Leaders in four Synod/Districts agree to participate in developing and executing an LMI pilot.

**Activity 2.4:** Develop detailed plans for each pilot region, in cooperation with pilot areas and working closely with synod/district leaders as well as networks, college/seminary/school leaders, women’s and men’s group leaders, parish project group leaders, etc. (Fall 2008)
- **Milestone 2.4:** Specific plans, activities and timeline for each of the four pilots established.

**Activity 2.5:** Determine baseline awareness about malaria among constituents in pilot areas via e-survey (Fall 2008)
- **Milestone 2.5:** Benchmarks established to compare awareness at end of pilot with that before pilot.

**Activity 2.6:** Develop materials for use in pilots. (Fall 2008 – Winter 2009)
- **Milestone 2.6:** Preliminary “LMI Toolkit” developed, including web, video and print resources.

**Activity 2.7:** Launch four LMI pilots. (Winter/Spring 2009)

---

2 LWR also plans to conduct a direct mail campaign, using its own resources.

This proposal and all attachments are proprietary information for use by the United Nations Foundation, its donor organizations, the ELCA and the LCMS.
Milestone 2.7: Hold four launch events, including specific events for colleges/seminaries as well as other congregational and community events, and with participation of two partners from Africa.

Activity 2.8: Train 40 volunteers in the pilot areas. (Spring 2009)
Milestone 2.8: Engaged volunteers are prepared to speak, present and fundraise on behalf of the LMI within pilot areas.

Activity 2.9: Conduct focus groups with pilot participants to evaluate the effectiveness of pilot materials. (Fall 2009)
Milestone 2.9: Possible reworking of materials based on focus group feedback.

Activity 2.10: Conduct up to three trips to Africa for pilot participants to see malaria work firsthand. (Winter 2009)
Milestone 2.10: Deeply committed LMI “ambassadors” are engaged with stories to share, a generation of new ideas for interpretation, and an inter-regional network of accountability.

Activity 2.11: Evaluate the LMI pilots. (Spring 2010)
Milestone 2.11a: Follow up e-survey to measure change in awareness of malaria.
Milestone 2.11b: Workshop held for pilot participants to share experiences.
Milestone 2.11c: Evaluation and “lessons learned” documented and distributed.
Milestone 2.11d: Messaging and activities refined in preparation for national rollout.

OBJECTIVE 3: Use pre-established events and communication mechanisms to educate over 600,000 U.S. Lutherans about malaria and the LMI, and engage them in furthering the goals of the campaign.

Activity 3.1: Create partner specific fundraising, communication and marketing materials to integrate malaria and LMI messages in pre-existing communication mediums. (April 2008 – March 2011)
Milestone 3.1a: Over 600,000 existing LWR, ELCA and LCMS database members reached with malaria and LMI messages.
Milestone 3.1b: Malaria video for LCMS specific audiences produced.³
Milestone 3.1c: Approximately 326,000 people per year view LMI ads in the The Lutheran, a general interest publication of the ELCA.

Activity 3.2: Conduct LMI education and outreach activities at pre-established churchwide events, including the 2009 ELCA Youth Gathering, the LWML International Convention, the 2008 Women of the ELCA Triennial Gathering and the LCMS District Conventions. (April 2008 – March 2011)
Milestone 3.2: Approximately 62,000 Lutherans reached with messages about malaria and the LMI at churchwide events.

Activity 3.3: Create and distribute malaria focused VBS materials.

³ LWR and the ELCA also plan to produce audience specific videos, with funds from other sources.
Milestone 3.3: 8,500 VBS kits sold to LCMS congregations.

OBJECTIVE 4: Gain approval from the two Lutheran church body governance structures and officially launch the LMI.

Activity 4.1: Present the LMI at the next ELCA Churchwide Assembly. (August 2009)

Milestone 4.1: The LMI is approved by the ELCA Churchwide Assembly.

Activity 4.2: Present the LMI at the next LCMS Convention (July 2010).

Milestone 4.2: The LMI is approved by the LCMS Convention.

Activity 4.3: Launch the LMI (August 2010)

Milestone 4.3: A high profile event co-hosted by the three LMI partners announces the official launch of the LMI.

OBJECTIVE 5: In conjunction with UNF, form a program advisory committee to provide high level advice, coordination and planning to LMI actors and strengthen relationships with the Global Fund.

Activity 5.1: Continue to coordinate with UNF to finalize the formation of the advisory committee (Spring 2008).

Milestone 5.1: In partnership with UNF, a program committee or council is formed.

8. Challenges

8.1 Campaign Coordination

Due to the distinct structures of the two church bodies and LWR, the fundraising component of the Lutheran Malaria Initiative will not be officially and comprehensively launched before approval at the LCMS Convention in July 2010. However, LMI related activities will begin immediately. It will be a challenge to engage some Lutherans on the issue of malaria early, and then maintain their interest until the official launch of the campaign. Both LWR and the church bodies are confident they can find ways to engage Lutherans before the official launch but within the structure of the church bodies.

8.2 Coordinating Outreach to Donors

Since there is considerable overlap between LWR’s donors and those of the ELCA and the LCMS, there is potential for donors to be contacted by multiple LMI partners, leading to donor fatigue. Additionally, there is potential for conflict when crediting contributions, particularly major gifts, towards each partner’s campaign goal. To address these issues the three partners will draft and sign agreements before implementation regarding how donors are approached and contributions are credited.
8.3 No precedent

The three LMI partners do not have a precedent of conducting a coordinated and focused campaign of this nature. However, during the process of designing the LMI, much progress was made in coordination and collaboration between the three groups. The LMI Governing Committee will serve as a tool for ensuring this type and level of collaboration continues in the future.

9. Budget

9.1 Budget Narrative

See Appendix B.

9.2 Additional Financial Support for the Project

9.2.1 LWR Financial Support

LWR resources were used to conduct the initial U.S. based LMI feasibility study (in addition to UNF resources) as well as a program feasibility study in the field. LWR funds also supported and will continue to support an LMI Coordinator, responsible for coordinating the LMI efforts of LWR and communicating and coordinating joint activities of LMI partners.

LWR resources will also be used for costs related to a direct mail campaign; developing LWR-specific communications materials; advertising; and exhibits at various events, such as the ELCA Youth Gathering. In addition, a number of current LWR senior employees, such as the President and CEO, Executive Vice-president, the Vice President for External Relations, the Vice President for International Programs, the Communications and Media Relations Director, and the Director for Mission Advancement will dedicate a significant amount of time to ensure the successful implementation of the project.

LWR will also provide $200,000 from its reserve funds in 2008 to expand malaria programming in the field, with additional funds in subsequent years.

9.2.2 ELCA Financial Support

Using its own financial resources, the ELCA plans to hire 2.5 new FTE staff positions – an ELCA LMI Coordinator, an LMI International Program Coordinator, and clerical support staff). In addition, the ELCA will fund a malaria program coordinator to complement the work of new HIV/AIDS staff. Placement of this person will follow a ten country HIV/AIDS-Malaria assessment planned for the first half of 2008. $300,000-$350,000 annually will be provided by the ELCA for this work, not including indirect costs of staff and travel related to the LMI both internationally and domestically (including engagement with networks and companion synods). Equally valuable, yet not easily quantifiable is the focused attention of Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson within the
ELCA and in international contexts, dedicated time at many major milestone events (such as synod assemblies) and access to existing leadership networks within the ELCA.

Additionally, the ELCA anticipates indirect costs of at least $600,000, including approximately one-quarter time for current ELCA World Hunger staff; one-eighth time for Development Services executive, major gift, marketing, and constituent management staff; comprehensive donor cultivation and solicitation materials incorporating LMI; dedicated time at deployed staff and World Hunger leadership training events; and incidental office expenses not directly captured by the LMI grant.

The ELCA is also covering costs of a four to six month campaign feasibility study that will test a broader ECLA fundraising strategy, but will include the LMI.

9.2.3 LCMS Financial Support
The LCMS will allocate funds from its core budget for the development of Vacation Bible School materials and curriculum materials with a malaria focus. The core budget will also support ongoing assessment and program work in malaria impacted areas, including staff salaries supporting this work, and grassroots support focused on women and youth. The LCMS will devote an appropriate array of existing executive, management, and administrative level time and energy to the coordination and implementation of the LMI. Resources will also be used to build support from its decision making bodies.

9.3 Existing Programs that Address Malaria

9.3.1 LWR Programs that Address Malaria
In September 2007, LWR was awarded nearly $900,000 from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) for a three-year malaria prevention project in Tanzania. Funded through the President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI), the project is being carried out with longtime LWR partner and ELCA companion church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania (ELCT). The project promotes a holistic approach to malaria education, prevention and treatment that will reach an estimated 1.6 million people in rural areas by mobilizing communities to increase awareness of and demand for malaria control measures such as insecticide-treated bed nets and anti-malaria medications. In addition, the project will empower health care providers to improve the quality and scope of malaria prevention and treatment in 31 rural health care facilities. Lastly, the project will strengthen the capacity of those facilities to consistently and effectively provide essential medication and services through forging links with regional and national partners. As the project’s activities scale up, they will also serve as models to replicate and expand to other countries where LWR and its partners are active.

LWR also responds to malaria threats in emergency settings. Responding to the needs of populations displaced by conflict in Northern Uganda or returning home after years of conflict in Southern Sudan, LWR’s partners train community members to manage water points to reduce the spread of malaria, including digging soak pits around boreholes in order to eliminate standing water which is a breeding ground for mosquitoes.
9.3.2 ELCA Programs that Address Malaria and HIV/AIDS

Malaria has not been a singular priority of the ELCA, since historically the ELCA has taken a holistic approach to health care in its mission engagement. The ELCA’s current engagement builds on the very long history of ELCA work with emerging indigenous churches to provide primary health care. In some countries, major health care systems were established as a result of that commitment. These are now locally run and, in some cases, continue to provide a large portion of the health services in certain countries. The ELCA continues to support health care through the placement of ELCA personnel requested by companion churches and through grants that support specific companion church health initiatives and outreach. Health care responses to malaria by companion churches have been supported by the ELCA through these channels, in partnership with other member churches of LWF.

Since 2001, HIV/AIDS has been a stated priority area for awareness-building, advocacy and fundraising for the ELCA. In 2007, the ELCA’s Churchwide Assembly, the church’s highest legislative body, reaffirmed the ELCA’s commitment not just to continue current levels of engagement in HIV/AIDS work but to move to a significantly higher level of engagement. The assembly called for the development of a comprehensive HIV/AIDS strategy, to be developed by 2008.

Anticipating this strategy, ELCA World Hunger allocated an additional $1 million this year as initial support of the strategy. Of that, $500,000 is being sent to LWF to support LWF regional efforts to build the capacity of Lutheran churches to participate in countrywide HIV/AIDS response and funding mechanisms and access funds available from the Global Fund and other sources. The Church of Sweden is also providing substantial financial support for this initiative. The ELCA’s Companion Synod Program, which links ELCA synods with Lutheran churches (or their dioceses) in other countries, is a major channel for resource sharing.

Due to this increased commitment to HIV/AIDS, and since historically the ELCA has taken a holistic approach to health care, the ELCA believes it is important to address both malaria and HIV/AIDS in an integrated way in its LMI campaign. Programmatically, HIV and malaria are inter-related diseases of poverty, and recent research confirms that the two diseases together fuel a vicious cycle of morbidity and mortality, each making the other worse when a person is infected with both. Additionally, infection with one increases the likelihood of infection with the other. Such linkages between diseases of poverty underlie the rationale for the creation of the Global Fund. By tailoring its portion of the LMI fundraising campaign to address both diseases, the ELCA will be able to build on Global Fund resources and the global architecture in this effort.

LWR recognizes the integrity of a joint malaria HIV/AIDS campaign within the ELCA as a means to addressing broader issues of global health. The LCMS and LWR do not anticipate conducting HIV/AIDS programming with funds raised through the LMI.

---

However, all three organizations have experience in HIV and anticipate continuing and deepening this work. The partners will work to identify appropriate ways to collaborate and strengthen HIV/AIDS programming.

9.3.3 LCMS Programs that Address Malaria

Community health has been an integral part of mission initiatives of the LCMS since the 1950s, in countries around the world. Early mission teams included doctors, nurses and community health practitioners who staffed clinics and hospitals, both national institutions and those run by the LCMS, in such countries as India, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Guatemala, Nigeria, Ghana, Liberia, and South Africa. One such missionary, Dr. William Foege, after his groundbreaking work helping to eradicate smallpox, went on to head the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and the Carter Center. He also helped form the Task Force on Child Survival and Development to improve childhood immunization rates.

In more recent years, the LCMS is linked with indigenous networks that provide community care through non-governmental organizations (NGOs), congregations, schools, clinics and hospitals in countries such as Guinea, Sudan, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Tanzania, Congo, Togo, Burkina Faso, Gambia, Uganda, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Vietnam, Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and the Dominican Republic. During the last fiscal year in Kyrgyzstan, through the Mobile Medical Trailer ministry, over 4,500 children were provided basic medical and dental care.

The LCMS’ current experience with malaria includes hosting Mercy Medical Teams (MMT), volunteer medical teams that create venues and opportunities to provide malaria education, diagnosis and treatment. The LCMS also distributes insecticide treated bed nets in the Sudan and Nigeria.

9.4 Potential for Increased Capacity

The Lutheran partners are poised to expand their work on malaria. With deep experience relating to health infrastructure and community development and mobilization, relationships have been established on which LMI programs can build.

To expand malaria programming, LWR, the ELCA and the LCMS anticipate engaging partners on multiple levels. The first is existing bilateral partners who implement health-related and development projects. Many of LWR’s partners are small-scale NGOs and CBOs with interests in programming on malaria and strong links with communities. This group has significant potential for incorporating malaria programming into their current approaches. Most significant among this group is the aforementioned ELCT, an LWR and ELCA partner, which is implementing the project supported by the PMI.

Beginning in September 2007, LWR hired a consultant to conduct a six month malaria program assessment (Appendix D) in its focus countries in East and West Africa to explore where LWR’s expertise and experience in sustainable community development could be utilized in the global fight against malaria. The assessment identified a large
array of current and potential partners with who LWR can consider partnering on malaria, including national level initiatives and bodies focusing on increased support of Artemisin Combination Therapy (ACT) and treatment regimes, national level suppliers of Long Lasting Insecticide Treated Nets (LLITN), and social mobilization efforts that can provide greater coverage for Information, Education and Communication (IEC) and Behavioral Change Communication (BCC) efforts. Additionally, the assessment provided evidence that many of LWR’s existing partners, characterized as rural, small and livelihood focused organizations, provide an array of skills and access to communities that can be mobilized on behalf of malaria. These will be more sharply assessed and prioritized in the coming year.

The ELCA is engaged in formal and informal gap analysis exercises with many of its current partners, especially in Africa but also in Asia (e.g., Papua New Guinea), to assess the capacity for malaria programming. Conversations have progressed furthest with the Lutheran Communion in Southern Africa. The ELCA is supporting, during the first half of 2008, a ten country assessment, building on the resources tested by LWR in West and East Africa earlier this year. Placement of a malaria program coordinator in Southern Africa will complement the work of a new regional HIV/AIDS program coordinator in the region. Strong interest has been shown by the church in Liberia for expansion of work at its two hospitals and community health programs, and the former head of Phebe Hospital, who currently serves as the Minister of Health of Liberia, has indicated a strong desire to advance the planning process. Conversations have also begun with other African companion churches, including churches in Tanzania, Madagascar, and Cameroon, where there are strong church health systems, as well as small churches, which are engaged in smaller scale community-based health work.

The LCMS will expand bilateral partnerships in both East and West Africa, such as LCMS supported clinics in Kenya, as well as HIV/AIDS Education in Madagascar. The Ministry of Health in Liberia is interested in a national church partnership in health including the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Liberia and three church bodies working with the LCMS. Partnerships with the Christian Health Association of Liberia (CHAL) are a possibility and there are LCMS partner hospitals in Guinea and Sudan that could provide opportunities for malaria work. The LCMS may also include malaria work in existing indigenous networks that provide community care through NGOs, congregations, schools, clinics and hospitals in countries such as Madagascar, Nigeria, Tanzania, Congo, Togo, Burkina Faso, Gambia, Uganda, Sierra Leone and Ghana. Discussions with relevant players in these countries are underway.

Partnerships with existing multilateral partners who implement health-related and development programs – primarily LWF and its related agencies – will also be explored by the LMI partners. In conversation with LWF, six countries were identified that could profitably invest program resources dedicated to malaria in the near term; the number increases significantly with the inclusion of HIV/AIDS. While malaria has not been a singular focus, LWF has the community mobilization infrastructure – most particularly in refugee and emergency zones such as Sudan and Chad – to integrate malaria programming rapidly and efficiently. LWF estimates it could invest $1.5-2 million per
year in its existing development programs in the near term, with the capacity to extend far beyond that over time.

Conversations with other European-based partners about malaria-focused programming are in the early stages. LWR anticipates that this category of partner will have significant capacity for LMI programming. The ELCA, in conjunction with the Church of Sweden and Norwegian Church Aid, is currently supporting regional technical services in HIV that present a model upon which malaria-related programming can build. The ELCA is currently programming approximately $1 million per year for HIV; with infrastructure support, this amount could be raised to $4-5 million per year.

Additionally, LWR is a founding member of Interchurch Medical Assistance (IMA), an NGO based in Maryland that works to strengthen medical infrastructure around the globe. IMA provides millions of dollars of purchased and donated medicines and medical products worldwide to provide basic health care for those living in poverty in under-resourced countries. LWR anticipates that IMA can productively manage significant malaria-directed funding.

9.5 Budget Spreadsheet

See Appendix B.
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### Addendum F to Appendix B - Budget Spreadsheet

**Organization Name:** Lutheran World Relief  
**Project Title:** The Lutheran Malaria Initiative  
**Period of Performance:** April 1, 08 - March 31, 11  
**Submitted to:** United Nations Foundation  
**Submission Date:** February 29, 2008

#### Budget Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR &amp; Marketing Director</td>
<td>Under the guidance of the Campaign Executive Director, this person is responsible for developing and implementing the joint public relations and marketing strategy of the US-based campaign. S/he will relate with the partner-specific public relations and marketing staff within LWR, ELCA and LCMS, and coordinate and mobilize those resources. This position is anticipated for the life of the grant.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Director</td>
<td>This person is responsible for developing and implementing the joint fund-raising strategy of the campaign. In parallel with the PR and Marketing Director, s/he will relate with the partner-specific fund-raising staff. S/he will be on staff for the last 18 months of the grant.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gift Officers</td>
<td>The Major Gift Officers will identify, cultivate and solicit major gift prospects for the LWR LMI campaign through current gifts and multi-year pledge commitments. They will also work with current LWR donors and Lutheran World Relief friends to identify and gain access to additional prospects and prepare regular activity reports and updates on activities that clearly indicate progress on LMI campaign goals related to major donor cultivation. Two Major gift Officers will be hired during the course of three years. First Major Gift Officer will be hired effective Year II and the funding for this has been requested from UNF. The second Major Gift Officer will be hired effective Year III, LWR will seek funding for this position from other sources.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMI Coordinator</td>
<td>The need for hiring this position, responsible for coordinating the LMI efforts of Lutheran World Relief and communicating and coordinating joint activities of LMI partners, will be necessary from the beginning of the grant. LWR is not requesting funding for this position, rather it will be covered from its own sources.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRINGE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>LWR provides the comprehensive benefits package to all its employees. The current rate of 29.5% of the base salary includes pension plan, health insurance and incentives, FICA, unemployment insurance, life, disability and accident insurance, workers compensation, etc.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULTANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising counsel</td>
<td>LMI will hire a fundraising firm, experienced in complex campaigns, who will provide coordinated counsel through the three year period to all three partners. The firm will provide LMI with the access to the technical resources (human, print, electronic) of the firm through a full time senior position, Campaign Executive Director. The Director, based on LWR's Baltimore office, will be approved by the Governing Committee and will have extensive experience in complex campaigns. S/he will have overall responsibility for the development, implementation, and reporting of all aspects of the US-based campaign. The Campaign Executive Director will be accountable to the Governing Committee for achievement of the objectives of the US-based campaign. On a daily basis, s/he will report to the Executive Vice-president of LWR and will supervise the three joint directors - PR &amp; Marketing Director, Fundraising Director, both budgeted under Personnel and the Education Director, budgeted under Consultant.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Director</td>
<td>This part time position is responsible for developing the joint resources for the US-based campaign. The position is budgeted at 50 percent FTE for the first two years of the grant, estimating that approximately 6 months work will be conducted each year.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web &amp; Design Consultant</td>
<td>This is a cost associated with pilot-related activities. As a part of developing materials for use in the pilot areas, a web consultant and a design consultant will be hired to help in developing and designing the LMI specific web site and visual identity for LMI print materials. $35,000 has been budgeted as fees for these professionals.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>The budgeted amount includes costs associated with a) Pilot-related activities - The materials will be developed in house and a printer will be hired to produce materials for the use in the pilot areas. Publishable materials will be developed in close collaboration with the three organizations (LWR, ELCA, LCMS) in consultation with the fundraising counsel and UNF. It is anticipated that $85,000 will be needed for the vendor to print the materials in year one and approximately $17,000 in year two to reprint the materials based on the received feedback. b) LMI specific communication materials – LWR will develop some communications materials (i.e., brochures, presentations to major donors, bulletin inserts, etc.) specific to its needs in addition to the joint materials developed during the pilots. The budgeted amount is $20,000 and covers the estimated printing and production costs of these materials, which will be developed by the LMI communications director in close consultation with LWR communications staff.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Production/Comm. Material</td>
<td>The budgeted amount includes costs associated with: a) Pilot-related activities - The materials will be developed in house and a printer will be hired to produce materials for the use in the pilot areas. Publishable materials will be developed in close collaboration with the three organizations (LWR, ELCA, LCMS) in consultation with the fundraising counsel and UNF. It is anticipated that $85,000 will be needed for the vendor to print the materials in year one and approximately $17,000 in year two to reprint the materials based on the received feedback. b) LMI specific communication materials – LWR will develop some communications materials (i.e., brochures, presentations to major donors, bulletin inserts, etc.) specific to its needs in addition to the joint materials developed during the pilots. The budgeted amount is $20,000 and covers the estimated printing and production costs of these materials, which will be developed by the LMI communications director in close consultation with LWR communications staff.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Mining/Prospect Research</td>
<td>An independent third party vendor will be hired to conduct data analysis on the LMI partners' respective database files to determine areas of strengths (geographic concentrations and gift size), and level of donor engagement based on recency, frequency and monetary value (RFM)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trainer/Facilitator</strong></td>
<td>This is a cost associated with pilot-related activities. As noted in the detailed training &amp; workshop budget, at the end of the second year a one-day experience sharing and lessons learned workshop will be consulted for the participants from the pilot areas. An experienced trainer/facilitator will be hired to help facilitate the process and document the lessons learned and recommendations that will support LMI partners during the campaign process. Based on LWR's experience in hiring consultants for similar purposes, $1,000/day has been budgeted as a fee for the trainer/facilitator.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TRAVEL

- **a) Travel of Governing Committee and the Directors**
  - As indicated in details in the Travel-Detailed Budget, this category includes the LMI Governing Committee's (one representative from each organization -- LWR, ELCA and LCMS) and the directors (Campaign Executive Director, PR & Marketing Director, Education Director, and Fundraising Director) travel for coordination and planning. Mainly, it is planned that a) Governing Committee will hold a one-day long bi-annual meetings in Baltimore, thus the costs associated with travel to Baltimore from Chicago and St. Louis is budgeted; b) The directors will conduct 2 trips/year to ELCA and LCMS headquarters in Chicago and St. Louis to conduct planning/coordination meetings with colleagues and staff members of the two organizations involved in the LMI activities. The budgeted costs include, airfare, per-diems, accommodation, ground transportation and other incidental expenses associated with the travel. The total amount budgeted for this type of trip is $26,344 over the three years of the grant.

- **b) Pilot-related travel**
  - This is the travel costs of LWR, ELCA, LCMS and guests associated with pilot-related activities. Four pilot areas from Western, Midwest and Eastern states will be selected. NC, TX, MN and CA were used for budgeting purposes only. Careful planning and consultation with the LMI partners might determine the pilots being elsewhere. The budget costs under this category include include air ticket, ground transportation, per diem (incl. accommodation), etc. associated with:
    - i) One-day trip to each pilot area for meeting with synod/district leaders (one trip to each region of two LWR/LMI one LCMS and one ELCA representative during the first year) - $14,600 has been budgeted for this;
    - ii) Two-day trip of three LMI representatives during the first and second years to each pilot area for developing detailed plan and conducting focus group with pilot participants - $12,000 for the first year and $12,360 for the second year has been budgeted for this;
    - iii) Ten days trip of those LMI representatives during the first year to East Africa for collecting video materials -- $12,400 has been budgeted for this;
    - iv) For launching pilots, 14-day trip of two representatives from each pilot region -- $12,000 has been budgeted for this;
    - v) In the second year, one-day trip of two LMI representatives to each pilot area for conducting training for the volunteers -- $6,952 has been budgeted for this;
    - vi) During the second year, one-day trip of two LMI representatives to each pilot area for conducting ongoing follow up and evaluation/lessons learned activities -- $7,828 has been budgeted for this;
    - vii) During the second year, 14-day LMI “ambassador” trip to East Africa of 4 LWR, 2 ELCA, 2 LCMS and 12 guests for the pilot areas for -- $98,880 has been budgeted for this.

- **c) LWR Specific - Staff Travel**
  - Travel of LWR Staff members (Major Gift Officers, Other staff) to different areas of the U.S. with the average rate of $300/flight has also been budgeted in the second and third years of the grant. LWR is requesting UNF to fund expenses for the second year with the total amount of $8,755 (5 trips, each trip 5-day long).

#### SUPPLIES

- **Allocated Central Services**
  - This includes the costs associated with the work of the four LMI Directors. The budgeted amount of $15,000 annual FTE includes the expenses associated with expendable supplies, equipment maintenance and repairs, office rent and utilities, etc. and budgeted based on LWR's actual expenses per FTE for the Fiscal Year 2007.

- **Telephone/Fax/Internet**
  - This is a cost associated with pilot-related activities. The costs of communication with the amount of $220/month has been budgeted to implement the pilot related activities.

- **Office Computers**
  - Three laptops with the cost of $3000/each have been budgeted for the three LMI directors.

#### CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

- **Video conferencing equipment**
  - The estimated cost necessary for purchasing video conferencing equipment has been budgeted under this category. The equipment will enable the LMI partners to have frequent (in average monthly) video conferences, which minimizes the face-to-face meetings, thus significantly reducing the amount of travel and the costs associated with it.

#### SUB-RECIPIENT

- **Subgrant to ELCA**
  - A full time Major Gifts officer hired from the Year II will focus on identifying, cultivating, soliciting and stewarding major donor prospects for the Lutheran Malaria Initiative.
**Budget Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>ELCA provides the comprehensive benefits package to all its employees. The current rate of 38.50% of the base salary includes pension plan, health insurance and incentives, FICA, life, disability and accident insurance, workers compensation, etc.</td>
<td>LWR Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>ELCA is requesting UNF partial support of its staff members for major donor cultivation and solicitation. It is planned that in years I &amp; II, 4-5 ELCA staff will be conducting about 4-5 trips annually, however, ELCA is only requesting funding of 3 trips of 3 staff members annually. The requested cost of $2,500 for year I and $2,500 for year II represents reasonable estimate based on ELCA's ongoing major donor travel costs.</td>
<td>LWR Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>1) Materials Development - The costs associated with developing LMI materials - brochures, bulletin inserts, posters, gift portfolios, etc. All the materials will be developed in-house. The budgeted $15,000 has been requested to pay a vendor for designing and printing purposes; 2) $5,000 for Donor stewardship/recognition includes materials needed for acknowledging and stewarding charitable gifts. This may include special LMI letterhead and envelopes, certificates or lower-cost donor appreciation items, follow-up mailings to inform early LMI donors about programmatic progress; 3) $15,000 for the Youth Gathering includes costs (rental of exhibit space and furnishings, development and production of display materials, shipping) to provide an interactive exhibit at the 2009 ELCA Youth Gathering. LWR in collaboration with ELCA will also contribute its own resources to coordinate the efforts for this activity; 4) $5,000 for Women's Triennial represent the costs (rental of exhibit space and furnishings, development and production of display materials, shipping charges to and from Utah) to include an interactive display about malaria at the Women of the ELCA Triennial in the summer of 2008. The total cost for participating in this conference is $10,000, LWR and ELCA will contribute the additional required resources from their own funds.</td>
<td>LWR Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1) Materials Development - The costs associated with developing LMI materials - brochures, bulletin inserts, posters, gift portfolios, etc. All the materials will be developed in-house. The budgeted $15,000 has been requested to pay a vendor for designing and printing purposes; 2) $5,000 for Donor stewardship/recognition includes materials needed for acknowledging and stewarding charitable gifts. This may include special LMI letterhead and envelopes, certificates or lower-cost donor appreciation items, follow-up mailings to inform early LMI donors about programmatic progress; 3) ELCA's negotiated cost for a full-page ad in The Lutheran is $15,000. As per the agreement between ELCA and Lutheran World Relief, this cost will be split in half, thus ELCA is only requesting funding for $7,500; 4) $15,000 for the Youth Gathering includes costs (rental of exhibit space and furnishings, development and production of display materials, shipping) to provide an interactive exhibit at the 2009 ELCA Youth Gathering. LWR in collaboration with ELCA will also contribute its own resources to coordinate the efforts for this activity; 5) $2,500 for Women's Triennial represent the costs (rental of exhibit space and furnishings, development and production of display materials, shipping charges to and from Utah) to include an interactive display about malaria at the Women of the ELCA Triennial in the summer of 2008. The total cost for participating in this conference is $10,000, LWR and ELCA will contribute the additional required resources from their own funds.</td>
<td>LWR Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above requested budget, ELCA will invest its own resources to this project. As currently planned, four new positions (3.5 FTE) focused on LMI and the ELCA HIV/AIDS strategy will be fully funded through ELCA's own resources: ELCA LMI Coordinator - full time. Posted in Feb 2008; LMI Program Coordinator - full time - in ELCA Global Mission for programmatic coordination. Posted in Feb 2008; Southern Africa Program Coordinator - full time. Filled end of 2008. Clerical Support - $30,000 - Half-time position. Additionally, the ELCA anticipates costs of at least $60,000 for the first three years of the LMI. This includes an approximate allocation of one-quarter time for current ELCA World Hunger staff time; one-eighth time for Development Services executive, major gift, marketing, and constituent management staff time; comprehensive donor cultivation and solicitation materials incorporating LMI; dedicated time at deployed staff and World Hunger leadership training events, and incidental office expenses. Equally valuable, is the focused attention of Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson within the ELCA and in international contexts, dedicated time at many major milestone events and access to existing leadership networks within the ELCA.

**Subgrant to LCMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>LCMS is requesting partial financial support of Major Gift Officer and International Personnel necessary for the successful implementation of the project. The Major Gift Officer would be responsible for coordinating and conducting the campaign to and with LCMS districts and congregations. The position will be hired full time effective year II. LCMS will cover the salary for the 7 months, thus requesting only support to cover costs for the 5 months. International Personnel, based in East Africa, will carry out the international field project. These positions will be funded in years I, II, and III to coordinate the work done with regard to international program pilots. The first year would include further assessment work and the development of delivery systems in one of the pilot locations. LCMS is only requesting partial support of these positions, to costs for the first year and partially the second year will be covered from its own sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>LCMS provides the comprehensive benefits package to all its employees. The current rate of 30.00% of the base salary includes pension plan, health insurance and incentives, FICA, life, disability and accident insurance, workers compensation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>LCMS will partner with its publishing arm, Concordia Publishing House, which will provide support in developing materials with a malaria focus and response for Vacation Bible School. $10,043 including 3% inflation rate has been budgeted in the second year of the grant. Additionally, LCMS is requesting $2,163 for video production, necessary for developing the video materials. The requested figure is based on overall estimated cost of video production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Travel associated with the campaign and district convention has been budgeted under this category. Mainly: 1) Campaign -- 4 trips to each of the 4 pilot locations; 2) District Convention -- airfare cost to 35 different locations with the cost of $300/flight; per diem of $150/day for 3 days per convention; and a car rental at 25 of the 35 conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>L&amp;G&amp;A rate of 30% of the base salary has been budgeted to cover costs associated with expendable supplies, equipment maintenance and repairs, office rent and utilities, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Addendum F to Appendix B - Budget Spreadsheet

**Organization Name:** Lutheran World Relief  
**Project Title:** The Lutheran Malaria Initiative  
**Period of Performance:** April 1, 08 - March 31, 11  
**Submitted to:** United Nations Foundation  
**Submission Date:** February 29, 2008

### Budget Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgrant to Synods/Districts</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the costs associated with pilot related activities. Small motivation/grant of $5,000 each will be given to each pilot region to be used for hosting events. The main goal of providing these types of grants is to empower pilot groups to get creative about how they implement LMI in their regions.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>LWR Specific, ELCA Specific, LCMS Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainings, workshops</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Trainings</td>
<td>This is a cost associated with pilot-related activities. A one-day training will be conducted to volunteers from each pilot area. The total of 4 trainings (one training in each pilot area) conducted by the LMI team will assist volunteers in planning and conducting LMI-related activities in their pilot areas.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Workshops</td>
<td>This is a cost associated with pilot-related activities. Cost of a one-day experience sharing and lessons learned workshop has been budgeted. It is planned that at the end of second year, a one-day workshop will be conducted in LWR's Baltimore office to share and document the lessons learned from the pilot activities. Volunteers from the pilot areas 2 (from each area), representatives of LMI partner organizations (one from ELCA and one from LCMS) and 3 representatives from East Africa will participate in the workshop. Total cost of $15,399 includes participants travel to and accommodation in Baltimore, meals and the costs associated with development of training materials.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LWR's INDIRECT RATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LWR's Indirect Rate of 16.63%</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LWR's Indirect Rate of 16.63% represents the actual rate for the Fiscal Year 2007 reviewed and verified by Independent Auditors. This rate will be used across the board in all the proposals submitted by LWR in the FY 2008. LWR's cognizant agency approving the indirect rate annually is department of State. The rate has already been submitted for approval. The costs under indirect rate includes all the expenses applicable to the executive director, finance and accounting, international program management, organizational effectiveness and human resources departments.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>LWR Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above requested budget, LWR will invest its own resources to this project. Mainly, LWR will allocate funds from the core budget the development of Vacation Bible School materials with a malaria focus and response; LWR will partner with its publishing arm, Concordia Publishing House, in the production of additional curriculum and materials in support of malaria; LWC will devote an appropriate array of existing executive, management, and administrative level time and energy to the coordination and implementation of this effort; LWC will use money from its core budget to support ongoing assessment and program work in malaria impacted areas; LWC will allocate funds from its core budget to build grassroots support focusing especially on women and youth; LWR will allocate funds from its core budget to build support from its decision making bodies.

In addition to the above requested budget, LCMS will invest its own resources to this project. Mainly, LCMS will allocate funds from the core budget the development of Vacation Bible School materials with a malaria focus and response; LCMS will partner with its publishing arm, Concordia Publishing House, in the production of additional curriculum and materials in support of malaria; LCMS will devote an appropriate array of existing executive, management, and administrative level time and energy to the coordination and implementation of this effort; LCMS will use money from its core budget to support ongoing assessment and program work in malaria impacted areas; LCMS will allocate funds from its core budget to build grassroots support focusing especially on women and youth; LCMS will allocate funds from its core budget to build support from its decision making bodies.
Appendix B: Budget Spreadsheet

Organization Name: Lutheran World Relief
Project Title: The Lutheran Malaria Initiative
Period of Performance: April 1, 08 - March 31, 11
Submitted to: United Nations Foundation
Submission Date: February 29, 2008

Raised - Other Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Total Years I &amp; II</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>85,356</td>
<td>227,174</td>
<td>312,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR &amp; Marketing Director</td>
<td>85,356.00</td>
<td>89,623.80</td>
<td>174,979.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Director</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>56,700.00</td>
<td>56,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gift Officers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80,850.00</td>
<td>80,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMI Coordinator</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44,978.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Processing Support</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>25,180</td>
<td>67,016</td>
<td>92,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>58,360</td>
<td>143,520</td>
<td>201,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>653,296</td>
<td>447,916</td>
<td>1,101,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising counsel</td>
<td>400,000.00</td>
<td>400,000.00</td>
<td>800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Director</td>
<td>27,634.01</td>
<td>29,015.71</td>
<td>56,649.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web &amp; Design Consultant</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Production/Comm. Materials</td>
<td>105,062.00</td>
<td>17,850.00</td>
<td>122,912.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Mining/Prospect Research</td>
<td>45,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>45,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemarketing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail Campaign &amp; acquisition mail</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer/Facilitator</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>46,140</td>
<td>49,069</td>
<td>95,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Central Services</td>
<td>37,500.00</td>
<td>46,350.00</td>
<td>83,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Fax/Internet</td>
<td>2,640.00</td>
<td>2,719.20</td>
<td>5,359.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Computers</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-grants to Others Organizations</td>
<td>120,020</td>
<td>259,660</td>
<td>379,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrant to ELCA</td>
<td>20,020.00</td>
<td>160,038.08</td>
<td>180,058.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrant to LCMS</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>99,621.60</td>
<td>179,621.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrant to Synods/Districts</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conferencing equipment</td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,519</td>
<td>19,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings, workshops</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19,518.50</td>
<td>19,518.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Exhibits costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>$1,015,352</td>
<td>$1,213,873</td>
<td>$2,229,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs @ 16.63%</td>
<td>$168,853.04</td>
<td>$201,867.14</td>
<td>$370,720.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,184,205</td>
<td>1,415,740</td>
<td>2,599,946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All amounts are in US $
2 5% increase in salaries & wages and fees and 3% in all other categories have been budgeted for each year effective year II
3 Funds necessary to carry activities in the years I & II being requested from UNF, the 3rd year funds will be raised from other sources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Line Items</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity /LOE</th>
<th>Year 1 # of Units</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year 2 # of Units</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year 3 # of Units</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR &amp; Marketing Director</td>
<td>$85,356</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$85,356</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$89,624</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$94,105</td>
<td>$269,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Director</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$56,700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$119,070</td>
<td>$175,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gift Officers</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$80,850</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$169,785</td>
<td>$250,635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMI Coordinator</td>
<td>$40,797</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$44,979</td>
<td>$44,979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Processing Support</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$21,168</td>
<td>$21,168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,356</td>
<td>$227,174</td>
<td>$449,107</td>
<td>$761,636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.50%</td>
<td>/base salary</td>
<td>85,356.00</td>
<td>$25,180</td>
<td>$67,016</td>
<td>$132,486</td>
<td>$224,683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-FRINGE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,180</td>
<td>$67,016</td>
<td>$132,486</td>
<td>$224,683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising counsel</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>/year</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Director</td>
<td>$9,211</td>
<td>/month</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>$27,634</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>$29,016</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$37,132</td>
<td>$77,132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web &amp; Design Consultant</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,132</td>
<td>$77,132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Production/Comm. Materials</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,062</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,850</td>
<td></td>
<td>$160,044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Mining/Prospect Research</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemarketing</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail Campaign &amp; acquisition mailing</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,526</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer/Facilitator</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-CONSULTANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$653,296</td>
<td>$447,916</td>
<td>$697,789</td>
<td>$1,799,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>$58,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,793</td>
<td>$230,673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-TRAVEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$58,360</td>
<td>$443,520</td>
<td>$28,793</td>
<td>$230,673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Central Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>/annual FTE</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$46,350</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$47,741</td>
<td>$131,591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Fax/Internet</td>
<td>$220.00</td>
<td>/month</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>$2,719</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Computers</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>desktop/laptop</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-SUPPLIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,140</td>
<td>$49,069</td>
<td>$47,741</td>
<td>$142,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conferencing equipment</td>
<td>$ 27,000</td>
<td>/lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-RECIPIENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrant to ELCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrant to LCMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrant to Synods/Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-SUB-RECIPIENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings, workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Exhibits costs</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,519</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-PROGRAM OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,519</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,519</td>
<td>$19,519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,015,352</td>
<td>$1,213,873</td>
<td>$2,821,302</td>
<td>$5,050,527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Detailed Travel Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit # of Units</th>
<th>Year I Amount</th>
<th>Year II Amount</th>
<th>Year III Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Travel of Governing Committee and the Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Airfare: St. Louis-Baltimore-St. Louis</td>
<td>$330 flight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Airfare: Chicago-Baltimore-Chicago</td>
<td>$250 flight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$515</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Airfare: Baltimore-St. Louis- Baltimore</td>
<td>$330 flight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,039</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Airfare: Baltimore-Chicago-Baltimore</td>
<td>$250 flight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,545</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem - Baltimore</td>
<td>$200 day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$412</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem - St. Louis</td>
<td>$200 day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem - Chicago</td>
<td>$200 day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$100 flight</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$618</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch Costs (Meetings)</td>
<td>$100 /meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$824</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Governing Committee and Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,860</td>
<td>$9,105</td>
<td>$9,378</td>
<td>$26,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Pilot-related travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWR, ELCA, LCMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to 4 Pilot Areas (NC, TX, MN, CA)</td>
<td>$400 flight/per</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$250 /day</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$300 /lumpsum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to 4 Pilot Areas (NC, TX, MN, CA)</td>
<td>$400 flight/per</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$4,944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$250 /day</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$6,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$300 /lumpsum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to 4 Pilot Areas (NC, TX, MN, CA)</td>
<td>$400 flight/per</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$3,296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$250 /day</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$300 /lumpsum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to 4 Pilot Areas (NC, TX, MN, CA)</td>
<td>$400 flight/per</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$3,296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$250 /day</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$300 /lumpsum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Africa</td>
<td>$2,000 flight/per</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$16,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$150 /day/per</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$17,304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$400 /lumpsum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Country Ground Transportation</td>
<td>$500 /per</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$4,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners trip from East Africa (Launch Pilots)</td>
<td>$2,000 flight/per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips to 4 Pilot Areas</td>
<td>$400 flight/per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$250 /day</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$300 /lumpsum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Africa</td>
<td>$2,000 flight/per</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$24,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$150 /day/per</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$25,956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$400 /lumpsum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Country Ground Transportation</td>
<td>$500 /per</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$6,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Pilot Related Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,500</td>
<td>$125,660</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$176,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) LWR Specific - Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel within the U.S.</td>
<td>$300 flight/per</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,545</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$5,092</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$250 /day</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$6,438</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$12,731</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi To/From Airports</td>
<td>$150 /lumpsum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$773</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,591</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - LWR-Specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,755</td>
<td>$19,414</td>
<td>$28,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Travel, Transportation and Per Diem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$58,360</td>
<td>$143,520</td>
<td>$28,793</td>
<td>$230,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Budget for Trainings, Workshops and Conferences

### TRAININGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training for Volunteers</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Training</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trainings</td>
<td>/training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants per Training</td>
<td>/people</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Rental per Training</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Transportation</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,296</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Accommodation per Day</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch and Refreshments per Participant Per Day</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$824</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials and Supplies per Participant per Training</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal-Trainings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,120</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WORKSHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Sharing and Lessons Learned</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Workshop</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Workshops</td>
<td>/workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants per Training</td>
<td>/people</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Rental per Workshop</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Transportation</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,712</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Accommodation per Day</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,741</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch and Refreshments per Participant Per Day</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,607</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Materials and Supplies per Participant per Workshop</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal-Trainings</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,399</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Trainings, Workshops and Conferences

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,519</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Budget of The Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA), a partner of Lutheran World Relief

*Only funding for Years I & II has been requested from UNF, Year III funding will be raised from other sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Line Items</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit /LOE</th>
<th>Quantity /LOE</th>
<th>Year 1 #of Units</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year 2 #of Units</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year 3 #of Units</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gifts Officers</td>
<td>$61,900</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$64,995</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$136,490</td>
<td>$201,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Processing Officer</td>
<td>$32,750</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$36,107</td>
<td>$36,107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCA LMI Coordinator</td>
<td>$72,200</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$79,601</td>
<td>$79,601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMI Program Coordinator</td>
<td>$72,200</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$79,601</td>
<td>$79,601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa Program Coordinator</td>
<td>$72,200</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$79,601</td>
<td>$79,601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Support</td>
<td>$43,500</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$23,979</td>
<td>$23,979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,995</td>
<td></td>
<td>$435,377</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRINGE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
<td>/base salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$64,995.00</td>
<td>$25,023</td>
<td>435,377.25</td>
<td>$167,620</td>
<td>$192,643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-FRINGE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,023</td>
<td></td>
<td>$167,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>$192,643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULTANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail Campaign</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-CONSULTANTS</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAVEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>/flight</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
<td>$4,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-TRAVEL</strong></td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Development</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>/package</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>$40,050</td>
<td>$70,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Stewardship/recognition</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Placement in the Lutheran</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>/one page</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Gathering</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Triennial</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL-PROGRAM OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,550</td>
<td></td>
<td>$107,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td>$20,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$160,038</td>
<td></td>
<td>$780,627</td>
<td></td>
<td>$960,686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Budget of The Lutheran Church of Missouri Synod (LCMS), a partner of Lutheran World Relief

* Only funding for Years I & II has been requested from UNF, Year III funding will be raised from other sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Line Items</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gift Officer</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Manager</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Director – Africa</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Field Personnel – Africa</td>
<td>/annual</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL-PERSONNEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRINGE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>/base salary</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>25,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL-FRINGE BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULTANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Publishing House</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>lumpsum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL-CONSULTANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAVEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare - Campaign (National)</td>
<td>/flight</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem - Campaign (National)</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare - District Conventions</td>
<td>/flight</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem - District Conventions</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Rental - District Conventions</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare - International Pilot</td>
<td>/flight</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem - International Pilot</td>
<td>/day</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Country Ground Transportation</td>
<td>/per</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL-TRAVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPLIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;A Costs</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>/base salary</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>25,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>/month</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL-SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Gathering</td>
<td>/lumpsum</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synodical Convention</td>
<td>/lumpsum</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Development (Nat'l &amp; Int'l campaign)</td>
<td>/package</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL-OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
CHURCH COUNCIL
April 11-13, 2008
Exhibit Q, Part 2a
MEMORANDUM
April 10, 2008

From: The Office of the Secretary
To: Church Council members
Re: Authorizing the Lutheran Malaria Initiative

In order to evaluate the propriety of and strategy for proceeding with the development of a proposal for a possible Lutheran Malaria Initiative (LMI), it is necessary to examine carefully this church’s governing documents, the original authorization of the World Hunger Program and Appeal, and the original authorization and subsequent extension of the “Stand with Africa” campaign. It also is helpful to look at recent actions that may have a bearing on the initiative. Examination of these documents provides the framework for making recommendations regarding actions of the Church Council and Churchwide Assembly regarding LMI.

A. THE GOVERNING DOCUMENTS
The governing documents define the responsibilities of the Church Council and the Churchwide Assembly regarding the establishment of fiscal policies and the authorization of fund-raising campaigns:

ELCA Constitution
11.41. Within the limits established by the Churchwide Assembly in the constitution and bylaws, the Church Council, as the board of directors of the churchwide organization, shall establish the fiscal policies of this church.

One such limit is the following:

11.41.06. No churchwide appeal to congregations or individuals of this church for the raising of funds shall be conducted by this church or churchwide units without the consent of the Churchwide Assembly, following consultation with the Conference of Bishops. No appeal to selected congregations and individuals of this church for the raising of funds shall be conducted by this church or churchwide units without the consent of the Church Council, following consultation with either the Conference of Bishops or specific synods as appropriate. Proposals for such special appeals shall be presented to the Church Council through the appropriate council committee with recommendations by the Office of the Presiding Bishop.

As can be seen, the Church Council has broad authority to establish fiscal policies, but it cannot authorize a new churchwide appeal focused solely on malaria. Only the Churchwide Assembly can authorize a new appeal. (However, an appeal limited to “selected congregations and individuals” could be authorized by the Church Council after consultation with either the Conference of Bishops or specific synods.)
B. AUTHORIZATION OF THE WORLD HUNGER PROGRAM AND APPEAL

The authorization for the World Hunger Program and Appeal dates from the ELCA Constituting Convention in 1987 [CA87.01.24]. The action provides as follows:

Resolved, that the following proposal be adopted by the Constituting Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:

Because the Holy Spirit calls us to share in God’s continuing care for all people and the entire creation;

Because God asks us to love our neighbors as Christ loves us;

Because God places us in a global neighborhood, with neighbors near and far who suffer hunger and oppression; and

Because God has given our uniting churches a positive experience with generous responses from our members to the world hunger reality, particularly through our special appeals since the mid-1970s; therefore,

a. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America establishes a World Hunger Program with these objectives:

1) to provide relief and development assistance for those who suffer from hunger and injustices related to hunger in this and other countries;

2) to foster the education of the members of this church to understand and confront the reality and underlying causes of hunger;

3) to advocate policies and actions for social and economic justice relating to hunger—with governments, business institutions, and structures of this church and its related agencies;

4) to encourage members to practice responsible stewardship of their lives and their financial resources toward the prevention and alleviation of hunger; and

5) to facilitate listening to and working together with those who have special awareness of the realities of food and hunger, including poor and hungry people in local and global communities, and those who produce, process, and distribute food.

b. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in order to sustain its World Hunger Program, establishes a continuing hunger appeal. It directs that funds be expended in the range of 25–30% within the territorial jurisdiction of this church and 70–75% in other parts of the world.

c. The three uniting churches shall begin immediately to combine their hunger programs.

The 1991 Churchwide Assembly added to the first objective the following sentence: “Maintain a disaster fund for response to international and domestic emergencies.” The Churchwide Assembly in 1999 adopted an action marking the 25th anniversary of World Hunger, but did not alter the enabling language.

Since the authorization of the World Hunger Program by the Constituting Convention, the Inter-unit Hunger Staff Team (IHST), authorized by the Office of the Presiding Bishop, has developed guidelines, principles, and assumptions for the program’s activities. The guidelines provide that activities shall relate to one or a combination of the following program areas:

a. RELIEF, which provides immediate access to food, shelter, clothing, medical supplies and care, and the means to deliver and sustain these (transport, storage, supplies, etc.) so that the basic need of people can be met;

b. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, which leads to increased access to food and sustainable livelihoods through means such as sustainable agriculture, care for the environment, appropriate technology, adequate housing, jobs, primary health care and disease prevention, job training, child care, elder care, nutrition education, literacy training, sanitation, safe water supplies, below-market loans, and just land use and distribution;

c. COMMUNITY ORGANIZING, which brings men and women with common values, complementary interests and shared concerns together to build and maintain an environment that empowers all persons to obtain justice, affirm
their dignity, and gain access to the goods of the earth (where possible these activities are congregation-based and help to overcome the irresponsible use of power in economic, social, and political arenas through a process that demonstrates a deep respect for the rule of law and democratic principles.);  
d. EDUCATION, which recognizes the abundance of God’s creation and addresses the causes, cures, and elimination of hunger and poverty, highlights the importance of lifestyle stewardship; engages our members, and empowers synods, congregations, affiliated ministries, and ecumenical partners to act through a variety of learning opportunities;  
e. ADVOCACY, which works to overcome the effects and root causes of hunger and poverty through administrative, legislative, and judicial actions in the public sphere and through corporate actions in the private sphere.

The sustainable development guideline mentions explicitly “primary health care and disease prevention,” and other guidelines also refer to elimination of root causes of hunger, one of which is disease.

In addition, the principles and assumptions include the following provision:

1. World Hunger Program activities will address the immediate and long-term causes of chronic and acute hunger and poverty, such as malnutrition, lack of access to food, inadequate agricultural production systems, environmental degradation and environmentally induced racism, HIV/AIDS, insurmountable international debt, inadequate education, discrimination against and oppression of women, unemployment, excessive military spending, and displacement due to civil strife.

The guidelines also address the international and domestic allocation of funds stipulated by the action of the Constituting Convention. A footnote states: “It is understood that this does not include Disaster Funds or other specifically designated monies.”

The initial objective in the original action of the Constituting Convention speaks broadly enough of “relief and development assistance for those who suffer from hunger and injustices related to hunger” to cover inclusion of the proposed Lutheran Malaria Initiative in the World Hunger Program. This conclusion is reinforced by the guidelines, principles, and assumptions referenced above.

C. Authorization and Continuation of the “Stand with Africa” Campaign

“Stand with Africa: A Campaign of Hope” was inaugurated by the action of the Churchwide Assembly in 2001. The Churchwide Assembly voted [CA01.06.27]:

To call upon individuals, congregations, synods, the churchwide organization, and related agencies and institutions to be strong and active partners in the emerging “Stand with Africa: A Campaign of Hope,” a cooperative effort of the World Hunger Program of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, World Relief of The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, and Lutheran World Relief, and to join others in (1) learning more about Africa; (2) advocating for justice, including special assistance in responding to the HIV–AIDS emergency in Africa; and (3) responding to urgent need through additional designated World Hunger “Stand with Africa” gifts within the context of ongoing support for the World Hunger Appeal of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and

To affirm the ministry of the World Hunger Program by returning the quarter and, for those that are able, adding to it. (Ed. note: this paragraph refers to a small basket containing a quarter that was distributed to each voting member.)

In 2004, the Church Council extended the “Stand with Africa” campaign by passing the following action [CC04.04.15]:


RESOLVED, that the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:

1. reaffirm this church’s commitment to continue to accompany companion churches and
   partner agencies in Africa, especially as they address the HIV–AIDS crisis, increases in
   chronic hunger, and the need for reconciliation and peacemaking;

2. express thanks to members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,
   congregations, synods, and agencies and institutions for “standing with Africa” through
   increased giving, education, and advocacy over the past three years;

3. express thanks to companion churches, Lutheran World Relief, and the Lutheran World
   Federation for “walking with” this church in this effort and for their leadership and
   service in addressing these issues;

4. affirm the continuation of “Stand with Africa: A Campaign of Hope” as a “second-mile”
   emphasis within the ELCA World Hunger Appeal and Program in order to raise
   awareness about Africa, encourage advocacy in support of Africa, and make available
   additional funding to enable coordinated and effective partnership activities in the three
   areas: the HIV–AIDS crisis, chronic hunger, and reconciliation and peacemaking;

5. continue to partner with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod where possible and
   provide support for Lutheran World Relief, bilateral assistance to companion churches
   in Africa, and support for the Lutheran World Federation’s Global HIV–AIDS
   Campaign through the “Stand with Africa” campaign;

6. call on members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, congregations, synods,
   the churchwide organization, and related agencies and institutions to continue to support
   “Stand with Africa” as strong and active partners in this campaign of hope and to (1)
   learn more about Africa; (2) advocate for justice, including special assistance in
   responding to the HIV–AIDS emergency in Africa and increased support for poverty-
   focused development; and (3) respond to urgent need through additional designated
   World Hunger “Stand with Africa” gifts, within the context of ongoing support for the
   ELCA World Hunger Appeal; and

7. request the presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to convey
   this expression of commitment and thanks to companion churches, Lutheran World
   Relief, and the Lutheran World Federation.

These actions indicate that the “Stand with Africa” campaign, both initially in its
establishment by the Churchwide Assembly and in its extension by the Church Council,
identified only HIV–AIDS by name as a target disease. However, the enabling legislative
actions contain broad language authorizing this church to “respond to urgent need . . . .”

D. SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS

Within the last year, this church has taken a number of inter-related actions.

1. The Lutheran Malaria Initiative

At its November 2007 meeting the Church Council approved the following:

To authorize staff of Development Services, Global Mission, and Church in Society, under
the coordination of the Office of the Presiding Bishop:

• to develop, in partnership with Lutheran World Relief, The Lutheran Church–Missouri
  Synod, and the United Nations Foundation, a proposal for a possible Lutheran Malaria
  Initiative, which would support the work of companion churches in the Lutheran World
  Federation and other international partners in ministry, as well as the Global Fund to Combat
  AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; and

• to develop plans for integrating and coordinating such an effort with the ELCA’s
  longstanding commitment to walk with those affected by HIV and AIDS and companion
  churches that are responding to this crisis, within the context of the integrated churchwide
  HIV and AIDS strategy that was called for by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly;
To request Development Services, Global Mission, and Church in Society to bring through the Office of the Presiding Bishop a report and possible recommendations on this initiative to the April 2008 meeting of the Church Council;

To authorize the Executive Committee, between meetings of the ELCA Church Council, to monitor and take appropriate action relating to the development of a possible malaria appeal and program, including the possible receipt of funding from the UN Foundation;

To request that the Office of the Presiding Bishop seek input from the Cabinet of Executives and that any information relating to the development of a possible malaria appeal and program be posted to the Church Council’s online listserv for input to the Executive Committee prior to any decision; and

To authorize staff of Development Services and Global Mission in 2008–2009 to include in the World Hunger Program’s “Stand With Africa” campaign pilot efforts in anti-malaria fundraising, education, and international programs as proposals for action by the 2009 ELCA Churchwide Assembly on a possible churchwide appeal are developed during that period.

The key paragraph is the last one, in which the Church Council authorizes inclusion of the malaria initiative in the “Stand with Africa” campaign until the 2009 Churchwide Assembly.

2. Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding

In response to urging from the Conference of Bishops, the Church Council created a Blue Ribbon Committee to study mission funding and practices. The report was received by the Church Council in April 2007, and the following action [CC07.04.15] was adopted:

To receive with gratitude the report of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding and to commend the members of the committee for their creative and diligent efforts on behalf of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;

To request that the presiding bishop inaugurate implementation in the 2008 proposed expenditure authorization of the funding and staffing implications contained in the report and recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding;

To delegate oversight and coordination for the implementation of the Blue Ribbon Committee’s report on mission funding to the Office of the Presiding Bishop—with special responsibility assigned to the Synodical Relations section and the Mission Funding and Interpretation Team—with an implementation plan, including specific measurements and evaluation cycles, to be presented to the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council and subsequently through regular progress reports to the Church Council commencing in April 2008; and

To urge that the Office of the Presiding Bishop develop, with the support of the Church Council, ways to foster throughout the ELCA’s congregations, synods, churchwide ministries, and related institutions and agencies a deeper and broader understanding of this church’s ecclesiology, polity, and philosophy of mission funding.

The Churchwide Assembly in 2007 took the following action [CA07.06.31] with respect to the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee:

1. To give thanks for the manifold ways in which God has blessed richly the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America with faithful members and abundant resources;
2. To acknowledge God’s summons to be good stewards in commitment to the mission entrusted to the Church and in the responsible management of the resources entrusted to members;
3. To receive with gratitude the report of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
4. To commend the content of the report for study and reflection throughout this church; and
5. To foster renewed commitment to vigorous mission-support efforts throughout the congregations, synods, and churchwide ministries of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in a wide variety of ways, including:
   a. examination of “best practices” for mission funding, alternative methods of generating mission-support income, and an improved consultation process for synods and the churchwide organization;
   b. commitment by the churchwide organization to convene stewardship leaders—including synodical stewardship committees, Lutheran professional advisers, and others—to encourage greater widespread ownership of stewardship endeavors throughout this church and to provide training, motivation, and inspiration;
   c. evaluation of stewardship education programs as well as the development and implementation of a strategy for stewardship leadership and staffing;
   d. presentation to the 2009 Churchwide Assembly of a proposal for the development and implementation of a resource to help congregations assess their responsible and accountable use of God’s resources commended to their care;
   e. development of educational opportunities for all those preparing for rostered leadership in this church through seminaries, programs of theological education for emerging ministries, and lay schools of theology;
   f. establishment of a requirement, by autumn 2009, for continuing education (6-10 hours) in financial stewardship for first-call rostered leaders to help them build upon competencies learned and practiced during their seminary education;
   g. engagement of new models for the role of the churchwide organization in financial leadership; and
   h. dissemination by the churchwide organization and synods to an increasing number of member households of regular, clear, and concise communication that is focused on mission interpretation.

The actions related to the Blue Ribbon Task Force, in themselves, do not address or restrict the opportunity to pursue the Lutheran Malaria Initiative.

3. Authorization of Fund Appeal
   In April 2007, the Church Council took the following action [CC07.04.17] regarding a feasibility study for a major fund appeal:
   To approve implementation of a feasibility study related to an ELCA fund appeal benefiting both synodical and churchwide ministries;
   To request the Office of the Presiding Bishop, Office of the Treasurer, Development Services, Communication Services, and the Conference of Bishops to proceed with the steps required for a professionally conducted feasibility study; and
   To request a report to the April 2009 meeting of the Church Council on the results of the feasibility study and recommendations pursuant to a fund appeal benefitting both synodical and churchwide ministries of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

   The wording of this action seems to mandate a feasibility study relating to a fund appeal addressed to both synodical and churchwide ministries.

4. HIV and AIDS Strategy
   The 2007 Churchwide Assembly took the following action [CA07.03.12]:
   1. To commit the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to a deeper engagement in addressing the AIDS pandemic through the development of a churchwide strategy for action in the coming decade, which will:
      a. build on the experience and commitments of the past and the strength of ELCA congregations, synods, churchwide structures, institutions, and agencies;
b. utilize the best thinking of ELCA experts, practitioners, congregational leaders, related institutions and agencies, and people living with HIV and AIDS, as well as ecumenical and global companions, in the development of this strategy;
c. express the ELCA’s commitment to work in cooperation with the Lutheran World Federation and in tandem with ecumenical partners both in this country and throughout the world;
d. express the ELCA’s commitment to engage proactively with others of good will in civil society and in government as they respond to the AIDS crisis; and
e. continue to move from crisis management to a more integrated, effective, and sustainable long-term response to the AIDS pandemic;

2. To express the solidarity of the ELCA with all people who are living with HIV and AIDS and with their families, both in this country and throughout the world:
   a. recognizing and giving thanks for the gifts, skills, and experience that people living with HIV and AIDS bring to addressing the pandemic and committing this church to work closely with them in its response;
   b. rejecting categorically the stigma and discrimination that are at times associated with HIV and AIDS;
   c. working to ensure universal access both to compassionate care and to effective treatment and prevention;
   d. engaging in education to prevent the further spread of HIV and AIDS; and
   e. providing a welcome in all aspects of church and congregational life to people living with or affected by HIV and AIDS;

3. To encourage ELCA members, congregations, agencies and institutions, synods, and the churchwide organization, at the same time this strategy is being developed, to:
   a. continue and extend their ministries among and with people living with HIV and AIDS;
   b. pray for people directly affected by HIV and AIDS and for churches, communities, and governments that they may have both the will and the wisdom to act boldly and effectively to address this crisis;
   c. intensify their support for the second-mile “Stand with Africa” campaign as well as the broader World Hunger Appeal, which enable this church to assist companions throughout the world as they respond to the AIDS crisis; and
   d. advocate with the U.S. government, urging it to:
      (1) demonstrate global leadership to achieve agreed-upon international goals, including universal access to treatment, care, and prevention by 2010;
      (2) contribute its proportionate share to fund fully the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; and
      (3) abolish the extraordinary requirements that make it difficult and painful for people living with HIV to receive a visa to enter the United States for any purpose, and prohibit discrimination against people living with HIV and AIDS;

4. To convey the deep appreciation of this church:
   a. to all those who provide care and support for those living with HIV and AIDS and those who seek a cure for this disease, in particular those members of this church who live out their Christian vocation as nurses, doctors, health researchers, and care providers;
   b. to ELCA pastors and congregations actively engaged in ministry with people living with HIV and AIDS as they support, counsel, and advocate with them for just and compassionate action in this church and in the wider society;
   c. to all those who have provided financial support to HIV and AIDS research and care, both in this country and throughout the world;
   d. to all those ELCA members whose financial gifts have enabled the ELCA to walk with companion churches in their response to the AIDS crisis, in particular through their “second-mile” giving to the World Hunger Appeal’s “Stand with Africa” campaign and companion synod action;
   e. to Lutheran social ministry organizations, hospitals, health facilities, and voluntary
organizations, including the Lutheran AIDS Network (LANET), that provide assistance to people living with HIV and AIDS as well as leadership in church and society on this issue;

f. to the Lutheran World Federation, Lutheran World Relief, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, ecumenical agencies (both domestic and global), and others with which the ELCA partners to provide care, address the impact of HIV and AIDS in communities, prevent the further spread of the disease, and advocate with governments to step up their action in addressing this pandemic; and

g. to companion churches in other countries, with which the ELCA is privileged to walk in ministry, as they respond to often overwhelming human need resulting from the spread of HIV; and

5. To request that the Church in Society and Global Mission program units take the lead in developing this strategy, which will be brought to the Church Council for adoption in 2008 and reported to the 2009 Churchwide Assembly.

As this strategy, which is specifically focused on HIV and AIDS, is developed, this church is encouraged to “intensify its support” for “Stand with Africa.” In addition, a report will be made to the Churchwide Assembly in 2009.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

The starting point for evaluation of the Lutheran Malaria Initiative in the governing documents is the prohibition against a churchwide appeal absent Churchwide Assembly approval. However, the Constituting Convention authorized an ongoing appeal for the World Hunger Program. Thereafter, the “Stand with Africa” campaign was engrafted onto World Hunger. In addition, the 2007 Churchwide Assembly adopted an HIV and AIDS initiative, with the assignment to report back in 2009.

Given the expansive language of the original enabling action for the World Hunger Program as well as its guidelines, principles, and assumptions, the World Hunger Program and Appeal can serve as the umbrella under which the Lutheran Malaria Initiative initially can be undertaken. The “Stand with Africa” campaign serves as a precedent for using the World Hunger Appeal as the legislative source for a new but related fund-raising effort until an appeal can be authorized at the 2009 Churchwide Assembly. Concerning receipt of funds for LMI, according to the World Hunger guidelines, specifically designated monies, such as those for LMI, do not come under the mandated percentage allocation between domestic and international distribution. Furthermore, for Phase One of LMI most funds will be expended domestically.

As is clear from the LMI proposal, plans already are underway for integrating the churchwide strategy on HIV and AIDS, as called for by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly, with the initiative. The proposal also commits this church to a goal of raising $10 million for HIV and AIDS.

The LMI also is being integrated with the feasibility study for a churchwide appeal, as called for in CC07.04.17. This Church Council action regarding a feasibility study for an appeal could be revisited and amended so that the study would address explicitly both the LMI and other churchwide and synodical ministries.
Synodical-Churchwide Consultations and Blue Ribbon Implementation Report

God our provider, you have not fed us with bread alone, but with words of grace and life. Bless us and these your gifts, which we receive from your bounty, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Synodical-Churchwide Consultations

As of this date there have been 33 mission support consultations with individual synods (one involving the three Texas synods), and three regional consultations that included the 17 synods of the regions, for a total of 51 synods. The remainder of the consultations will be concluded by May 15. The focus of this year’s consultations has been on strengthening the relationship between synods and the churchwide organization. Discussion has included the interdependence of the three expressions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as we seek to carry out our shared mission as this church in the world. Churchwide representatives to the consultations have carried back to the churchwide offices the challenges and significant concerns identified by synod participants. Each synod has been encouraged to focus on increasing generous and faithful giving by the members of their congregations. Each synod that is below the goal of 55 percent sharing of mission support has been encouraged to move toward that sharing by increasing the percentage of sharing in 2009 by at least one-half percent. Several synods have indicated their intention increasing mission support that is given by their congregations for synod and churchwide ministry by this amount or more.

Blue Ribbon Report on Mission Funding: implementation update

The Blue Ribbon Report on Mission Funding and the implementation plan include significant collaborative work within the churchwide organization and its units and sections, as well as close collaboration with synods and the Conference of Bishops. The following elements of the implementation plan are underway, with the key churchwide units indicated:

• “Gifts from congregations for synodical and churchwide mission support (“undesignated giving”) will be acknowledged as key to ‘best practices’ for mission funding”—Synodical Relations, Office of the Treasurer, Office of the Presiding Bishop.
• “Beginning in 2008, standardized reporting will allow for expanded acknowledgment of local giving. To facilitate this goal, synods will actively pursue full and accurate submission of parochial data reports”—Office of the Treasurer, Development Services, Office of the Secretary, Synodical Relations, Research and Evaluation, Mission Funding and Interpretation Team.

At the March meeting of the Conference of Bishops the conference acted to “request that the Office of the Treasurer, Synodical Relations, Research and Evaluation, and Office of the Secretary develop a mechanism for reporting congregational mission support.” This action gave the bishops’ endorsement to develop a process to identify congregational mission support as the necessary basis for acknowledging that support by both synods and the churchwide organization. Work is underway to provide the means for synods to gather and report this information with implementation during 2008.

• “Through the 2007-2008 consultation process, four or five synods will be identified and asked to develop and submit pilot proposals with clearly defined goals and objectives for increasing the amount of mission support in their synods” – Synodical Relations, Office of the Treasurer, Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission.

The request for synods to indicate their interest in the pilots came to the March meeting of the Conference of Bishops. It was indicated that there will be no pre-determined criteria for the synod proposals. Synods will be encouraged to be creative and innovative in their thinking about how to increase mission support within the synod. The potential for an effort’s success will be a factor in considering the viability of a proposal. The Mission Funding and Interpretation Team at
its March 12, 2008, meeting decided to ask twelve synods to consider developing such a formal proposal. The deadline for synod proposals is June 1, 2008. The time period for the pilot projects is September 1, 2008 – September 2010.

- “Office of the Secretary and Research and Evaluation will oversee necessary adjustments to the 2008 parochial report forms in order to facilitate the gather of information that will allow for some acknowledgement of local giving beyond the churchwide organization and more consistency in the reporting of financial information in order to make it more comparable across synods”—Office of the Secretary, Research and Evaluation.
- “Beginning in 2008, the Conference of Bishops will review all mission support plans of the synods, utilizing a format with consistent data from each synod. The Conference of Bishops will provide for a fuller conversation within the conference agenda regarding the context for mission support within synods, and will provide a recommendation to the ELCA Church Council regarding any requests for mission support exceptions”—Synodical Relations, Research and Evaluation.

Background
The ELCA Church Council voted at its April 2007 meeting (CC07.04.25) to amend continuing resolution 15.31.A03. as 15.31.A07. related to the responsibilities of the Conference of Bishops.

The Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall...
1. Assist the bishops in their role as leaders in fostering support for the work of this church by being a forum for discussion of annual mission support plans and serving as a means of providing advice and counsel to the Church Council in the council’s responsibility for approval of those plans.

The COB responsibility related to being a “forum for discussion of annual mission support plans” and as “a means of providing advice and counsel to the Church Council” will involve discussion of context and accountability. At the March 2008 meeting of the Conference of Bishops, the conference acted to “request the advisory bishops to the ELCA Church Council, in consultation with the Synodical-Churchwide Relations Committee, to work together for the implementation continuing resolution (15.31.A07) in order to provide advice and counsel to the Church Council.”

The advisory bishops will meet during this meeting of the Church Council to discuss the process for the Conference of Bishops to engage in this discussion.

- “Stewardship education programs and processes are evaluated and a strategy for stewardship leadership is developed and implemented.”

The 2007 Churchwide Assembly amendment to the recommendation on the BRC report requested “presenting to the 2009 Churchwide Assembly a proposal for the development and implementation of a resource to help congregations assess their responsible and accountable use of God’s resources commended to their care.”

“The churchwide organization will develop and implement a process to evaluate existing congregational stewardship education resources and its synodical and churchwide staffing”—Synodical Relations, Research and Evaluation, Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission.

An advisory team has been appointed and is scheduled to meet April 21, 2008, to develop the process of evaluation, with final responsibility for implementation by Synodical Relations and Research and Evaluation. The evaluation of resources and staffing will begin in 2008, with annual reports until a final report and proposal is prepared in three to five years. A proposal to the 2009 Churchwide Assembly for the development and implementation of a resource will be brought to the April 2009 meeting of the Church Council.
“Seminaries, lay theological education programs, and Theological Education for Emerging Ministries (TEEM) programs offer stewardship education opportunities for all those preparing for rostered leadership in this church”—Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission, Vocation and Education, ELCA seminaries and the Stewardship of Life Institute.

This Blue Ribbon Report outcome relates to stewardship education in seminaries, parish-based internship, and first-call theological education. Task groups related to each of these three areas have met and a progress report on theological education templates, stewardship competencies, core skills, and competencies will be presented at a meeting of the Stewardship of Life Institute in May 2008.

As I have participated in both synod and regional mission support consultations across the ELCA I have seen without exception synod participants expressing their commitment to the life of this church and to working in close collaboration with the churchwide expression. The Blue Ribbon Committee report has called attention to the challenging reality of a long-term decline in mission support from congregations for the work of the larger church and the need to increase the capacity for carrying out the mission of Christ’s church in the world. I believe that as we tell the story of what difference the ELCA is making in the world our members will respond with generous and faithful giving. It’s not just a tagline, but reality: God’s Work. Our Hands.

Pastor A. Craig Settlage
Director for Mission Support
Selection of Site for 2011 Churchwide Assembly

“Physical arrangements for churchwide assemblies shall be made by the secretary or by an assembly manager working under the secretary’s supervision. Such committees as may be necessary to facilitate the planning for and operation of the assembly may be established by the secretary in consultation with the presiding bishop,” according to churchwide bylaw 12.31.05. Further, churchwide bylaw 13.41.02.h. indicates that the secretary shall “[a]rrange for and manage meetings of the Churchwide Assembly . . . .”

In accord with these responsibilities, research was conducted and management provided by the secretary and the secretary’s staff for the sites of each of the assemblies already held: Chicago, Ill., in 1989; Orlando, Fla., in 1991; Kansas City, Mo., in 1993; Minneapolis, Minn., in 1995; Philadelphia, Pa., in 1997; Denver, Colo., in 1999; Indianapolis, Ind., in 2001; Milwaukee, Wis., in 2003; Orlando, Fla, in 2005; and Chicago, Ill., in 2007. Preparations are under way for the 2009 Churchwide Assembly, which will be held in Minneapolis, Minn.

Because of the space requirements for a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and because utmost care is exercised to control costs related to the assembly, comparatively few sites meet the requirements for hosting an assembly. Key costs are transportation, the assembly site, housing, and food for voting and advisory members.

Houston, Phoenix, Columbus, San Antonio, and Orlando all submitted bids for the 2011 Churchwide Assembly. With the exception of Orlando, these locations require the use of at least two hotels for voting and advisory members. In addition, a convention center is needed for meeting space. Use of a convention center causes additional costs due to the need to rent tables and chairs and pay for the labor to set them up. Transportation from the hotels to the convention center adds further charges. Shuttle buses can be inconvenient, and they have an adverse impact on the environment.

In contrast to the other potential sites, the Marriott World Center in Orlando, Fla., is large enough for the meeting to be self-contained, eliminating the costs detailed above. Another advantage is the building of community, which is fostered when all assembly participants stay in one hotel. Providing security also is easier and less expensive at one site, rather than in multiple spaces. In addition, because Florida is a “right-to-work” state, volunteers can be utilized for many tasks, such as running cameras and setting up, resulting in further savings.

The Marriott World Center has just completed the addition of a 105,000 sq. ft. exhibit hall, which is pillar-free and has 30 ft. ceilings. This space can be divided so that worship and plenary can take place in adjoining areas, eliminating excessive travel time between halls. The higher ceiling and new lighting also allow for more staging possibilities. The hotel channels are available for the ELCA’s video programming, and banners can be hung in all areas.

The Marriott World Center has agreed to a room rate of $131 per room per night for 2011. This amount represents just a 2 percent increase per year over the 2005 rate. Meals and coffee will be offered at reduced cost, again a 2 percent increase per year over 2005 costs. The other concessions that were offered in 2005 also are confirmed for 2011.
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3) Our Redeemer Lutheran Church; past Congregation Council; current Mutual Ministry; Current Oregon Synod Council and Executive Committee; Current Oregon Synod Outreach Committee, Oregon Synod Finance Committee
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5) Chief of Operations, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
6) Friends of Hood River Library; Nature Conservancy; Habitat for Humanity
7) 1951
8) English
Comments:
Pr. Rachel L. Connelly (2013)
Synod 9B North Carolina
1) Water of Life Lutheran Church, Wilmington, NC
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4) B.A., Augsburg College; M.Div., Union Theological Seminary; Merrill Fellow, Harvard Divinity School
5) Presiding Bishop, ELCA, 2001-; President, Lutheran World Federation, 2003-
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Synod 5D Southeastern Iowa
1) St. John, Des Moines, IA
2) Leadership in congregation, conference, and synod; Planner and participant in ecumenical events; Churchwide Assembly, 2001
3) Congregation Council President, 3 years; Congregation Call Committee Co-Chair, Lector, Communion Assistant, Ministry teams; Synod Council, Finance Committee, Ministry Team, church and lesbian and gay persons
4) B.S., Iowa State University; M.D., University of Iowa College of Medicine; Certificate, University of the South, Education for Ministry
5) Physician, End of Life Counselor; Hospice and Palliative Medicine
6) Co-principal Investigator, grant to improve End of Life; Founder and First President, bioethics center; Advisory Council, Clinical Pastoral Education
7) 1944
8) English
Comments: After choosing to become a Lutheran in my mid-thirties, I have found my home in the ELCA to be both comforting and challenging. I live out my faith as a hospice physician, as a teacher and mentor, and in the every-day-ness of every day. I enjoy the out of doors, classical music, and a good book of poetry.
Pr. Keith A. Hunsinger (2011)
Synod 6D Northwestern Ohio
1) St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church, Oak Harbor, OH
2) Voting member, three Churchwide Assemblies; Reinartz Scholar, LTSS; Intern Supervisor, Trinity Seminary
3) Past Synod Executive Committee; Past Synod Council; Dean, three conferences in two synods
4) B.A., University of South Florida; M.Div., Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary
5) Senior Pastor; St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church
6) Past emergency chaplain, clergy association president, four towns in two synods
7) 1952
8) English
Comments: Being a member of the Church Council is the extension of a gift of being called to serve as the Spirit sees fit.

Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton
Synod 5A Metropolitan Chicago Synod
1) Joy!, Gurnee, IL
2) 12 years with Division for Global Mission, Accountant for Overseas Operations, Assistant Finance Director, Director for Finance
3) Member, Assimilation Committee; Children’s Ministry Teacher; Worship assistance
4) B.A., Concordia College; M.B.A., Thunderbird Graduate School of International Management
5) ELCA Treasurer and MIF President
7) 1965
8) English
Comments: I have served as the treasurer of the ELCA and president of the Mission Investment Fund since 2002. My family and I are members of Joy! Lutheran Church, in Gurnee, Illinois.

Pr. David E. Jensen (2009)
Synod 5G Northern Great Lakes
1) Ascension, Minocqua, WI
2) Synod Council Executive Committee, Ministry and Ecumenical Committees; Board of Directors, Howard Young Medical Center; Board, “Planning for Vision,” Nicolet College
3) Synod LERN Representative, Region 5 LERN Representative and Executive Board; ELCA Representative, National Planning Commission for Christian Unity; ELCA delegate to NCCC and Ecumenical Pilgrimages
4) D.Min., Graduate Theological Foundation; Bush Fellow, Magdalen College, Oxford University; Bush Fellow, Centro Pro Unione, Rome
5) Pastor; Ascension Lutheran Church
6) Institutional and Medical Ethics Committee; Board of Directors, Community Foundation & Community Mental Health; Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Nicolet College
7) 1952
8) English
Comments: I love to play the bagpipes. I picked up the interest while traveling Scotland as a teenager. That also accounts for my continued fascination with the game of golf. For every winter, which is long in Northern Wisconsin, I take on a new project hoping to gain a new skill set. They have ranged from juggling to horological repair and maintenance.

Mr. Mark E. Johnson (2013)
Synod 1B Northwest Washington
1) Magnolia Lutheran Church, Seattle, WA
2) Attorney who listens well, cogently summarize key points/ identify possibilities; Actively involved in the worship life of the Church for 40 yrs.; Active in the community, serving on boards of two nonprofit corporations
3) Delegate to the Constituting Convention of the Luther League of The ALC; Member of Synod Council, 2002-present, recently re-elected to second term; President of Congregation Council; mbr. of Congregation Council, two terms
4) B.A., Trinity College; J.D., University of Oregon School of Law
5) Attorney/Partner, Lane Powell PC Attorneys/Counselors
6) Board of directors, Residence East Corp. (provides housing/services); Board of directors, LOM/Spiritwood at Pine Lake, assisted living/memory care; Past Chair of Troop Committee, Troop 80, Boy Scouts of America, Seattle, Wash.
7) 1943
8) English

Comments: I am a life-long Lutheran, a graduate of Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut and the University of Oregon School of Law, a retired Captain in the Coast Guard Reserve and a semi-retired trial lawyer with a concentration in maritime law and work for the London Insurance Market. I am a huge Oregon Duck football fan (currently #5 in the BCS polls) unlike my Bishop, Chris Boerger, who is a huge Ohio State Buckeye football fan (currently #1 in the BCS polls). I spend a bit of time working, but mostly I do non-profit work for a number of church or other non-profit organizations when I am not pursuing my interest in wine or hacking about a golf course

Pr. Susan Langhauser (2013)
Synod 4B Central States
1) Advent Lutheran Church, Olathe, KS
2) Member of Congregation Council as lay person 1982-1990; Staff Liaison to International Council of Governors and Chapter Presidents Council; Dean of Conference
3) Co-Chaired Local Arrangements Committee for ELCA Churchwide Assembly 1993; First-Call Theological Task Force and Tri-Synodical Educational Steering Com. Chair 1998; Retreat/Seminar Leader and Speaker, “Blessings and Rituals for the Journey of Life”
4) B.A., University of Missouri; M.Div. Honors, Pacific Lutheran Theological Sem.
5) Pastor, Advent Lutheran Church
6) Convener, Blue Valley Ministerial Association; Chaplain, Overland Park Police Department; Chair, Blue Valley Fine Arts Commission
7) 1952
8) English
Comments: My husband, Roger Gustafson, and I met at seminary, married, and served our internship together. We are currently in our 18th year as co-pastors at Advent on the outskirts of Kansas City. I often lead workshops and seminars that result from my first book, "Blessings and Rituals for the Journey of Life" and I write for the Akaloo program. I am a birder, a singer, and enjoy the fine arts. My undergraduate degree was in Speech & Drama.

Pr. Jonathan W. Linman (2011)
Synod 8B Southwestern Pennsylvania
1) St. Peter’s, New York, NY
2) Teacher of seminary courses on spirituality for practice of ministry; Served as spiritual director to persons discerning call to ministry; long involvement in LCM
3) Synod Candidacy Committee; Past board member, DCM; Voting member, two Churchwide Assemblies
4) B.A., Carleton College; M.Div., Trinity Lutheran Seminary; M.A., Ph.D., Duquesne University
5) Director, Center for Christian Spirituality; The General Theological Seminary
6) Community Service Award recipient; Shared in community parish nurse/health ministries program; Participated in after-school program for elementary-age children
7) 1961
8) English
Comments: I am director of the Center for Christian Spirituality and associate professor of Ascetical Theology (ask him why a Lutheran is teaching "works") at the General Theological Seminary of The Episcopal Church in New York City. I am married to Jennifer, who is an Episcopal priest, so it's full-communion full-time!

Mr. William R. Lloyd Jr. (2009)
Synod 8C Allegheny
1) Trinity Evangelical, Somerset, PA
2) Service on Synod and Congregation Councils; Service in the state legislature; Experience with budgets, programs, issues as legislator and attorney
3) Synod Council; Congregation Council Pres.; Congregation Lector and Communion Assistant
4) B.A., Franklin and Marshall College; J.D., Harvard Law School; U.S. Naval Justice School
5) Attorney; Small Business Advocate; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
6) Active duty service as a naval officer; Retired, PA House of Representatives, 18 years
7) 1947
8) English
Comments: I served 18 years as a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and was the Democrats’ unsuccessful candidate against U. S. Senator Arlen Specter in 1998. As Pennsylvania’s small business advocate, my staff and I litigate before the Public Utility Commission on behalf of small business ratepayers. I am an avid sports fan—especially of the Pittsburgh Pirates, the Pittsburgh Steelers, and Penn State football.
Pr. Steven ‘Steve’ P. Loy (2011)
Synod 2E Rocky Mountain
1) Peace, Las Cruces, NM
2) Pastor in the ELCA, 20 years; Internship Supervisor, 9 years.; Adjunct faculty at Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
3) Synod Candidacy Committee Chair; Past Board member, DM; Synod Council
4) M.Div., Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg; Ph.D., New Mexico State University
5) Pastor; Peace Lutheran Church
6) Adjunct faculty, New Mexico State University
7) 1960
8) English
Comments: I am beginning my 15th year as the pastor of Peace Lutheran Church in Las Cruces, New Mexico. I am married and have two daughters, 17 and 15.

Mr. John S. Munday (2013)
Synod 3G Minneapolis Area
1) Long Lake Lutheran Church, Isanti, MN
2) Leadership in bereavement support groups for 25 yrs.; A global perspective based upon 20 yrs. of Third World involvement; A full understanding of today’s technical world as a patent attorney
4) B.S., Purdue University; J.D., DePaul University; M.T., Princeton Theological Seminary
5) Intellectual Property Lawyer and Writer, self-employed attorney and author
6) Founding president of Habitat for Humanity Affiliate, Berlin, Md.; Co-Founder, Compassionate Friends Chapter, Delaware County, Pa.; Charter board member of Romero Interfaith Center, Philadelphia, Pa.
7) 1940
8) English
Comments: I write a column for two local newspapers titled “The Path To Healing,” a result of twenty-five years of grief work after the murder of my wife's daughter Marlys in 1979. The story is told in my book, Justice For Marlys (University of Minnesota Press, Paper 2006) We live on 14 acres in the woods (in a house actually) about 40 miles north of the twin cities, on one of 167 lakes in Minnesota named Long Lake.
Mr. Mark W. Myers (2013)
Synod 2D Grand Canyon
1) The Lakes Lutheran Church, Las Vegas, NV
2) I have served as conference representative on the Synod Council, two yrs.; I have spoken to each head pastor in our conference and have strong understanding; On Synod Council I helped with healing after resignation of bishop
3) President of Congregation Council, The Lakes, Las Vegas; Currently on Synod Council, Colorado River Conference Representative; Currently serving as an assisting minister in my congregation
4) B.S., University of New York; M.B.A., Canisius College
5) Real Estate Agent, self employed, RE/MAX One
6) Pres., V.P., Sec. and Treas. for local Rotary Club; Council Advancement Chair for the Boy Scouts, 5½ yrs.; Active in Boy Scouts of America as adult leader, 14 yrs.
7) 1953
8) English
Comments:

Ms. Ann F. Niedringhaus (2011)
Synod 3E Northeastern Minnesota
1) First, Duluth, MN
2) Experience in policy development and planning; Skills in finance, budgeting and fund development; Experience with people with disabilities, diverse cultural backgrounds
3) Congregation Stewardship Board, Chair; Congregation Strategic Planning Committee, Co-Chair; Past Congregation President and Vice President
4) B.S.N., St. Olaf College; M.S.W., University of Minnesota, Duluth
5) Retired social worker/education for teen mothers.
6) Board, Holden Village; Board of Trustees, Foundation, 7 years, Chair; Board and Past Vice President, Lutheran Social Services of MN
7) 1943
8) English
Comments: For the last fifteen years my most satisfying activity has been writing. During the summer my second poetry chapbook was accepted for publication; and my publication celebration and reading is November 3rd. Later in November I will begin coordinating writing groups in our county jail twice a month.

1) Congregational membership 2) Experience relevant to this position 3) Church-related service 4) Education 5) Occupation 6) Community service 7) Year of birth 8) Primary language
Mr. Carlos E. Peña
Synod 4F Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast
1) First, Galveston, TX
2) Experience of having served on the ELCA Church Council; Attended many synod assemblies and two Churchwide Assemblies; Worked with a broad base of people in church and community
3) Chair, ELCA Churchwide Nominating Committee; Past Synodical Vice President; ELCA Church Council, 1993-99; Church Council Executive Committee; Chair, Synodical Multicultural Board; Congregation President, Vice President, and various committee chairs
4) B.A., University of Houston
5) Kleen Supply Co., owner
6) Past President, Historical Foundation; Vice Chair, Christus Health Care Regional Governing Board; Director, Texas First Bank; Vice President, Galveston Independent School District Educational Foundation; Director, Rotary Club of Galveston
7) 1953
8) English
Comments: I currently own a cleaning supply business on Galveston Island off the coast of Texas, where I also live with my wife, Diane, two cats, and dog. I like to jog and have run in several marathons. I enjoy cooking and reading murder mysteries. I am a member of the Houston Musician's Union and play trombone professionally.

Pr. Pablo Obregón (2013)
Synod 3F Southwestern Minnesota
1) Paz y Esperanza, Willmar, MN
2) Have a passion for the long-term vision of the ELCA; The Church is a wonderful place of empowerment, healing and reconciliation; Represent both rural America and multicultural presence in the larger church
3) Past Assistant to the Director, Latin America Region, Global Mission; Past member of ELCA board for Church in Society; Past Coordinator for Hispanic Ministries, Southwestern Minnesota Synod
4) Biblical Study, Luther Bible Institute; M.Div., Luther Seminary; Universidad San Martin De Porres
5) Chaplain, Bethesda Health and Housing
6) Member of Shelter House board of directors, present; YMCA Kandiyohi, board of directors, past; Human Rights Commission, City of Willmar, past
7) 1965
8) Spanish
Comments:
Pr. David W. Peters (2013)
Synod 1F Montana Synod
1) King of Glory Lutheran Church, Billings, MT
2) Life-long Lutheran, soaked and enfilled with the grace of Word and Sacrament; Wide variety of ministry, parish pastor, missionary Southeast Asia, chaplain; Knowledge in theological and faith issues, management and administration
3) Member, Spiritual Emotional Care Committee, Lutheran Disaster Response; Voting member, 2003 ELCA Churchwide Assembly; Chaplain/Presenter, Mont. Synod First-Call Theological events
4) B.A., Gustavus Adolphus College; M.Div., Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary
5) Associate to the Bishop, Montana Synod
6) Chair, community advisory committee, St. Vincent Health Care; Chair, St. John’s Lutheran Ministries; Member, Montana Faith Health Cooperative; Member, Pacific Lutheran University board of regents.
7) 1949
8) English
Comments: My passion, besides peace and justice, is music (from Pink Martini and U2 to Charlie Parker and Bill Evans to Grieg’s Holberg Suite and Eric Whitacre’s Cloudburst) and finding a fine wine for less than $10 (“Beer is made by man, wine by God” - M. Luther, “Wine is like the incarnation, it is both divine and human - Paul Tillich). Interesting experiences seem to come while flying - de-planed due to bomb threat, rain pouring through the outer skin in a typhoon, emergency landings due to a plane being fire, and just recently a plane being struck by lightning. I love to read (novels, theology, history) and have been trying to break 80 on the golf course for too long. I am quiet and reserved (for a while); a “one” on the enneagram and an INFJ

Pr. J. Paul Rajashekar (2009)
Synod 7A New Jersey
1) Redeemer, Penndel, PA
2) Dean and Professor, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia; Past board member, DM; Served LWF
3) Asian Lutheran Int’l. Conference; Synod Committee for Multicultural Ministries; Presenter, Bishops’ Academy, 2003
4) B.D., United Theological College; S.T.M., Christ-Seminex; Ph.D., University of Iowa
5) Academic Dean, Luther Reed; Professor, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia
6) Member of Commission on Accreditation; National Assn. of Asian Christians; Representative, Interfaith Committee, NCC-USA
7) 1948
8) Kannada
Comments: I was born in India to Christian parents. Educated both in India and the US. I have served the Lutheran World Federation as Secretary for Theology prior to coming to the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia. I currently serve as the Dean of the Seminary. Christian relations with people of other living religions has been a life-long focus of my studies and publications. I enjoy teaching and assisting in the formation of future pastors at the Seminary
Ms. Lynette M. Reitz (2011)
Synod 8E Upper Susquehanna
1) St. John’s, Watsontown, PA
2) Previous synod council experience; Education and experience as a social worker; Desire to help and empower others
3) Synod Council; Synod Church and Society Committee; Staff, Camp Mount Luther and Camp Nawakwa
4) B.S., Indiana University of PA; M.S.W., University of Chicago; Ph.D., Marywood University
5) Associate Professor; Lock Haven University of PA
6) National Association of Social Workers; Council on Social Work Education; Junior Woman’s Club
7) 1963
8) English
Comments: I am the proud mother of two adopted daughters who are so different, but complement each other in so many ways. Through them I have become the voice of the Muncy High School marching band and have traveled to New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware to watch and cheer for my youngest daughter who dances competitively. I love to go to Penn State football games with my husband--Go PSU! When I have a little time to myself, I enjoy doing word searches, playing card or word games with my mother, or curling up with a good book in front of the fireplace.

Pr. John C. Richter (2009)
Synod 7E Northeastern Pennsylvania
1) Trinity, Reading, PA
2) Doctor of Ministry focused on planning; have served both urban and suburban congregations; served large congregation with a diversity of opinion on issues facing ELCA
3) Synod Candidacy Committee Chair; Policy Council, Lutheran Advocacy Ministry in Pennsylvania; Board of Trustees, Lutheran Theological School at Philadelphia
4) B.A., New York University; M.Div., Union Theological Seminary; D.Min., Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia
5) Vice President of Church Relations, Diakon Lutheran Social Ministries
6) Board of Directors Family Promise of Berks County
7) 1949
8) English
Comments: In our spare time, my wife Pat and I enjoy exploring neighboring cities (especially New York and Philadelphia), and being involved in the lives of our three young adult daughters. We get to see lots of basketball, since one daughter is a coach (at Randolph Macon College) and another plays (for Wellesley College). Other favorite activities are walking, reading, and getting to a beach at least twice a year (most recently Martha’s Vineyard and Mexico).
Ms. Sandra Schlesinger (2011)
Synod 6B North/West Lower Michigan
1) Trinity, Midland, MI
2) Serving as council president; Chairing Worship Task Force
3) Confirmation Teacher, 6 years; Adult Advisor, LYO; Past Congregation Council Pres.
4) B.A. St. Olaf College
5) Analytical & Quality Leader; Dow Chemical
6) Treasurer, Boy Scouts; Parent volunteer at school
7) 1962
8) English

Comments:

Pr. Norene A. Smith
Greater Milwaukee Synod (5J)
1) Bay Shore Lutheran Church, Milwaukee, WI
2) Parish ministry in both rural and urban settings since 1983; Campus Ministry, Luther College 1991-1997; Advocacy for adolescent mental health via Rogers Mem. Hosp Found.
3) GMS member chosen to introduce the ELW to our synod.; Member of 2 synod worship committees, reference and council committee; Member of MICAH-Milwaukee Inner City Churches Alive in Hope
4) Queen Anne High School, Seattle WA, 72; B. Music., Pacific Lutheran University, 76; M. Div., Luther Theological Seminary, 82
5) Pastor; Bay Shore Lutheran Church
6) Milwaukee clergy rep for Next Door Foundation annual Walk For Kids; Advocate for adolescent mental health via Rogers Memorial Hosp Found.; Helped sponsor ecumenical Theology and the Environment symposium.
7) 1954
8) English

1) Congregational membership  2) Experience relevant to this position  3) Church-related service  4) Education
5) Occupation  6) Community service  7) Year of birth  8) Primary language
Pr. Jeff B. Sorenson (2011)
Synod 3C South Dakota
1) Gloria Dei, Sioux Falls, SD
2) Mission plan oversight and Money for Mission Task Force; “Bridgebuilder” consultant & “Healthy Congregations” facilitator; Pastor/developer of one new congregation, redeveloped another
3) Walking with Companion Synod churches; Teaching pastoral ethics, confessions, preaching; Past Synod World & American Missions Board Chair
4) B.S., North Dakota State Univ.; M.Div., Luther Seminary; D.Min. study, Luther Seminary
5) Assistant to the Bishop, South Dakota Synod
6) Member of School Board; Coach, youth sports; Youth Mentor, Big Brother & foster parent
7) 1953
8) English
Comments: I most enjoy asking the missional questions, pushing the envelope, asking what God is up to in the world - and how we can be part of it. Currently, I am completing research for a Doctor of Ministry in Biblical Preaching, with the thesis, "How Can We Preach 'Authentically' at the Postmodern Turn?" along with development of a project/process for congregations to adapt constructively to the major cultural shifts that swirl around us. I believe that God has great things in store for the future of our ELCA - if we will have our ears on, our minds open and our courage up!

Mr. David D. Swartling (2013)
Synod 5A Metropolitan Chicago Synod
1) Bethany Lutheran Church, Bainbridge Island, WA (current)
3) Congregational president; Northwest Washington Synod, vice president; Region 1 Council, chairperson; ELCA Foundation, chairman of the board; ELCA Board of Pensions, trustee
4) B.A., Princeton University; J.D. University of Washington
7) 1947
8) English
Comments:
Mr. David Truland (2011)
Synod7D Upstate New York
1) Faith, Troy, NY
2) Broad interest in “church,” including a sense of call for involvement; Ecumenical, through worship (trumpet) and public policy activities; Training as an attorney to evaluate matters thoroughly and rationally
3) Synod Council, 7 years, and Executive Committee, 5 years; Participant, Consultations in Chicago and Philadelphia; Voting member, 2003 Churchwide Assembly and observer, 2005 Churchwide Assembly
4) B.S., Hartwick College; J.D., Albany Law School; Masters courses, College of St. Rose
5) Attorney, Family Court Law Guardian; Self-employed
6) Assist with public school music activities; Educational program for foster parents and Head Start Program; Nonprofit Web Advocacy
7) 1955
8) English

Comments: Former music teacher who now practices law as law guardian and assigned counsel in a New York State Family Court. Married, with one daughter in college and one in Middle School. Vice President of the Upstate New York Synod.

Judith Tutt-Starr
Synod 2B Southern California (West)
1) Ascension, Los Angeles, CA
2) Synod Council Member; CWA Voting Member; Ministry partner w/spouse studying @ Makumira Theo. Sem.
3) Bd., LSSCH; Congregation Pres.; Project Com., ELM
4) B.G.S. Capital Univ.
5) Principal; St. Timothy Lutheran School
6) Teacher for college bound Saturday school; Reader, Foundation for the Junior Blind; Manager, girls ice hockey team
7) 1954
8) English

Comments: I love to read and drift away with ‘coffee table’ books to other countries and get inside of other cultures. I have lived in and visited east African countries of Tanzania and Kenya. My biggest trip to come will be to China. I’m a Scrabble aficionado—will play with anyone, anywhere, anytime. I love to direct our young people to ELCA colleges.
Mr. Richard L. Wahl (2009)
Synod 8F Delaware-Maryland
1) Our Shepherd, Severna Park, MD
2) Leadership roles in synod, conference and congregation; Lifelong passion and commitment to our church and its ministry together; Voting Member/Visitor, all Churchwide Assemblies
3) Past Synod Budget and Memorials Committee Chair; Past Synod Council and Transition Team Co-Vice Chair; Past Congregation President and Call Committee Chair
4) B.A., St. Olaf College; M.S., George Washington University; St. Mary’s Seminary Ecumenical Institute
5) Retired; Federal Government, Foreign Intelligence
6) Past President, county Sheltered Workshop; Past Board of Directors, Lutheran Social Services in Baltimore; County Winter Relief Homeless Shelter
7) 1939
8) English
Comments: After a career in government intelligence, retirement provided the long-desired opportunity for studies in theology (8 biblical courses). Among my interests: traveling throughout this country, hiking through old growth forests, biking, the Baltimore Symphony and Annapolis Chorale, the Redskins and Orioles, genealogy, and working with homeless men.

Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace (2009)
Synod 9F Caribbean
1) Frederick Evangelical, St. Thomas, VI
2) Service on policy making boards, commissions and councils; Served as Vice President, Lutheran Center for Theological Formation; Served as President, Women of the ELCA at Frederick
3) Synod Vice President; Region 9 Executive Committee and Archives Board; Congregation Vice President
4) B.S., Morgan State University; M.S., American University; D. Ed., University. of Miami
5) Deputy Commissioner, Administrative Services and Management, VI Department of Health
6) Legislative Committee, Breast & Cervical Cancer Coalition Chair; Past Vice President and Secretary, League of Women Voters; Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority
7) 1948
8) English
Comments:
Mr. Gary Wipperman (2009)
Synod 5F Northeastern Iowa
1) St. Paul, Waverly, IA
2) Member of strategic planning committee in congregation; Chair of congregation during approval and implementation of strategic plan
3) Past Congregation officer, Call Committee, School Board, Assisting Minister; Voting member, several synod assemblies; Voting member, 2001 Churchwide Assembly
4) B.A., Wartburg College; M.A., University of Iowa
5) Director, Information Technology Services; Wartburg College
6) Board of Directors, Community Symphony; Volunteer, Democratic Party
7) 1953
8) English

Comments: I have an interest in genealogy which ties in nicely with several other hobbies including photography and computers. This has lead to an interest in Irish and Scottish history and culture. Besides these interests, I am an avid gardener and enjoy landscaping my yard and in my distant past I used to be a high school teacher of Mathematics and English.