

**EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA  
CHURCH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES  
November 9-11, 2007  
Lutheran Center  
Chicago, Illinois**

The fifty-eighth meeting of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) was convened in the Council Room of the Lutheran Center at Chicago, Illinois. The meeting began on Friday, November 9, 2007, with a service of Holy Communion. The Rev. Mark S. Hanson, presiding bishop, was the presider; the Rev. Steven P. Loy preached, Ms. Kathy J. Magnus was the lector, and Ms. Norma J. Hirsch served as assisting minister.

**ORGANIZATION OF MEETING**  
(Agenda I.A.-I.E.)

The following persons were present for all or part of the meeting:

***Voting Members***

**Officers:**

Pr. Mark S. Hanson, presiding bishop  
Mr. Carlos E. Peña, vice president  
Mr. David D. Swartling, secretary  
Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton, treasurer

**Church Council:**

Pr. David P. Anderson	Mr. John S. Munday
Ms. Rebecca Jo Brakke	Mr. Mark W. Myers
Ms. Judith Anne Bunker	Ms. Ann C. Niedringhaus
Ms. Deborah L. Chenoweth	Pr. José Pablo Obregon
Pr. Rachel L. Connelly	Pr. David W. Peters
Mr. Bradley Dokken	Pr. J. Paul Rajashekar
Mr. John R. Emery	Ms. Lynette M. Reitz
Ms. Karin Lynn Grady	Pr. John C. Richter
Mr. Mark S. Helmke	Ms. Sandra Schlesinger
Ms. Norma J. Hirsch	Pr. Jeffrey "Jeff" B. Sorenson
Pr. Keith A. Hunsinger	Mr. David Truland
Pr. David E. Jensen	Ms. Judith Tutt-Starr
Mr. Mark E. Johnson	Mr. Richard L. Wahl
Pr. Susan Langhauser	Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace
Pr. Jonathan W. Linman	Mr. Gary L. Wipperman
Mr. William R. Lloyd Jr.	
Pr. Steven P. Loy	

***Representatives of the Conference of Bishops***

Bp. Allan C. Bjornberg ( <i>excused</i> )	Bp. Gerald L. Mansholt
Bp. Leonard H. Bolick	Bp. Murray D. Finck
Bp. Callon W. Holloway	Bp. Peter Rogness
Bp. Marie C. Jerge	Bp. Paul Stumme-Diers
Bp. H. Gerard Knoche	Bp. Martin D. Wells ( <i>excused</i> )

**Advisory Members**

**Youth:**

Ms. Briana R. Watts

Mr. Samuel F. Schlouch

**Advisors:**

Pr. Chi Shih Chen, Association of Asians and Pacific Islanders

Mr. Michael D. Bash, chair of the board of trustees, Augsburg Fortress, Publishers

Ms. Susan Candea, Consulting Committee for Justice for Women

Ms. Jennifer Deleon, Association of Latino Ministries

Pr. Khader N. El-Yateem, chair, Multicultural Ministries program committee

Mr. Joseph A. Husary, president, Association of Lutherans of Arab and Middle Eastern Heritage (*excused*)

Pr. Phillip D. W. Krey, ELCA seminaries

Pr. O. Dennis Mims, president, African American Lutheran Association

Pr. Sarah Lee-Faulkner, chair, Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission program committee

Ms. Carmen Richards, president of the board, Women of the ELCA

Pr. Frederick Strickert, chair, Global Mission program committee

Mr. Kai S. Swanson, chair, Vocation and Education program committee

Pr. Roger A. Thompson, chair, Church in Society program committee

Mr. Larry Thiele, president, American Indian and Alaska Native Lutheran Association

Mr. Richard L. Torgerson, ELCA colleges and universities

Ms. Suzanne Wise, social ministry organizations

**Resource Persons**

**Office of the Presiding Bishop:**

Pr. M. Wyvetta Bullock, executive for leadership development

Pr. Kathie Bender Schwich, executive for synodical and constituent relations

Ms. Myrna J. Sheie, executive for governance and institutional relations

**Section Executives and Staff:**

Pr. Michael L. Burk, executive for worship and liturgical resources and chaplain to the Church Council

Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep, executive for research and evaluation

Pr. Donald J. McCoid, executive for ecumenical and inter-religious relations

Pr. Darrell D. Morton, assistant to the presiding bishop for federal chaplaincy ministries

Pr. A. Craig Settlage, director for mission support

Ms. Else B. Thompson, executive for human resources

**Office of the Secretary:**

Pr. Ruth E. Hamilton, executive assistant to the secretary

Mr. Phillip H. Harris, general counsel

Pr. Paul A. Schreck, executive assistant to the secretary

Mr. David A. Ullrich, associate general counsel

**Office of the Treasurer:**

**Section Executives and Staff:**

Ms. Karen Rathbun, executive for management services

Ms. LaRue R. Unglaube, executive for information technology

Pr. Jeffrey R. King, support specialist, information technology

**Program Unit Executives:**

Ms. Linda Post Bushkofsky, executive director, Women of the ELCA  
Pr. Sherman G. Hicks, executive director, Multicultural Ministries  
Pr. Rebecca S. Larson, executive director, Church in Society  
Ms. Beth A. Lewis, president, Augsburg Fortress, Publishers  
Pr. Richard A. Magnus, executive director, Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission  
Pr. Rafael Malpica-Padilla, executive director, Global Mission  
Pr. Stanley N. Olson, executive director, Vocation and Education

**Service Unit Executives:**

Ms. Kristi S. Bangert, executive director, Communication Services  
Ms. Cynthia J. Halverson, president, Foundation of the ELCA, and executive director, Development Services  
Mr. John G. Kapanke, president, Board of Pensions  
Mr. Daniel J. Lehmann, editor, *The Lutheran* magazine  
Ms. Eva M. Roby, executive vice president for administration, Mission Investment Fund

**Press:**

Mr. John R. Brooks, director, ELCA News Service  
Ms. Elizabeth M. Hunter, *The Lutheran* magazine  
Mr. Frank F. Imhoff, associate director, ELCA News Service  
Ms. Melissa Ramirez-Cooper, ELCA News Service

**Ecumenical Guests:**

Canon Victoria L. Garvey, The Episcopal Church (*excused*)  
Ms. Kathy J. Magnus, North American representative, Lutheran World Federation  
Pr. Mary Ann Neevel, United Church of Christ (*excused*)  
Moravian Church in America [position vacant]  
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) [position vacant]  
Reformed Church in America [position vacant]

**Friday, November 9, 2007  
Plenary Session I**

Following the opening service of Holy Communion, Vice President Carlos E. Peña called to order the first plenary session of the fifty-eighth meeting of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at 2:12 P.M. He welcomed all those present and thanked them for attendance, and he announced those who were unable to be present. Vice President Peña made a number of routine announcements about the council's procedures and also introduced the council's prayer team: Ms. Judith Ann Bunker, the Rev. Rachel A. Connelly, Mr. Bradley Dokken, Ms. Norma J. Hirsch, the Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger, and the Rev. Jeffrey "Jeff" B. Sorenson. At Vice President Peña's request Pr. Sorenson led the council in prayer for Pr. Mary Ann Neevel, the representative from the United Church of Christ to the Church Council, who was recovering from surgery.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA  
(Agenda 1.F.)**

*Background:*

Agenda items had been distributed by mail and electronically. Additional items were distributed at the meeting to the members of the Church Council, representatives of the Conference of Bishops, advisory members, and resource persons.

*Church Council Action:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called on Mr. David D. Swartling, secretary, to read the action pertaining to adoption of the agenda. After receiving a second, Vice President Peña announced that an executive session for the purpose of discussing personnel matters would be held later in the afternoon and called for discussion. There being no discussion of the adoption of the agenda, Vice President Peña called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.62 To adopt the agenda and to permit the chair to call for consideration of agenda items in the order the chair deems most appropriate.**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña asked those in attendance to introduce themselves by stating their name, home, and occupation.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
(Agenda I.G.)**

*Background:*

The minutes of the April 13–16, 2007, and August 5, 2007, meetings of the Church Council had been distributed to council members. The minutes of the council's Executive Committee meetings on April 13, 2007; June 13, 2007; August 5, 2007; and October 9, 2007, also had been distributed.

Council members were asked to provide in writing to the Office of the Secretary any typographical errors in the distributed text of the minutes so that corrections could be entered into the protocol copies of the minutes.

*Church Council Action:*

At the request of Vice President Carlos E. Peña, Secretary David D. Swartling read the proposed action. Vice President Peña called for a second, then opened the floor for discussion. There being none, he called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.63 To approve the minutes of the April 13-16, 2007, and August 5, 2007, meetings of the Church Council; and  
To ratify actions of the council's Executive Committee as indicated in the minutes of the April 13, 2007; June 13, 2007; August 5, 2007; and October 9, 2007, meetings.**

Following the vote, Vice President Peña announced that the deadline for removing items from the *en bloc* action was Saturday, November 10, 2007, at 12:15 P.M.

**REPORT OF THE PRESIDING BISHOP**

(Agenda II.A.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit A, Part 1)

The Rev. Mark. S. Hanson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, focused on shared leadership as the theme of his oral report. He said: "I want to talk with you about our shared leadership. It was a theme of my oral report to the Churchwide Assembly, if you were there and if you remember. I talked about shared leadership for a sent church, and as I now take up my second term as presiding bishop, I think it is one of the primary challenges that we must give attention to. Because if we are not clear in the multiple tables of leadership that exist in this church how we engage in shared leadership and for what purpose and how we differentiate in our shared leadership and yet find complementarity, I think enormous energy will be consumed that will ultimately detract from the task of sharing leadership for the sake of the Gospel and God's mission in the world. In fact, I think we have done good work the last six years in focusing on mission, embracing a Plan for Mission that came out of broad conversations within this church. We have now aligned the churchwide organization, its staff, its structure, and its budget for the sake of that mission. We have redefined many leadership tables. Now the challenge will be: how shall we lead together and how do we distinguish the various roles of leadership that are defined in this church.

"If you think about from whom you heard in this room, you really have, I think, the representatives of the core leadership spheres or tables that are now challenged to discover together the nature of our shared leadership. You who are the elected Church Council members are, as you know, the board of directors of this church, and you also serve as the interim legislative authority between Churchwide Assemblies. You have been elected to the highest office of leadership between assemblies. So, too, we who are elected to be officers in this church and are members of the Church Council. You also have representatives of the Conference of Bishops, an increasingly, I think, significant table of leaders to whom this church turns for wisdom and counsel, theological perspective, and contextual understanding but who serve as advisory bishops to this council and do not have legislative authority. You also have represented in this room the colleagues whom this church has called and chosen to provide churchwide programmatic leadership for the mission that we share together as the ELCA. You also have representatives of ethnic associations, program units, the separately incorporated units, and our ecumenical partners, the Lutheran Youth Organization, and our academic institutions. In other words, this is the room that needs to birth an image of shared differentiated leadership for the life of this church. I think it may be our primary task in the coming months. So I would like to share with you five marks of what I think that shared leadership will look like. . . .

"First of all, I think that we are called in our shared, differentiated, complementary leadership to exercise spiritual leadership in and for this church. Now we can debate whether that word fits our two kingdoms understanding of the sphere of God's right hand or left in which we think of leadership. Let's set that argument aside. But I do think this church looks to us for leadership that I would describe as spiritual. So what will that look like? It will look like we have already experienced today: centering our leadership, our decisions, our life together in worship, as we have developed the pattern of the Churchwide Assemblies the past six years with the centerpiece being the assembly gathered around the means of grace, but the whole day's work framed in prayer and worship. I would want us to continue to bring that self-understanding of our shared leadership to this room and the various tables of leadership we represent. In other words, we gather around the good news that we are saved by God's grace for Jesus' sake. In that freedom of the Gospel, we are sent to engage God's work in God's world.

“It also means that we will continually center our decisions and discussions in prayer. It has been a wonderful addition to the life of the Churchwide Assembly and the Church Council to have a prayer team to whom we turn before we make often difficult and important decisions but also, as we just did, as we pray for one another in our particular stages of life.

“A third mark of spiritual leadership is that we will constantly be engaged by God’s living speech, as that living speech becomes incarnate in Jesus, as it is proclaimed in the Gospel, and as it is recorded in Scripture. You know, I trust, that one of the most exciting things going on in this church is the synergy and energy around the ‘Book of Faith’ initiative. In fact, we are not trying to harness it. We are just trying to give some shape to it because it is not something that is coming out of Higgins Road. It is literally something birthed out of the grass-roots life of this church. As you know, the genesis of that initiative was one congregation in North Carolina bringing a memorial to their Synod Assembly, who passed it on to the Churchwide Assembly, which adopted it as a five-year initiative called ‘Book of Faith’. Now under the leadership of our Vocation and Education program unit and Diane Jacobson as the half-time director, we are beginning to talk about what does a ‘Book of Faith’ church body look like? What are congregations that declare themselves to be ‘Book of Faith’ congregations engaged in? Our goal is to have all 65 synods describe themselves as ‘Book of Faith’ synods. We have the creative energy of Augsburg Fortress colleagues at the table with others saying, ‘What resources do we need to sustain this commitment?’ . . . The goal is by 2009 to have a Lutheran study Bible as part of the ‘Book of Faith’ initiative, something that, I think, we have long needed. We know from past experience in this church and predecessor church bodies the renewal that comes to individual lives and congregations when there is a sustained engagement with God’s Word. Perhaps you remember Search Bible study, or Word and Witness, or Bethel Bible studies, or Crossways. . . . But we know something about the power of God’s Word to bring reformation. The birthing of this church called the Lutheran church within the Church catholic was about an engagement with the Word of God.

“I wonder what it would look like to be a ‘Book of Faith’ Church Council and how would we model in our engagement with the Word of God these two years, five years, six years for leadership tables in the rest of this church. It certainly would include also moments of Dwelling in the Word . . . where we invite you to just share a moment of reflection of a significant part of the Word of God in your life of faith, perhaps from your family of origin. Those have been most meaningful testimonies to the Word of God. Beth [Lewis, president of the publishing house] shared with us in a devotional at our ‘One Leadership’ table recently an article by Joan Chittister entitled, ‘Leading the Way: To Go Where There Is No Road and Leave a Path.’ Let me quote from Joan Chittister something about spiritual leadership:

The ability to give meaning to life is of the essence of spiritual leadership. Immersion in the immediate, a sense of spiritual vision, the pursuit of meaning, and the courage to question the seemingly unquestionable is the essence of spiritual leadership. We cannot and should not attempt to lead anyone anywhere unless we ourselves know where we are, where we are going, and what dangerous questions it will be necessary to ask if we really want to get there. No, leadership is not force. Leadership is the ability to see the vision beyond the reality and make a road where no road has been. Spiritual leadership is the ability to question the present in order to show the way to the greater good, whether it is popular to pursue that good or not. The questions of leadership are organizational ones, of course, but they are spiritual ones, too. They have something to do with the structures of the society, yes, but they have more to do with the spirit of that society and the compass of its souls. And it is often a lonely, lonely task. Knowing where to go is one thing. Breaking the path together is another. And it is the breaking the path that is of the essence of spiritual leadership. Spiritual leadership is not an exercise in social isolation. Spirituality and spiritual leadership have something to do with critiquing the present, envisioning a better future, and asking the right questions as we go. We must lead people down the road of the One who said, ‘I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.’

I would hope that we would mature beyond my experience of any council to date in our capacity to ask those provocative questions about the way the Spirit is leading us on the way of the cross as we lead this church. In the rush to make decisions and to do them efficiently and effectively, it is tempting not to pause to ask and ponder the hard questions that I think are a mark of spiritual leadership.

“Secondly, shared leadership will be evangelical and missional. How will the Gospel be in the room as we struggle

with our discussions and decisions for the sake of God's liberating, life-giving, self-giving, reconciling, incarnate Word for the whole creation? It is interesting when we went around what we told you to say about yourselves. It is kind of the familiar pattern. I never have forgotten the chapel service at St. Olaf College years ago that I tuned in on WCAL radio. . . . The preacher that morning began his sermon thusly: 'Good morning. I am Tom, a baptized believer in Jesus Christ, a Lutheran Christian, and I am your bus driver.' And what unfolded was Tom the bus driver's, who drives St. Olaf students to Carleton and Carleton students to St. Olaf every day, life story of faith and struggle. The story of his being a successful corporate executive who lost everything in the downsizing of the early 1980s and, as a consequence, experienced great depression, and finding in the valley of depression a new self-understanding as a baptized child of God, a believer in Jesus Christ, a Lutheran Christian, who now exercises his faith in the daily vocation of driving St. Olaf students back and forth. What an evangelical, vocational self-understanding! Wouldn't it be wonderful if that permeated the life of 4.87 million ELCA members in their self-identification?

"I love going to Washington, D.C., because I have the most interesting conversations with cab drivers. They are so quick to be self-revelatory about their life story, their country of origin, the struggles of their families, and their faith. Last weekend I had three cab rides. One was from a Coptic Christian from Ethiopia, one was with a Muslim, and one was from a Baptist who met Jesus six years ago, and his wife still has not met him, and it has created great stress in their marriage. Each one in a brief cab ride began to talk about their life of faith, their struggles in the world, and their desire for deeper understanding with persons of other faiths. How can we give evangelical, missional leadership to this church so people have that clarity about their self-understanding and are willing to risk being revelatory about it with others?

"Last weekend I participated in the conversation at the third annual missional church consultation at Luther Seminary, one of many examples of each of our eight seminaries increasingly defining themselves in the vocation of preparing evangelical leaders for a missional, public church. We did an inventory . . . two years ago of the listing of all the leadership initiatives. . . . 27 pages of activities—and we know that we did not get them all—of examples of how this church is tending to the work of forming evangelical, missional leaders whose vocations serve God in a pluralistic world. I think evangelical, missional leaders will be nimble and yet purposeful. That is often a challenge for a board of directors. How do you keep this organization focused on a purpose but create a culture that allows us to be nimble on the way and open to redefining purpose as we continue to engage God's Word, this church, and the world? The Plan for Mission . . . will be the orienting lens for much of our work. It will always be, other than today, the framework for my report to you, and it is for the written report. Lots of work went into adopting that Plan for Mission by the Milwaukee Assembly in 2003, which mandated the Church Council and the churchwide staff to align the organization for the purpose of implementing that mission. It really does clarify the direction of the churchwide organization around structure, budget, and personnel.

"The mission statement is what? [Members of the Church Council recited the mission statement.] The emblem is what? Describe it, please. [Members of the Church Council did so.] Cross and globe. Think about the interrelationship of those two. 'Marked with the Cross of Christ forever. Claimed in Baptism. Gathered in the body of Christ, we are sent for the sake of the world.' If we can get that much down—and my goal is if 70 percent of the leaders of this church had that much down—we would have made huge progress in our self-understanding of an evangelical church engaged in mission. And the Plan for Mission is part of that road map.

"Now, evangelical, missional leaders will do a number of things in their exercise of leadership. One, they are going to make sure that we have the financial resources necessary to engage in that mission to which we believe God has called us, and that begins with us modeling generous stewardship of our financial resources personally, congregationally, synodically, institutionally, and churchwide. As I said to some of the new members of the Church Council and new advisors, we expect that sometimes you will be perhaps the lone voice that will stand up at your congregational meeting and advocate why reducing congregational gifts to the synod is not being faithful to our shared mission, and you will advocate for an increase rather than tolerate a decrease. We expect that we will have conversations with one another about our personal stewardship. . . . The recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding, which were adopted at the Churchwide Assembly, will have major priority in the coming two years for churchwide staff and partners. That means we are going to give increased attention and resources to teaching of stewardship, both in seminaries—we have commitments from our colleagues in the seminaries—and in First-Call Theological Education for our newly rostered leaders. I have committed to having one-on-one conversations with our Conference of Bishops about

our respective personal stewardship and our leadership of stewards in this church. We will also look to have those conversations with you. We will be undertaking a major feasibility study on the possibility of a churchwide funding appeal to honor our 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2012. You will be asked to take action on spending authorizations that are within the realm of expected income but also are responsible to undergird the mission of this church.

“One of the most important things now taking place is the Board of Pensions, the Foundation, and the Mission Investment Fund, three large financial centers that serve this church, its members, and our mission, have grown to such a capacity, and they have such external competitors now, that we have to make sure that our three financial centers are viable within their own spheres of competition and . . . in the market place but do not end up having that competition be at the expense of each other. So we have chosen a consulting firm to work with those three cost centers on how we can strengthen each of them, position them well, and serve this church and its mission strongly in a collaborative kind of way. That’s a very important piece of work, and I am very thankful that the leadership of all three are at the table and that we have chosen an exceptional consulting firm. . . .

“Missional, evangelical leaders will provide financial resources. You will also provide staff resources. Some of those you will elect at this meeting; some of them I appoint; some of them are selected by my colleagues in the room; some are elected by other bodies. I am absolutely delighted that we have lived through a huge year of transition in leadership, and we have done it smoothly and well. It is wonderful now to almost be on other side of that. To have David Swartling here, to have Don McCoid here, to have Cindy Halverson here, to elect the persons that I trust you will elect today and Sunday will put a complement of incredibly gifted leaders together that will serve this church well, staff that reflect our commitment to unity and diversity.

“Another dimension of stewarding evangelical, missional leaders will be that you will be communicators, telling the story of this church wherever you go. I told some of you in the orientation that a pastor out in the Bay Area confronted me recently at California Lutheran University and said, ‘So when is the ELCA . . . going to develop a score card that is missional and not just statistical?’ He said, ‘I am always asked every year on membership and deaths and baptisms and that’s all fine, but I never get to talk about what we are engaged in in mission in our congregation.’ I said, ‘Well, what do you wish that you could tell?’ He said, ‘I’d like to tell the fact that we have 11 adults that go once a month to prison, . . . and they are matched up one-on-one with residents of that prison . . . and do one-to-one relationship-building.’ He said, ‘I would talk about the tutoring program we do in our community. I would talk about the new member class that is going on that may or may not result in people statistically joining this church but is resulting in faith being deepened and enlivened in those who are participating.’ I think that this is one of the challenges before us: not to disregard the daunting statistics of our continued loss of baptized membership, averaging about a synod every two years, not disregarding that we are 15 years older in average age than the U.S. population and still 97 percent white and that our fastest-growing group of congregations are those that worship 50 or fewer. We need to be attentive to what those say, but we cannot let them so paralyze us that we cannot find ways to discover the story of what God is up to—and I see you being those discoverers of the story and the tellers of the story.

“I am very excited about the . . . ad campaign we have done through our Communication Services as well as the Rocky Mountain Synod and the congregations of the greater Denver area. We have not gotten results yet on the analysis of the campaign and its success, but just the anecdotal response has been very high. The ad campaign has been around the theme, ‘God’s work. Our hands,’ which we are coming to think has a lot better traction as a tag line than ‘Living in God’s amazing grace.’ . . . The wonderful visual and clear verbal way that we have been able to tell something of the story of this church engaged in God’s mission in the world, always with the symbol of the cross wonderfully positioned in those billboards or print ads. We would love to have the money to take that to other marketplaces. We are very excited about the rollout of a totally redone Web site April 1 that, I think, will be stunning in its capacity to engage the people of this church in interactive conversations, easily navigated, and that will bring much greater capacity to this church to both tell the story and engage its members in conversation.

“Three: Shared leadership will be relational leadership. That’s the phrase these days, every place I go. It’s all about relationships; it’s all about relationships. . . . I think we are called to steward the ecology of interdependent ecosystems . . . . The image that I have of the ELCA that was given to us by Craig Dykstra of the Lilly Foundation is that we seem to see ourselves—and I think it is true—as an ecology of interdependent ecosystems built upon the very principle of interdependence. That we understand each of those ecosystems—the eight seminaries, the 28 colleges and universities,

the network of social ministry organizations, the outdoor ministries, the campus ministries, LYO, and young adults—are all interdependent within the sphere of those individual ecosystems but also interdependent with the whole of the ecology for the sake of their vibrancy and life. So, too, our polity: one church, three expressions—congregational, synodical, churchwide. Its very premise is interdependence within the recognition that each of those ecosystems has its own vitality and particular calling within God’s work. I think we need to keep stewarding that ecology of interdependence.

“But secondly, I think we need to have much greater imagination about the capacity that comes to this church because of our ecumenical and global relationships. If there has been any exponential growth in our 20-year history, it has been the growth in the complex web of global relationships—church to church, synod to synod, congregation to congregation, institution to institution—and the capacity we have because we have five full-communion partners. We are on the verge of adopting full communion with the United Methodist Church the next two years. We are having lively conversations with the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. We have conciliar relationships with the National Council of Churches of Christ (NCC) and ecumenical tables that are much broader in their participation: Christian Churches Together, of which we are a founding member; Churches Uniting in Christ (CUIC) . . . with which we are a partner in mission and dialogue. . . . What we have done is think that the adoption of those full-communion agreements is the end point rather than a beginning point. Those are adopted for the sake of the capacity they bring to deepen relationships, interchangeability of ministries, strategic missional planning together. We call that ‘reception,’ living into the relationship. I hope that we are entering an era of much greater imagination about the capacity those relationships give us for ministry and witness in the world.

“Also, the new capacity that comes from grass-roots ecumenism. We were at the NCC General Assembly this week, and we had 20-some ELCA folks there. At the dinner I invited each one to stand up, introduce themselves, and describe something that is going on ecumenically in the grass-roots community in which they work or live or are involved in congregations. It was stunning; it was absolutely stunning, all that is going on ecumenically at the grass-roots. I think that is what is going to sustain the ecumenical movement globally right now. We are dealing with some difficult issues theologically that will, I think, prevent us from experiencing a unity at the Lord’s Table, for instance, with the Roman Catholic Church or The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS). . . . But we have difficult theological issues that we are going to keep working at, and we are going to keep working at them with great commitment, but where there is this grass-roots spirituality of ecumenism, that sustains us who are dealing with the global, theological, difficult questions to which we are committed.

“I think we are at a new era where tending to inter-religious relationships is an absolute imperative for us. As we meet, the Lutheran–Jewish consultative panel is meeting. It is absolutely critical that we keep building upon that strong foundation that Lutherans have had as we followed the lead of the Lutheran World Federation in 1993 in rejecting Luther’s anti-Semitic writings. The tensions now about the Middle East—a most amazing thing happened in Washington, D.C., on Monday. The leaders of the Council of Religious Institutions in the Holy Land came together to the United States. They have been working for two years to form this council. The Norwegian government and the Church of Norway provided the money and the leadership to facilitate the possible creation of a table of religious leaders in the Holy Land. They chose to make it a table of religious institutions so it would not be dependent on the particular leaders. Do you know who came to Washington, D.C.? The two chief rabbis of Israel, and three other Jewish leaders; the chief judge of the Islamic Shi’ia court, the highest ranking Palestinian Muslim for all Palestinian Muslims, and the minister of religion for the Palestinian Authority, and three Palestinian Muslim leaders; and four of the five Christian Palestinian leaders, Bishop Munib Younan being one, the patriarch of the Orthodox Church, the patriarch of the Latin Church, the bishop of the Anglican Church. The only patriarch who could not come was the Armenian patriarch because he was ill. They met with their U.S. counterparts all day Monday. I am so disappointed that that story did not get told all over this country. I am so disappointed our president chose not to meet with them, although Secretary Rice did meet with them when she was in Jerusalem. That is a historic sign of hope in a land where extremists are winning the day, religious extremists, political extremists. I think it is absolutely incumbent upon us to model that in local communities, so we will be forming a Lutheran–Muslim consultative panel that will begin . . . December 14, led by Mark Swanson, one of our most eminent Islamic scholars, teaching at LSTC [Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago]. I think those need to be modeled in local communities. Our bishops will all be going to the Holy Land together in January 2009 for the academy. I can tell you already that just our commitment to go is a powerful sign of hope for those struggling day to day.

“I want to say a word about our relationships to each other, and thank you, Pastor Loy, for your sermon because it was a good reminder that we model the relationships we want in a contentious, fractious society and often church in the way that we engage and respect each other. I think there is a tendency in the ELCA for like-minded people to gather in a room to reinforce the rightness of their like-mindedness and the wrongness of the positions not represented in the dialogue. We tend to talk to people we agree with about how wrong the people that we do not agree with are. That is not going to help us. That is not going to help us in avoiding the laying down and picking up of the gauntlet. It is not going to help us in stewarding both our unity and our diversity. When it comes to the navigating of the sexuality discussions, I think it begins with leaders and how we will respectfully, thoughtfully, prayerfully engage each other in an environment that is safe. I think that safety needs to transmit over to the Marriott when you are sitting in a bar and how you respect boundaries and respect confidentiality. To be honest, that has not always gone as well in the past as we had hoped. I think the life of what is talked about in this room needs to be honored when we are out of this room, and the relationships that we expect to have in this church apart from here need to be modeled in the relationships we have with one another. I think part of our tending to relationships is to tend to our own health and well-being, to be part of the Board of Pensions’ and Vocation and Education’s healthy leaders campaign, for us who are rostered to get on and do the health assessment online. It is not only financially advantageous, but also it is a good model for others.

“I just looked at Dan [Lehmann, editor of *The Lutheran* magazine], and [was reminded that I] forgot [something] back in [the] communication [section]: Every one of you will get a subscription to *The Lutheran*, even if you do not now. If you are not a subscriber, and if your congregation is not, that is a key way that you can open the doors of communication to your congregation, and all should be subscribing to *The Little Lutheran* for their grandchildren.

“Two more: Our leadership will be contextual. We will be attentive to context. Saul Bellow—who now there is controversy around in his death about some of his actions—in his obituary in the *New York Times* was described as a ‘first-class noticer.’ I think leaders today need to be first-class noticers, noticers of what the Holy Spirit is up to, noticers of the context in which we live and in which God has placed us, so I think we need to pay a lot of attention to what Kenn Inskeep [executive for research and evaluation] and our Research and Evaluation staff so exceptionally provide in terms of contextual understanding, both external contexts but also the contexts of those who make up this church. I think we need to grow in our cultural competencies about cultures that are not our own primary culture. It is one thing to say that we want to become a multi-cultural church; it is another thing to engage in the disciplined self-practice of learning the culture of another at such a depth that we appreciate its fullness and what it brings now to our cultures. I think contextual awareness means that we who are white need to continue to confront our white privilege that often is so woven into our consciousness, the structures of our society, and our church, that we do not have to notice it because that is one of the marks of white privilege. You do not have to pay attention to it because it is normative for us in our daily lives. We as a council and staff need to continue to address white racism.

“We are learning about being a public church in this context. The bishops’ briefing in Washington, D.C., by our Washington staff was exceptional. [For example,] the work now being done on the farm bill after . . . [holding] listening posts around the country. The point of that was that we want to listen and then form policy on the basis of our social statements and the engagement with members. If you are not a member of ‘One Lutheran,’ get online and become a member. I did an interview this morning about hunger. The premise of the interview was we are reducing hunger in the world. In the last 40 years the number of malnourished people in the world is fewer proportionately than today. We have a long way to go, but we have the capacity if we have the will. Joining ‘One Lutheran’ is one way to do that.

“Lutheran Disaster Response continues to be a marvelous way that we engage a context in the aftermath of disaster. I hope Bishop Murray Finck gets a chance to have some time . . . in Joys and Concerns to report on the fire and the aftermath of the fire, thankful for the work of ELCA and Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod colleagues and Lutheran Disaster Response. You have a consultation report, I believe, in your materials from the consultation that occurred in Florida where we want to look, particularly in the light of Katrina and Rita, how we can grow in our capacity to be responsive, not only to the needs of individuals but congregations and those who serve them. At this gathering you will be asked to consider the possibility of our joining with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod and Lutheran World Relief in a Lutheran malaria initiative that we will join with our strong track record in World Hunger and our emerging commitment to HIV and AIDS in the strategy that is being developed out of the consultation asked for by the Churchwide Assembly. I hope when that presentation comes, . . . you will enthusiastically endorse the process that will lead to a

decision about such a campaign and the capacity it has to address malaria and HIV and AIDS in the world.

“Finally, I hope our leadership will be always holding in tension the navigational dimensions of leadership and the agitational dimensions of leadership. In other words, . . . part of our shared leadership is to navigate this part of the body of Christ called the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. We navigate it by tending to order, tending to our governing documents, tending to good, responsible business practices, to make sure we have contingency planning, that we have understandable audits, that we have good infrastructure and a strong IT, that we have personnel policies that are adopted. But ‘navigational’ also attends to destination. We can be so preoccupied with the orderliness of the ship that we forget to ask what port we are headed towards, and that’s about vision for mission and knowing destination and knowing the route, and along the way to engage in a little agitation. You know my pet peeve is those communities of faith that seem to describe tranquillity as the greatest sign of vitality in ministry today. ‘Well, we have such a friendly congregation, and we all get along, and we all love our pastor.’ Those are wonderful attributes; they do not have much to do with the book of Acts. It may be that there won’t always be such friendliness and love of pastor in congregations that are struggling to engage in ministry and mission in a very diverse and changing context. The challenge is: how do we stay engaged in each other, centered in Word and Spirit, while we experience some of those tensions?”

“I said to the two orientation groups: I think [there are] four challenges that we face. I think that we face the challenge of continuing to build trust in a church that still feels distanced and disengaged from its leaders in a culture of distrust. Secondly, that we have to continue to create awareness, tell the story. Third, we have got to raise expectations for what the Holy Spirit is doing and can do. Fourth, we’ve got to lower anxiety about sexuality. The next two years we need to be thoughtfully engaged in the development of a social statement and the recommendations for implementing that social statement, but we cannot let that social statement define solely the life and work of this church or our leadership. That is going to take shared leadership. If we become so preoccupied with 2009, we are conveying a message that sexuality defines this church, and over sexuality this church could potentially be divided. Frankly, that is heresy. That is absolute heresy. The Gospel of Jesus Christ defines this church, and only whether some gospel other than the good news that we are saved by God’s grace on account of Christ is being preached should this church be divided. It is up to us to create that kind of culture and climate of engagement: thoughtful, prayerful, and honest, but framing the sexuality conversation within the larger context of our life and work. That is a shared task.

“So I end with two questions that I want you to ponder and share with somebody next to you. Think back on your life, your life of faith, your life of leadership, your life of experiences: What is one experience that you will draw from and upon to shape your leadership in this room over the next two years? We do not come to this room unprepared. We have been formed for this task our whole lives. It is easy sometimes to forget the wellspring from which we draw as we lead together. So I want you to think of one—it could be a relationship, leadership experience, place where you were tried and tested in the trenches, or you failed and learned from it. Secondly, what is one provocative question that you bring to this meeting that you hope gets into the mix of agitational navigating of this church’s life and mission—something provocative, okay?”

Following time for small-group conversations, Presiding Bishop Hanson added a postscript to his earlier comments, saying that in his description of conciliar relationships, he had neglected to highlight this church’s participation in the Lutheran World Federation. He then invited council members to share parts of their conversations about the questions he had asked or to ask questions of him.

Ms. Rebecca Jo Brakke proposed communicating with members of this church about issues that the Word Alone organization has raised so that people could have more than one perspective. Presiding Bishop Hanson responded by reiterating his call for the council to be a model of being safe space for disagreement, while challenging and holding each other accountable for the claims and allegations made about one another. He characterized some conversations about perceived opponents as violating the eighth commandment and not speaking truth about another. He expressed the hope that the “Book of Faith” initiative would create a different context for a lively conversation that did not draw lines in the sand between participants.

Mr. John R. Emery stated that much of the conversation about the upcoming social statement on sexuality focused on what it would say. An additional question that needed to be addressed was the following: regardless of what the statement says, how can the members of this church find a way to co-exist? Many people are waiting to see what the statement says in order to determine their future course, he observed. It was the duty of leaders to find ways to reach

out to all members. Presiding Bishop Hanson answered that it was different to struggle with tensions, differences, and potential divisions in an existing relationship rather than in one that does not exist. He expressed concern that those who are waiting to judge whether to remain in relationship already are not in the relationship. Many of them always have had a “wait and see, opt in later maybe” relationship with this church. If people focus only on the aspect of the social statement that pertains to homosexual rostered leaders, those who are heterosexual will have managed to avoid coming to terms with their own human sexuality in its giftedness and brokenness. Presiding Bishop Hanson urged that people first use the social statement as a mirror in which to examine their own sexuality before using it as a lens through which to see the sexuality of others. The Task Force for the ELCA Studies on Sexuality, he pointed out, is not a jury that has been sent out to bring in a verdict. It is a group of thoughtful representatives of this church that is going to invite us into a deeper conversation with Scripture and one another. It is incumbent on leaders to create the atmosphere in which that conversation can take place. He stated that it was essential to ground the social statement in Scripture and theology because the alternative is that it will be seen as part of this society’s culture wars. He stated his commitment to working to create the right atmosphere for the social statement to be received, but he refused to let it solely define his leadership or this church’s vocation. Members of this church must give themselves credit that they have taken back from the culture the power to define and frame what it means to be sexual beings in the context of relationships in God’s gift of life and creation, he observed.

The Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger asked when Lutherans stopped being a “Book of Faith” people. Presiding Bishop Hanson responded that, from his parish experience, praying Scripture in the liturgy and devotions took precedence over studying it. Studying takes discipline and willingness, and too many of this church’s members stop studying after confirmation, he noted. Yet, people today have a hunger for engagement with the Word. He observed that the question is how this church can feed that hunger creatively while remaining faithful to its understanding of the Word.

Ms. Jennifer Deleon inquired what this church’s response was to current immigration issues. Presiding Bishop Hanson answered that immigration was creating significant debate in this country, caused in part by a fearful society. This church needs to speak the truth of God’s radically inclusive grace, justice, and mercy. This church and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Society are committed to keeping immigration issues on the table, he concluded.

## **REPORT OF THE VICE PRESIDENT** (Agenda II..2.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit A, Part 2)

Mr. Carlos E. Peña, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, yielded the chair to Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson in order to give the report of the vice president.

Vice President Peña observed that, generally, he used his report to provide information about his family, who shared his call in part through the sacrifices they make when he is away from home. The report also provides an update on the activities he attends on behalf on the council between meetings.

Vice President Peña reported on the recent meeting of the Committee on Lutheran Cooperation in Baltimore, where he heard about the social ministries supported jointly by this church and The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, including Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Lutheran Services in America, Lutheran Disaster Response, and Lutheran World Relief. He asked that council members keep these ministries in their thoughts and prayers.

After the meeting, Vice President Peña had traveled with his wife to Grand Junction, Colorado, for the dedication of a new building for the congregation of American Lutheran Church. He called the beautiful new building an example of this church’s mission statement since the members of the congregation understand that they, as part of the ELCA, are in ministry for the sake of the world.

Vice President Peña, recalling Presiding Bishop Hanson’s earlier questions, commented that tending to relationships was an experience from his business life that had prepared him for his call in this church. He added that he intended to exercise agitational leadership in the rest of his report. He noted that all of the council’s decisions should be grounded in the five strategic directions, so he asked individual council members to recite them. He encouraged council members to learn thoroughly the directions and the commitments for implementations since they would frame the council’s work.

Vice President Peña announced that he had attended six Synod Assemblies during 2007, and he encouraged council members to do the same. A proposed action, coming from the Executive Committee, urged council members to commit

to attending Synod Council meetings and Synod Assemblies in their own synod and one other synod.

Vice President Peña reviewed a number of suggestions that had been made by outgoing council members at their debriefing in August 2007, as well as responses made to those suggestions. Concerning a request for more transparency, he summarized how appointments to committees were made and stated that a grid outlining the preferences would be distributed. He announced that Church Council members would be made more readily identifiable at Churchwide Assemblies through ribbons on their name tags. Presentation of mosaics to outgoing council members would occur at a plenary session of the Churchwide Assembly, rather than the pre-assembly banquet. These efforts would honor appropriately and more visibly the service of Church Council members to this church, he stated.

### **REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Agenda II.E.2.)**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña presented the report of the Executive Committee of the Church Council.

### **PATTERN FOR ADVISORS IN EXECUTIVE SESSIONS (Agenda III.D.1.)**

#### *Background:*

At its January 2007 meeting, the Executive Committee discussed the pattern for the presence of advisors in executive sessions of the Church Council. In the past, most executive sessions included the advisory bishops, youth representatives, and executive assistants to the officers. After considerable discussion, the Executive Committee approved the following recommendation to the council [EC07.01.04]:

To determine that only voting members of the Church council and the advisory bishops shall be included in executive sessions of the Church Council; and

To acknowledge that resource persons and other advisors for their expertise in pending action may be invited by the chair to be present in executive sessions.

Subsequent to that action, requests were made for further consideration. At its August 2007 meeting, the Executive Committee voted [EC07.08.21]:

To refer to the Executive Committee at its November 2007 meeting further discussion of the pattern of advisors in executive sessions of the Church Council, pending authorization of the relevant bylaw changes by the Church Council and the 2007 Churchwide Assembly.

Following further discussion at its November 2007 meeting, the Executive Committee voted [EC07.11.31] to recommend the following action to the Church Council:

To determine that only voting members of the Church Council and the liaison bishops shall be included in executive sessions of the Church Council; and

To acknowledge that resource persons and other advisors for their expertise in pending action may be invited by the chair to be present in executive sessions.

#### *Church Council Action:*

At the request of Vice President Carlos E. Peña, Secretary David D. Swartling read the proposed action. Vice President Peña opened the floor to discussion.

Ms. Briana R. Watts remarked that while she understood the desire and need to limit the number of people in executive sessions, she asked the Church Council to consider a number of points before acting on the matter. She pointed out that there was no clear understanding of the role of the youth advisors to the council, evidenced by the variety of terms used for them. She commented that the Lutheran Youth Organization was in the process of restructuring, so a clear understanding of the role of youth advisors, achieved through conversation with the Church Council, would be helpful to that process. She cited the fact that youth advisors had been present for previous executive sessions as precedent for continuing to allow them access. To adopt the proposed action would give the appearance that this church was moving to exclude youth, she said. Ms. Watts continued by noting that if advisors could be included when an issue directly relates to their area of expertise, then youth always should be at the table to offer their perspective, which is their

expertise. She urged that this church fully incorporate youth in every way.

Secretary Swartling, citing the constitution provisions (14.30.ff.) about the composition of the Church Council, explained that there are three categories of members: voting, liaison, and advisory. Youth are part of the advisory category, he indicated.

Presiding Bishop Hanson remarked that the addition of more advisors to the council had raised anew the question of who should be in attendance at executive sessions. The struggle was to develop a consistent policy and practice. He noted that most arguments that were made for the inclusion of youth also could be made for communities of color. He urged the council to decide the matter without further delay.

Mr. William R. Lloyd Jr. asked who is included in executive sessions under the existing rules. Mr. Phillip H. Harris, general counsel, explained that, in the absence of a new policy, executive sessions of the Church Council fell under this church's open meeting policy. For executive sessions, which are rare, those entitled to be present are voting members only as well as those specific persons that the elective body deems necessary for the purpose of the session. Mr. Lloyd clarified that if the recommended action did not pass, the liaison bishops would need to leave at the time of the executive session, unless the chair asked them to remain.

Ms. Judith Tutt-Starr commented that, given this church's emphasis on youth participation, excluding the youth advisors seemed to be moving backwards.

The Rev. H. Gerard Knoche, bishop of the Delaware-Maryland Synod, wondered why a youth member had not been designated at the formation of the Church Council. Presiding Bishop Hanson replied that there had been attempts to designate slots for youth and for young adults, but those efforts had failed in Churchwide Assembly votes.

Mr. Mark W. Myers stated that the Grand Canyon Synod Council designated two seats for youth members and advocated doing the same for Church Council.

Presiding Bishop Hanson reminded members of the council that the issue on the table was the composition of executive sessions.

Mr. Bradley Dokken agreed with Ms. Watts' point about the importance of having youths' perspectives on any issue.

Presiding Bishop Hanson reminded the council that it is the board of directors of a significant corporation. Occasionally boards, for the well-being of the organization, need to act in executive session, usually on matters of litigation or personnel. At such times, questions of inclusiveness become secondary.

The Rev. Susan Candea indicated her appreciation of the opportunity as an advisory member to participate in council meetings; however, she recognized that executive sessions that included only voting members were necessary.

Mr. David A. Ullrich, associate general counsel, confirmed that executive sessions were limited to matters of personnel, contract proposals, and pending litigation.

Secretary Swartling added that executive sessions to discuss pending litigation raised the issue of attorney-client privilege. It would be more difficult to argue for the privilege for 70 people, including advisors, than for 37 voting members. Secondly, he said, it was impossible to distinguish between youth and all other advisory members for inclusion in executive sessions.

The Rev. David E. Jensen reported that the focus of the Executive Committee's discussion was the need to empower directors and officers to respond to sensitive issues and to provide a sense of confidentiality.

The Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger asked for clarity that the proposed action included liaison bishops and did not exclude people who had been included previously. Presiding Bishop Hanson called on Mr. Harris to respond, noting that practice had set a precedent that was not policy-based.

Mr. Harris concurred, saying that there had been times when executive sessions had included people who would not have been permitted to stay under the open meetings policy. The open meetings policy had been supplemented to make it clear that bishops who were advisors to boards and committees could be in executive sessions of those bodies. It had not been supplemented to indicate that all advisory bishops would be included in executive sessions of the Church Council.

Mr. Lloyd proposed operating under the open meetings policy. He pointed out that the Conference of Bishops did not include council members in its executive sessions.

The Rev. Steven P. Loy asked Presiding Bishop Hanson to provide a rationale for including liaison bishops in executive sessions. Presiding Bishop Hanson responded that the bishops are briefed on pending litigation by the

attorneys at the Conference of Bishops; the litigation often involved one or more synods. Mr. Harris added that the ELCA counsel had an attorney–client relationship with synodical bishops; others were not included in that relationship.

Mr. Mark E. Johnson compared executive sessions to the principle of “need to know” in the Coast Guard. Even though the opinions of advisory members were valued, maintaining attorney–client privilege was important, he said.

The Rev. Jonathan W. Linman recommended that, regardless of the vote on executive sessions, the council not lose sight of the matter of clarifying the role of youth advisors or of the possibility of a youth Church Council member. Secretary Swartling promised that the subject would be placed on the agenda of a future Church Council meeting.

The Rev. Leonard H. Bolick, bishop of the North Carolina Synod, proposed letting the policy stand and having the council decide at the time of each executive session who should attend. Presiding Bishop Hanson reflected that what Bp. Bolick proposed was the current policy. Historically, however, liaison bishops were not pleased at being asked to leave executive sessions.

In response to a request from Mr. Lloyd, Presiding Bishop Hanson said that the current policy did not reflect current practice. Mr. Harris restated the current policy.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote. A voice vote being inconclusive, the chair asked for a show of hands on the issue.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.64 To determine that only voting members of the Church Council and the liaison bishops shall be included in executive sessions of the Church Council; and  
To acknowledge that resource persons and other advisors for their expertise in pending action may be invited by the chair to be present in executive sessions.**

**SYNOD VISITS BY CHURCH COUNCIL MEMBERS**

(Agenda III.D.3.)

*Background:*

In the 2005–2007 biennium, the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America committed itself to building relationships between the churchwide organization and synods, congregations, institutions, and agencies. According to the “Report on Governance” prepared for the 2005 Churchwide Assembly by the Church Council, “Church Council voting members . . . 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.”

At the November 2005 meeting, members of the Church Council prepared assignments for “Church Council contacts with synods: 2005–2007.” Members were encouraged to report on synodical visits regularly. A summary of the reports was included for each meeting of the Church Council. In addition, a notebook that included the full texts of reports submitted was available on the materials distribution table.

At its November 2007 meeting, the Executive Committee discussed options for the Church Council to continue to build relationships with synods during the 2007–2009 biennium.

*Church Council Action:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña introduced the topic. At the chair’s request, Secretary David D. Swartling read the proposed action. The chair then opened the floor to discussion.

Mr. Gary L. Wipperman asked that the difference between current expectations and the proposed action be explained. Secretary Swartling replied that the action stated all related expectations in one place. Presiding Mark S. Hanson added that the proposed action put into writing expectations that had been articulated but not always met.

Mr. William R. Lloyd Jr. commented that he hoped that the proposed action would not prevent council members’ trading synods, saying that he attended the West Virginia–Western Maryland Synod Council rather than the one with which his synod was paired. Secretary Swartling replied that any such trades should be reported to the Synodical Relations section. Ms. Myrna J. Sheie, executive for governance and institutional relations, announced that Exhibit D,

Part 3, a brief version of council members' stated relationships from the previous biennium, would be distributed later. She asked that council members consider the matter during the weekend so that by the time of adjournment they could identify the synods to which they would be relating.

Ms. Sandy Schlesinger reported that although she had tried to be engaged with both of her synods, she had been more successful with one than the other. She encouraged the liaison bishops to work with their colleagues to support the development of relationships between synods and council members. She appreciated the fact that the proposed action addressed funding, and she warned her fellow council members that establishing relationships would take determination and perseverance.

The Rev. Marie C. Jerge, bishop of the Upstate New York Synod, pointed out that the term "partner synod" was confusing since that term was used for another type of relationship.

The Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger proposed substituting "paired" for "partner" in the proposed action.

**Moved;**

**Seconded:**

*To amend by substitution:*

To recall that, concerning changes in governance of this church, the 2005 Churchwide Assembly voted [CA05.06.21]: "To encourage greater interaction of members of the Church Council with synodical councils and synodical assemblies in their respective areas";

To urge members of the Church Council to accept this responsibility and interact with their own synods and their ~~partner~~ paired synods in various ways, including attending at least one Synod Council meeting per year and participating in Synod Assemblies, especially in years when a synod is considering nominations to the Church Council; and

To note that expenses for attending Synod Council meetings and Synod Assemblies will be reimbursed by the churchwide organization in accordance with the ELCA travel policy.

Mr. John S. Munday asked for explanation of the difference between the two terms. Presiding Bishop Hanson responded that the "partner" synod program linked two different synods; "paired" synods referred to the constitutional linking of geographically proximate synods for purposes of nominations and elections.

The Rev. Jeffrey "Jeff" B. Sorenson expressed confusion about the practical implications. Presiding Bishop Hanson answered that while the resolution referred to constitutionally paired synods, in practice council members would negotiate so that all synods would be linked to a Church Council member. The Rev. John C. Richter pointed out that council members would need to live into the practice.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson assured council members that Synod Relations would work with those synods that had not welcomed visits by council members thus far.

Mr. Wiperman summarized that the intent of the proposed action was to put in writing what had been sporadic practice. He urged council members to be diligent in reporting all visits and proposed an amendment to the resolution.

Bp. Knoche suggested substituting "another" for "partner."

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote on the amendment.

**Moved;**

**Seconded;**

**Carried:**

*To amend by substitution:*

To recall that, concerning changes in governance of this church, the 2005 Churchwide Assembly voted [CA05.06.21]: "To encourage greater interaction of members of the Church Council with synodical councils and synodical assemblies in their respective areas";

To urge members of the Church Council to accept this responsibility and interact with their own synods and their paired synods in various ways, including attending at least one Synod Council meeting per year and participating in Synod Assemblies, especially in years when a synod is considering nominations to the Church Council; and

To note that expenses for attending Synod Council meetings and Synod Assemblies will be reimbursed by the churchwide organization in accordance with the ELCA travel policy.

The chair announced that the amendment had been approved and that discussion could continue on the motion as amended.

Mr. Wipperman moved to include reporting of visits in the proposed action.

**Moved;**

**Seconded:**

*To amend by addition:*

To recall that, concerning changes in governance of this church, the 2005 Churchwide Assembly voted [CA05.06.21]: “To encourage greater interaction of members of the Church Council with synodical councils and synodical assemblies in their respective areas”;

To urge members of the Church Council to accept this responsibility and interact with their own synods and their paired synods in various ways, including attending at least one Synod Council meeting per year and participating in Synod Assemblies, especially in years when a synod is considering nominations to the Church Council;

To encourage council members to be diligent in reporting synodical visits; and

To note that expenses for attending Synod Council meetings and Synod Assemblies will be reimbursed by the churchwide organization in accordance with the ELCA travel policy.

There being no discussion on the amendment, the chair called for a vote.

**Moved;**

**Seconded;**

**Carried:**

*To amend by addition:*

To recall that, concerning changes in governance of this church, the 2005 Churchwide Assembly voted [CA05.06.21]: “To encourage greater interaction of members of the Church Council with synodical councils and synodical assemblies in their respective areas”;

To urge members of the Church Council to accept this responsibility and interact with their own synods and their paired synods in various ways, including attending at least one Synod Council meeting per year and participating in Synod Assemblies, especially in years when a synod is considering nominations to the Church Council;

To encourage council members to be diligent in reporting synodical visits; and

To note that expenses for attending Synod Council meetings and Synod Assemblies will be reimbursed by the churchwide organization in accordance with the ELCA travel policy.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote on the motion as amended.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.65**

To recall that, concerning changes in governance of this church, the 2005 Churchwide Assembly voted [CA05.06.21]: “To encourage greater interaction of members of the Church Council with synodical councils and synodical assemblies in their respective areas”;

To urge members of the Church Council to accept this responsibility and interact with their own synods and their paired synods in various ways, including attending at least one Synod Council meeting per year and participating in Synod Assemblies, especially in years when a synod is considering nominations to the Church Council;

To encourage council members to be diligent in reporting synodical visits; and

To note that customary expenses for attending Synod Council meetings and Synod Assemblies will be reimbursed by the churchwide organization.

## NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND ELECTIONS

(Agenda III.A.)

### RATIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS TO CHURCH COUNCIL COMMITTEES

(Agenda III.A.5.; Exhibit B, Part 4 and Part 4a)

#### *Background:*

In preparation for the August 2007 meeting, continuing members of the Church Council were invited to indicate their preferences for service on one of the four standing committees of the Church Council: Budget and Finance, Legal and Constitutional Review, Planning and Evaluation, or Program and Services. Members also indicated interest in other areas of service. At its August 2007 meeting, the Church Council ratified the provisional membership for the four standing committees.

Following the Churchwide Assembly, newly elected members indicated their committee preferences. The Executive Committee reviewed the requests for assignment at its November 2007 meeting and made recommendations for ratification by the Church Council.

#### *Church Council Action:*

At the request of Vice President Carlos E. Peña, Secretary David D. Swartling read the motion.

Vice President Peña opened the floor to discussion.

Secretary Swartling reviewed a number of assumptions underlying the appointments.

There being no further discussion, the chair called for a vote.

#### **VOTED:**

**CC07.11.66 To ratify the appointments to the Church Council committees and other advisory responsibilities for the 2007–2009 biennium as follows:**

#### **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Pr. Mark S. Hanson, presiding bishop  
Mr. David D. Swartling, secretary  
Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton, treasurer  
Mr. Carlos E. Peña, vice president and chair  
Ms. Norma J. Hirsch  
Pr. David E. Jensen  
Pr. Steven P. Loy  
Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace  
[three to be elected]

#### **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Ms. Ann F. Niedringhaus (8/09)  
Pr. John C. Richter, chair (4/09)  
Mr. Timothy Stephan (8/09)  
Mr. John Timmer (8/08)  
[two to be elected]  
*Staff: Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton, Mr. Michael McKillip*

#### **BOARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Mr. Mark S. Helmke

Ms. Lynette M. Reitz

Mr. Gary L. Wiperman, chair

[three to be named by EC]

*Staff: Pr. M. Wyvetta Bullock, Ms. Myrna J. Sheie*

#### **BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton

2009: Pr. John C. Richter

Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace, chair

2011: Pr. David P. Anderson

Pr. Keith A. Hunsinger

Ms. Ann F. Niedringhaus

Ms. Lynette M. Reitz

2013: Ms. Deborah L. Chenoweth (4)

Mr. John R. Emery (3)

Advisory bishops: Bp. Marie C. Jerge, Bp. Peter Rogness

Advisors: Mr. Michael Bash, Ms. Carmen Richards; Mr. Samuel F. Schlouch

*Staff: Pr. M. Wyvetta Bullock, Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton, Pr. A. Craig Settlage*

**LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW  
COMMITTEE**

2009: Mr. William R. Lloyd  
2011: Mr. Mark S. Helmke  
Pr. Jonathan W. Linman  
2013: Mr. Mark E. Johnson  
Mr. John S. Munday  
Advisory bishop: Bp. Martin D. Wells  
Advisor: Mr. Larry Thiele  
*Staff: Mr. David D. Swartling; Mr. Phillip H. Harris; Mr. David A. Ullrich*

**PLANNING AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

2009: Ms. Judith Anne Bunker  
Pr. David E. Jensen, chair  
Mr. Richard L. Wahl  
Mr. Gary L. Wipperman  
2011: Mr. Bradley Dokken  
Pr. Jeffrey B. Sorenson  
Mr. David Truland  
2013: Ms. Karin Lynn Graddy (2)  
Pr. Susan Langhauser  
Pr. José Pablo Obregon  
Advisory bishops: Bp. Callon W. Holloway;  
Bp. H. Gerard Knoche; Bp. Paul Stumme-Diers  
Advisors: Mr. Chi-Shih Chen; Pr. Khader El-  
Yateem; Mr. Joseph A. Husary; Mr.  
Richard Torgerson; Ms. Brianna R.  
Watts; Ms. Suzanne Wise  
*Staff: Pr. M. Wyvetta Bullock; Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep, Pr. Kathie Bender Schwich*

**PROGRAM AND SERVICES COMMITTEE**

2009: Ms. Norma J. Hirsch  
Pr. J. Paul Rajashekar  
Ms. Judith Tutt-Starr  
2011: Pr. Steven P. Loy, chair  
Ms. Sandra Schlesinger  
2013: Ms. Rebecca Jo Brakke  
Pr. Rachel L. Connelly  
Mr. Mark W. Myers  
Pr. David W. Peters  
Advisory bishops: Bp. Leonard H. Bolick;  
Bp. Murray D. Finck; Bp. Gerald Mansholt  
Advisors: Mr. Joseph A. Husary; Pr. Phillip D. W.

Krey; Pr. O. Dennis Mims, Pr.  
Frederick Strickert, Mr. Kai S.  
Swanson

*Staff: Ms. Myrna J. Sheie*

**Church Council Task Forces**

**PRAYER TEAM**

Ms. Judith Anne Bunker  
Pr. Rachel L. Connelly  
Mr. Bradley Dokken  
Ms. Norma J. Hirsch  
Pr. Keith A. Hunsinger  
Pr. Jeffrey B. Sorenson

**Church Council Liaison Positions**

**CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Pr. John C. Richter

**THE LUTHERAN MAGAZINE**

Ms. Deborah L. Chenoweth

**JUSTICE FOR WOMEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Mr. David Truland

**EVANGELICAL OUTREACH AND  
CONGREGATIONAL MISSION**

Ms. Ann F. Niedringhaus

**GLOBAL MISSION**

Pr. J. Paul Rajashekar

**VOCATION AND EDUCATION**

Pr. David P. Anderson

**CHURCH IN SOCIETY**

Pr. John C. Richter

**MULTICULTURAL MINISTRIES**

Pr. José Pablo Obregon

**WOMEN OF THE ELCA**

Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

Secretary David D. Swartling reminded council members that the deadline for removal of items from the *en bloc* action was 12:15 P.M. on Saturday. He asked that he be informed of elections of committee chairs as soon as possible, and he also made a number of housekeeping announcements.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION: ELECTIONS

(Agenda III.A.)

The Church Council entered into executive session at 4:34 P.M. for the purpose of discussing nominees for a number of positions in the churchwide organization. The executive session concluded at 4:57 P.M., after which the plenary session resumed.

## NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND ELECTIONS

(Agenda III.A.1.)

### ELECTION OF TREASURER

(Agenda III.A.1.)

*Background:*

Section 13.50. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* describes the position, responsibilities, and process for election of the treasurer of this church. According to provision 13.52.: "The treasurer shall be elected by the Church Council to a six-year term and shall be a voting member of a congregation of this church." Churchwide bylaw 19.31.01.d. specifies: "The treasurer shall be elected by a two-thirds vote of the Church Council." The term of the treasurer elected at the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council will begin on February 1, 2008.

In accordance with provision 13.51, "The treasurer of this church shall serve under the presiding bishop of this church," and in acknowledgment of Treasurer Christina Jackson-Skelton's leadership as an officer of this church, Presiding Bishop Hanson nominated her to a second term.

*Church Council Action:*

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.67**

**To reelect Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton to a six-year term beginning February 1, 2008, as treasurer of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and**

**To determine that the treasurer shall continue to serve simultaneously as president of the Mission Investment Fund as provided in bylaw 17.51.01. in the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.***

Following her election, Treasurer Christina Jackson-Skelton expressed her gratitude to the council. She added that she had enjoyed her six years as treasurer.

### ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE FOR ADMINISTRATION

(Agenda III.A.2.)

*Background:*

The executive for administration is the chief administrator of the churchwide organization and one of the executive assistants to the presiding bishop. According to continuing resolution 15.11.A04. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*: "The executive for administration shall be elected by the Church Council upon nomination of the presiding bishop and shall have an appointment coterminous with

the term of the presiding bishop.” Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson nominated the Rev. M. Wyvetta Bullock as executive for administration.

*Church Council Action:*

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.68 To elect the Rev. M. Wyvetta Bullock as the executive for administration for a term coterminous with the term of the presiding bishop, as provided in churchwide continuing resolution 15.11.A04.**

Pr. Bullock stated her gratitude for being called to serve this church because she had a deep and abiding love for what God does in and through churchwide ministries.

**ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF GLOBAL MISSION**  
(Agenda III.A.3.)

According to bylaw 14.21.21. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*:

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

The Church Council received a recommendation from Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson for election of the Rev. Rafael Malpica Padilla as executive director of the Global Mission program unit.

*Church Council Action:*

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.69 To re-elect the Rev. Rafael Malpica Padilla to a four-year term as executive director of the Global Mission program unit beginning August 1, 2007.**

Pr. Malpica-Padilla thanked council members for their vote of confidence. He commented that it has been a great continuing education experience to serve Global Mission and to receive the partnership of the many companion churches of the ELCA and the people of the world.

**RECESS**

Following the elections, the first plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America recessed at 5:08 P.M.

**Plenary Session II  
Saturday, November 10, 2007**

Prior to the beginning of the second plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council, the Rev. Michael L. Burk, executive for worship and liturgical resources and chaplain to the council, led a service of morning prayer. Standing committees of the council then met. Vice President Carlos E. Peña called to order the second plenary session at 11:05 A.M. He thanked new council members for sharing something about their lives during the previous evening's banquet. He announced the elections of chairs of standing committees: Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace, Budget and Finance Committee; Mr. William R. Lloyd, Legal and Constitutional Review Committee; the Rev. Jeffrey "Jeff" B. Sorenson, Planning and Evaluation Committee; and the Rev. Steven P. Loy, Program and Services Committee.

**NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND ELECTIONS**  
(Agenda III.A.)

**ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
(Agenda III.A.4.)

*Background:*

At the first meeting of each biennium the Church Council elects a new Executive Committee. Seven members of the Church Council will serve on this committee for the 2007–2009 biennium, in addition to the four officers of this church. Incumbent members of the Executive Committee are eligible for re-election.

The election process follows the following pattern:

- a. To facilitate its work between regular meetings by ensuring input and perspective from each of its standing committees, the chairs of the committees will be elected to the Executive Committee.
- b. The remaining three members of the Executive Committee will be selected through the following process. The first ballot shall be a nominating ballot for each of the following identified categories:
  1. Female Clergy
  2. Lay Male
  3. Lay Female
- c. The second ballot shall be limited to the two people (plus ties) in each category receiving the greatest number of nominations.
- d. Upon completion of the balloting, the Executive Committee, consisting of four officers, four committee chairs, and three at-large members, shall be deemed constituted.

*Church Council Action:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña reviewed the background of the action. A list of council members was distributed to facilitate the election. Secretary David D. Swartling read the proposed action. The chair opened the floor to discussion. There being none, he called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.70 To reaffirm the process for the election of the Executive Committee for the 2007-2009 biennium; and**

**To declare that the chairs of the Budget and Finance Committee, the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee, the Planning and Evaluation Committee, and the Program and Services Committee shall be members of the Executive Committee of the Church Council.**

Vice President Peña announced that the council would proceed to the election of the rest of the Executive Committee members. Ballots were distributed.

Ms. Judith Anne Bunker inquired whether former members of the Executive Committee continued in office or were eligible for re-election. The chair explained that the officers and the chairs of committees were members of the Executive Committee; the elections were for three additional slots.

Mr. Bradley Dokken asked that the two candidates for the female clergy position stand. They did so.

Mr. Richard Wahl recalled that the governing documents did not differentiate between male and female clergy. Secretary Swartling replied that was the case for the representational principles in the constitution; however, the practice had been to have both male and female clergy on the Executive Committee as well as male and female lay persons. Presiding Bishop Hanson added that the council could change the categories if it so chose.

The Rev. Steven P. Loy proposed that the category be clergy, with encouragement to elect a female.

Mr. Wahl moved the following:

**Moved;**

**Seconded:** To stipulate that one of the categories for vacancies on the Executive Committee be clergy, without designation of male or female.

The chair opened the floor to discussion.

Ms. Judith Anne Bunker urged that the imbalance of clergy males and females not become a permanent part of the Executive Committee.

Treasurer Christina Jackson-Skelton pointed out that since there already were both male and female lay persons on the Executive Committee, there was no need to designate one category for lay male and one for lay female.

There being no further discussion, the chair called for a vote on the amendment. The voice vote being inclusive, Vice President Peña called for a show of hands.

**Moved;**

**Seconded;**

**Defeated:** To stipulate that one of the categories for vacancies on the Executive Committee be clergy, without designation of male or female.

The chair explained that the previously designated categories thus remained.

Prior to the vote, Vice President Peña asked Ms. Karin Lynn Graddy to lead the council in prayer. The vote for the remaining seats of the Executive Committee was taken using written ballots.

## **OTHER ELECTIONS**

(Agenda III.E.6.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit C, Parts 1 and 2)

*Background:*

Between meetings of the Churchwide Assembly, the Church Council has the responsibility of electing people to fill unexpired terms on the Church Council and boards and committees of the churchwide organization, once the secretary has declared a vacancy [provision 14.15.].

*Church Council Action:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña reviewed the background of the action. He asked Secretary David D. Swartling to list the open positions and the candidates for each position.

In response to a question about the candidates for the vacancy on the churchwide Committee on Discipline, Mr. Phillip H. Harris explained that although the person who had resigned was male, the candidates were female because the 19-person committee alternated between having 10 males and 9 females and 10 females and 9 males.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.71 To receive the report of the Nominating Committee and request that a ballot be prepared:**

**CHURCH COUNCIL**

Clergy [Term 2009] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Jennifer J. Thomas, Milwaukee, Wisc. (5J)*

1. a. Pr. Norene A. Smith, Milwaukee, Wisc. (5J)
- b. Pr. Kathy J. Boadwine, Waukesha, Wisc (5J)

**EVANGELICAL OUTREACH AND CONGREGATIONAL MISSION**

Clergy [Term 2009] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Pamela R. Fickenscher, Minneapolis, Minn. (3G)*

1. a. Pr. Robert W. Fritch, Jamaica, N.Y. (7C)
- b. Pr. Steven E. Wigdahl, Naples, Fla. (9E)

Clergy [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to resignation of Pr. Angela L. Shannon, Fort Wayne, Ind. (6C)*

1. a. Pr. Kristine L. Carlson, Minneapolis, Minn. (3G)
- b. Pr. Jeffrey L. Sandgren, Fargo, N.D. (3B)

Lay Female [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Marilyn Liden Bode, Kingston, Wash. (1B)*

1. a. Ms. Barbara R. Dowdy, Richmond, Va. (9A)
- b. Ms. Maxine S. Young, Darby, Pa. (7F)

**VOCATION AND EDUCATION**

Clergy [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Gerald A. Spice, Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich. (6A)*

1. a. Pr. Heidi M. Murken, Grafton, Wisc. (5J)
- b. Pr. Paul A. Wollner, Irmo, S.C. (9C)

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE LUTHERAN MAGAZINE**

Clergy [Term 2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Karen G. Bockelman, Duluth, Minn. (3E)*

1. a. Pr. Pamela S. Russell, Seattle, Wash. (1B)
- b. Pr. Jennifer M. Ginn, Salisbury, N.C. (9B)

**BOARD OF PENSIONS**

Lay Female [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Ms. Ivy S. Bernhardson, Bloomington, Minn. (3G)*

1. a. Ms. Ingrid S. Stafford, Evanston, Ill. (5A)
- b. Ms. Andrea K. Hayes, San Mateo, Calif. (2A)

Lay Male [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Mr. David D. Swartling, Bainbridge Island, Wash. (1B)*

1. a. Mr. John L. Capecci, Charlotte, N.C. (9B)
- b. Mr. Bruce D. George, Westborough, Mass. (7B)

**CHURCHWIDE COMMITTEE ON DISCIPLINE**

Lay Female [Term 2009] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Mr. Aureo Andino, San Juan, P.R. (9F)*

1. a. Ms. Nancy M. Reed, Luray, Va. (9A)
- b. Ms. Kathryn E. Baerwald, Washington, D.C. (8G)

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE ENDOWMENT FUND OF THE ELCA  
AND BOARD OF ADVISORS OF THE ELCA FOUNDATION**

Lay Female [Term 2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Ms. Tonia J. Lindquist, Gresham, Ore. (1E)*

1. a. Ms. Kathleen M. Rehl, Tampa, Fla. (9E)

**CHURCHWIDE COMMITTEE OF HEARING OFFICERS**

Clergy [2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Leslie G. Svendsen, Sioux Falls, S.D. (3C)*

1. a. Pr. Tor K. Berg, Pullman, Wash. (1D)
- b. Pr. Charles H. Maahs, Olathe, Kans. (4B)

Clergy [2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. J. Phillip Wahl, Worthington, Ohio (6F)*

1. a. Pr. Kerry L. Nelson, Houston, Tex. (4F)
- b. Pr. Paul J. Blom, Houston, Tex. (4F)

Lay Male [2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Mr. Bradford E. Cook, Manchester, N.H. (7B)*

1. a. Mr. Kevin D. Anderson, Gaithersburg, Md. (8G)
- b. Mr. Ray E. Boyd, Blackfoot, Idaho (1D)

Ballots were distributed. Prior to voting, Vice President Peña asked that Ms. Karin Lynn Graddy lead the council in prayer. The vote was taken using a written ballot.

**DWELLING IN THE WORD**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña asked the Rev. Leonard H. Bolick, bishop of the North Carolina Synod, to share with the Church Council his reflections on Dwelling in the Word. Bp. Bolick said: “My parents, Naomi and Homer, grew up together in a little place called Bailey’s Camp. It’s just north of Happy Valley, and on the outskirts of a town called Blowing Rock. They lived within walking distance of St. Mark’s Lutheran Church. St. Mark’s Church was a very special place for Mother and Dad. That’s where they were baptized, that’s where they were confirmed, that’s where they attended Sunday School, that’s where they worshiped, that’s where they grew in faith, that’s where they were married in 1943, that’s where Dad was Sunday School superintendent for 51 years, where Mother played the organ for 73 years, and it may well be the place where they fell in love.

“In their home Dad built an altar in the corner of the living room. That altar looked very much like the altar at St. Mark’s Church. ‘Holy, Holy, Holy’ was across the top of that altar in Old English letters. There were candles, flowers when possible, and at the center of the altar was the family Bible. And every night just before Dad went to bed, he would stop by the altar and read from that Bible. He always left the Bible open to the third chapter of St. John: ‘For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son that those that believe in him might never die but live forever.’ Dad said he liked that text—it was his favorite—because it reminded him of God’s love in Jesus. It changed the way he lived.

“On December 6, 2002, Mother and Dad were at home, and Dad collapsed in front of the altar. The Bible was opened to the third chapter of St. John. The last words he spoke were to Mother, and he said, ‘Don’t worry; I’ll be okay.’ Then he slipped into unconsciousness. He was rushed to the hospital. The next day the family gathered. We filled the room. We gathered around the bed, and we sang hymns, we prayed, and we quoted Scripture. And, yes, from the third chapter of St. John. That day at noon, he passed away. A few days later we received friends in the nave of St. Mark’s Church the evening before the funeral, and then my mother and I spent the night in the church with Dad. The pulpit Bible was open to the third chapter of St. John. During the funeral, or what I like to call the celebration of the resurrection, we read from the third chapter of St. John. We did that because it changed the way he lived, and the message it proclaimed changed the way he died.”

### **REPORT OF THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE** (Agenda II.E.4.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit E, Part 2)

The Rev. Jeffrey “Jeff” B. Sorenson, chair, presented the report of the Planning and Evaluation Committee. He announced a number of items on the committee’s agenda for the coming year, including the resolution from the Southwestern Minnesota Synod on communal discernment. The committee also heard reports related to its ongoing evaluation of the churchwide organization, particularly in relationship to the strategic directions and commitments for implementation. One of these reports had been given by Ms. Josselyn N. Bennett, director for poverty ministries; another by Ms. Kristen Glass, director for young adult ministries; and another by Ms. Mary Streufert, director for justice for women.

The committee had been focusing as well on strategic planning and evaluation. Pr. Sorenson called on Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep, executive for research and evaluation, to review a summary of churchwide unit plans and the ways they relate to the overall Plan for Mission. Mr. Inskeep reported a large overlap between each unit’s plans and the Plan for Mission. The units were working under overarching themes: discipleship, vocation, networking, accompaniment, and leadership.

Pr. Sorenson concluded by announcing that the committee desired to add to its agenda the issue of the size of the Church Council.

### **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON MISSION FUNDING** (Agenda III.F.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit E, Part 3)

The April 2007 meeting of the Church Council acted “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” [CC07.04.15].

The 2007 Churchwide Assembly adopted recommendations based on the report of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding, “Mission Flowing from God’s Abundance,” including the following recommendation:

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 advisors, 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. 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;
- 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 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.

*Church Council Action:*

The Rev. Jeffrey “Jeff” B. Sorenson, chair of the Planning and Evaluation Committee, introduced the proposed action.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña opened the floor to discussion.

Ms. Rebecca Jo Brakke asked whether the process for new church starts had been analyzed. Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson replied that the new starts process was not directly part of the implementation of the recommendations. Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep, executive for research and evaluation, was conducting a parallel process on new starts in collaboration with churchwide units. Mr. Inskeep indicated that a report on new starts over the last 20 years, comparing the two decades, was posted on his unit’s Web page. A churchwide group currently was working with that report, and it would be a significant topic of discussion at the March 2008 meeting of the Conference of Bishops. The Planning and Evaluation Committee also might discuss that report.

Ms. Brakke remarked that the current process did not seem to be working because one of the largest, fastest-growing suburbs of Dallas was unable to get a new start. Presiding Bishop Hanson responded that the report would help deal with such problems.

The Rev. Rachel L. Connelly, based on her experience as a mission developer, emphasized the need for reorganization and change of culture in this church related to new starts.

Presiding Bishop Hanson commented that the conversation was important but premature. It would be important to resume it, he said, after everyone has seen the report and conversation with Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission could take place.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.72 To receive the implementation plan for coordination of the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding as requested by the Church Council at its April 2007 meeting;**  
**To express gratitude for the specific information provided, including coordinating units, specific measurements, and evaluation cycles; and**  
**To anticipate that the Church Council will receive regular progress reports beginning in April 2008 through the Planning and Evaluation Committee.**

**CONSULTATION ON DISASTER RESPONSE RECOMMENDATIONS**

(Agenda III.F.2.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit E, Part 1)

*Background:*

A consultation on this church’s Disaster Response was requested by Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson to respond to a variety of concerns that had been raised. The consultation met September 30–October 1, 2007, in Tampa, Florida, to explore how the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in all of its expressions and institutional forms contributes to the needs of congregations and rostered leaders affected by disaster. Resolutions related to this topic also were considered by the consultation, including ones from the Southeastern Synod and the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod.

*Church Council Action:*

The Rev. Jeffrey “Jeff” B. Sorenson, chair of the Planning and Evaluation Committee, introduced the proposed action, amending it by striking the words “and the Southeastern Synod.”

Vice President Carlos E. Peña opened the floor to discussion.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson urged that council members stay informed about the complexities of disaster response and the commitments contained in the proposed action.

Pr. Sorenson pointed out that in responding to disasters the needs of congregations and rostered leaders were different from diaconal work in the wider communities.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.73** To receive the report of the consultation on ELCA disaster response that was held September 30–October 1, 2007, which provides an evaluation of the contributions of the ELCA in all its expressions, institutions, and agencies to the needs of congregations and rostered leaders affected by disaster;

To reaffirm the guiding principles for ELCA disaster response as identified by the consultation: 1) the ELCA is a church of abundance; 2) to be Lutheran is to love the neighbor; 3) Lutheran Disaster Response (LDR) is the primary way that the ELCA provides care for the wider community; 4) synods are the primary way that the ELCA provides care for congregations and rostered leaders; and 5) support and cooperation among all expressions of this church is assumed;

To acknowledge that the consultation addressed areas of general consensus and topics to be considered in subsequent consultations; and

To recognize that the consultation also sought to respond to a variety of concerns pertaining to disaster response raised by synodical resolutions from the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod and to anticipate that a report and specific recommendations related to these concerns will be brought to the November 2008 meeting of the Church Council.

**NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND ELECTIONS**  
(Agenda III.A.)

**ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

(Agenda III.A.4.) *Church Council Action:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called on Secretary David D. Swartling for a report on elections.

Secretary Swartling announced the results of the election for the Executive Committee. With 36 ballots cast, the results were as follows:

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CHURCH COUNCIL**

Female Clergy

**Pr. Susan Langhauser - 19**

Pr. Rachel L. Connelly - 12

Abstentions - 5

Lay Female

Ms. Norma J. Hirsch - 16

Ms. Judith Tutt-Starr - 7

Ms. Ann F. Niedringhaus - 5

Ms. Sandra Schlesinger - 3

Ms. Judith Anne Bunker - 2

Ms. Lynette R. Reitz - 2

Ms. Karin Lynn Graddy - 1

Lay Male

Mr. Gary Wipperman - 13  
Mr. Mark S. Helmke - 11  
Mr. Richard L. Wahl - 3  
Mr. David Truland - 3  
Mr. Bradley Dokken - 2  
Mr. Mark W. Myers - 1  
Mr. John S. Munday - 1  
Mr. Mark E. Johnson - 1  
Abstentions - 1

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.74            To declare the election of the Rev. Susan Langhauser to the Executive Committee  
of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.**

Secretary Swartling indicated that two persons who had received the most votes in the categories of lay female and lay male would appear on the second ballot.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called on Secretary David D. Swartling for announcements.

Secretary Swartling made a number of housekeeping announcements. He reminded council members that the deadline for removal of items from the *en bloc* action was 12:15 P.M.

Vice President Peña called on Ms. Norma J. Hirsch to offer a table prayer before lunch.

**RECESS**

The second plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America recessed at 12:04 P.M.

### Plenary Session III Saturday, November 10, 2007

Vice President Carlos E. Peña reconvened the Church Council meeting at 1:30 P.M.

#### BIBLE STUDY

Ms. Mary Streufert, director for justice for women, led the council in a Bible study, “Resistance to and Readiness for Change,” based on selections from the book of Exodus. The Bible study began with the hymn “Bless Now, O God, the Journey.” Ms. Streufert outlined the format of the study: introduction, large-group reading and discussion, textual study with a partner, large-group discussion, reporting back, personal reflection, and conclusion. The focus of the study, she said, was the exodus of Israel out of Egypt and into the wilderness with God where the Israelites learned to respond to God’s call to be in right relationship. Right relationship, Ms. Streufert explained, required Israel to change. The premise of the study was that changes involved in addressing sexism and racism are changes toward right relationship with God and each other. The goals were to think about the required changes, the reasons and occasions for resistance to change, and ways of overcoming resistance to change in order to transform.

Ms. Streufert identified the first step in transforming sexism and racism as naming the problem. The Church Council, she commented, had named the problem when it committed itself to further education on sexism and racism at its April 2007 meeting. The selections from Exodus demonstrated how God had taught Israel about right relationships, and they can teach this church as well, she stated. The stories that shaped Israel’s identity can help members of this church understand themselves as part of a community of God. Ms. Streufert compared Israel’s transformation in the wilderness from slaves to a free people to the change brought about by baptism. She encouraged the members of the council to see the study as taking another look at sexism and one way of seeking right relationship.

The study continued with oral reading of the Exodus texts. The questions for the large plenary discussion were as follows:

- What does God want? (Exodus 6:6–9)
- How does Israel react? (Exodus 6:9)
- Under what circumstances is it easy for the Israelites to follow God? (Exodus 12:24–28, 50–51)
- Under what circumstances is it difficult for the Israelites to follow God?
- How do the Israelites react in the transition from Egypt into the wilderness, from slavery into freedom? (Exodus 14:10–14)
- In this circumstance specifically, how do they react once they are saved? (Exodus 14:30–31)
- Why do the Israelites falter? What do they want? (Exodus 32:1)

Working in small groups, council members discussed Exodus 15:22–27; 16:1–18; 16:5, 19–30; or 17:1–7, using the following questions:

- Why do the Israelites resist in this passage?
- What do they do when they resist?
- What happens when they resist?
- What helps them work through their resistance?
- Who asks the Israelites to change?
- What are they asked to do? Why?
- What are the anticipated results of changing in this instance?

The questions for the personal reflection time were as follows:

- When has change been demanded or asked of you?
- Who “asked” for the change?
- What were you being “asked” to do [e.g., birth, death, accidents, natural disasters]?
- How did you respond?
- If you resisted the change, why did you?

- How did you come to recognize your resistance? What supported you to let go of your resistance?

Ms. Streufert concluded with two questions and three remarks:

- What do you notice when you think about your own experiences in relationship to that of Israel?
- What do you notice when you think of the work of the Church Council in relationship to the story of Israel?
- We have recognized that we resist change when we are thirsty, hungry, or greedy, or when the future is not in our own hands.
- We have begun to understand we resist change because we might be afraid, when we are uncertain about leaders, or when we feel threatened or out of control.
- Like Israel, council members had identified that it takes trust and risk to move through resistance in order to change. It was possible to learn what it means to be in right relationship with God, and through trust and risk live in the freedom from oppressing others.

Council members ended the session by singing “Rise Up, O Saints of God.”

## **NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND ELECTIONS** (Agenda III.A.)

### **REPORT ON OTHER ELECTIONS** (Agenda III.E.6.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit C, Parts 1 and 2)

*Church Council Action:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called upon Secretary David D. Swartling for a report on elections. Secretary Swartling reported elections to the Church Council, program committees, and churchwide committees.

#### **VOTED:**

**CC07.11.75 To declare elected the following:**

#### **CHURCH COUNCIL**

Clergy [Term 2009] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Jennifer J. Thomas, Milwaukee, Wisc. (5J)*

1. a. **Pr. Norene A. Smith, Milwaukee, Wisc. (5J) - 18**  
b. Pr. Kathy J. Boadwine, Waukesha, Wisc (5J) - 17

#### **EVANGELICAL OUTREACH AND CONGREGATIONAL MISSION**

Clergy [Term 2009] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Pamela R. Fickenscher, Minneapolis, Minn. (3G)*

1. a. **Pr. Robert W. Fritch, Jamaica, N.Y. (7C) - 19**  
b. Pr. Steven E. Wigdahl, Naples, Fla. (9E) - 16

Clergy [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to resignation of Pr. Angela L. Shannon, Fort Wayne, Ind. (6C)*

1. a. **Pr. Kristine L. Carlson, Minneapolis, Minn. (3G) - 21**  
b. Pr. Jeffrey L. Sandgren, Fargo, N.D. (3B) - 13

Lay Female [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Marilyn Liden Bode, Kingston, Wash. (1B)*

1. a. **Ms. Barbara R. Dowdy, Richmond, Va. (9A) - 21**  
b. Ms. Maxine S. Young, Darby, Pa. (7F) - 13

**VOCATION AND EDUCATION**

Clergy [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Gerald A. Spice, Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich. (6A)*

1. a. **Pr. Heidi M. Murken, Grafton, Wisc. (5J) - 23**
- b. Pr. Paul A. Wollner, Irmo, S.C. (9C) - 12

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE LUTHERAN MAGAZINE**

Clergy [Term 2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Karen G. Bockelman, Duluth, Minn. (3E)*

1. a. **Pr. Pamela S. Russell, Seattle, Wash. (1B) - 22**
- b. Pr. Jennifer M. Ginn, Salisbury, N.C. (9B) - 13

**BOARD OF PENSIONS**

Lay Female [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Ms. Ivy S. Bernhardson, Bloomington, Minn. (3G)*

1. a. **Ms. Ingrid S. Stafford, Evanston, Ill. (5A) - 25**
- b. Ms. Andrea K. Hayes, San Mateo, Calif. (2A) - 10

Lay Male [Term 2011] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Mr. David D. Swartling, Bainbridge Island, Wash. (1B)*

1. a. Mr. John L. Capecci, Charlotte, N.C. (9B) - 15
- b. **Mr. Bruce D. George, Westborough, Mass. (7B) - 20**

**CHURCHWIDE COMMITTEE ON DISCIPLINE**

Lay Female [Term 2009] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Mr. Aureo Andino, San Juan, P.R. (9F)*

1. a. Ms. Nancy M. Reed, Luray, Va. (9A) - 9
- b. **Ms. Kathryn E. Baerwald, Washington, D.C. (8G) - 26**

**CHURCHWIDE COMMITTEE OF HEARING OFFICERS**

Clergy [2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. J. Phillip Wahl, Worthington, Ohio (6F)*

1. a. Pr. Kerry L. Nelson, Houston, Tex. (4F) - 13
- b. **Pr. Paul J. Blom, Houston, TX (4F) - 20**

Lay Male [2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Mr. Bradford E. Cook, Manchester, N.H. (7B)*

1. a. **Mr. Kevin D. Anderson, Gaithersburg, Md. (8G) - 22**
- b. Mr. Ray E. Boyd, Blackfoot, Idaho (1D) - 12

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE ENDOWMENT FUND OF THE ELCA  
AND BOARD OF ADVISORS OF THE ELCA FOUNDATION**

Lay Female [Term 2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Ms. Tonia J. Lindquist, Gresham, Ore. (1E)*

1. a. **Ms. Kathleen M. Rehl, Tampa, Fla. (9E) - 33**

Secretary Swartling announced that there had been no election in the following category:

**CHURCHWIDE COMMITTEE OF HEARING OFFICERS**

Clergy [2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Leslie G. Svendsen, Sioux Falls, S.D. (3C)*

1. a. Pr. Tor K. Berg, Pullman, Wash. (1D) - 17
- b. Pr. Charles H. Maahs, Olathe, Kans. (4B) - 17

He stated that the next ballot would include the nominees for the clergy vacancy on the Committee on Discipline, due to the resignation of Pr. Leslie G. Svendsen, and for the lay male and lay female positions on the Executive Committee.

Ballots were distributed. Prior to voting, Vice President Peña asked the Rev. Rachel L. Connelly to lead the council in prayer. The vote was taken using written ballots.

### **JOYS AND CONCERNS**

Mr. John S. Munday asked for prayers for the Rev. Rolf E. Olson and his wife Nancy, who were mourning the death of their daughter, a murder victim. The Rev. Rachel L. Connelly led the council in prayer.

The Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger thanked the Church Council for their prayers as his wife Sue underwent back surgery. The surgery had been successful, he reported.

The Rev. Steven P. Loy called attention to Vision for Mission and distributed envelopes for contributions. He also highlighted the Good Gifts catalogue.

The Rev. Murray D. Finck, bishop of the Pacifica Synod, shared with council members a PowerPoint presentation on the recent California wildfires.

### **BOARD DEVELOPMENT: RESPONDING TO THE MEDIA**

(Minutes Exhibit Z)

Ms. Kristi S. Bangert, executive director of Communications Services, and the Rev. Kathie Bender Schwich, executive for synodical and constituent relations, led the council in a primer devoted to responding to the media. Pr. Bender Schwich also reviewed guidelines for responding to correspondence and for meeting with Synod Councils. She referred council members to the appropriate places in the orientation manual that dealt with these topics. The guidelines were distributed to council members as well.

When Vice President Carlos E. Peña called for questions or comments, Ms. Judith Anne Bunker expressed her gratitude for the guidelines, saying that when she had first become part of the council, she had not known what to do with the correspondence she had received.

### **REPORT OF THE SECRETARY**

(Agenda II.A.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit A, Part 3)

Mr. David D. Swartling, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, opened his report by offering thanks to the Rev. Murray D. Finck, bishop of the Pacifica Synod, for the slides and for the help he had provided the people touched by the fires as well as to the secretary's family.

Secretary Swartling said, "Three months ago yesterday, three months ago I was elected to be secretary of this wonderful, wonderful church. So much for being a regional gift planner. It does not surprise you that much has changed dramatically in Barbara's life and my life since that time. I have shut down a law practice of 31 years. I sold the converted beach house we lived in for 25. I said good-bye to friends I have known for more than a quarter-century. For the first time since I departed from college many years ago, I moved away from the west coast. So I have been dealing with transitions on multiple levels.

"During one of my commuting trips to Chicago, Michael Burk asked me to preach at chapel on the 7<sup>th</sup> of November, the first week I was here. Two months out that seemed like a really good idea. It took him a little bit of convincing, but he gave me the texts. I can't say that I liked all of them, but one of them was the planned giving text from Luke. And secondly, I wanted to talk about this [Secretary Swartling displayed a piece of art]. Something happened in between. On Tuesday, October 23, while driving on Interstate 90 in South Dakota, on a cell phone we learned that my father died while being moved from a retirement community outside San Diego. Now he did not die in the fires. He died of natural causes in getting ready to be removed to a safer place. Well, driving down the road and grappling with those emotions and the logistics that you can't imagine, Barbara and I concluded that God had a different evacuation plan for my dad.

“One of the most powerful things that sustained us was being surrounded by your prayers. And I told the staff last Wednesday that this group now in this building and many if not all of you are now part of my extended family, and I want to thank you all on my behalf and Barbara’s behalf for the prayers of support and the words of solace. I cannot adequately articulate what they have meant to us.

“But I still had a sermon to prepare. I always thought that this calligraphy was a profound piece of wisdom that was given to me almost 10 years ago by the multicultural minister in Region 1 after some difficult times that related to a number of issues there. For 10 years it hung behind my office chair at my law firm, and if you come and visit me today, you will see it’s behind my chair here on Higgins Road. You will realize that, as it appears, this calligraphy has multidimensional meanings. There are two characters . . . representing one word, and that word is ‘crisis.’ But the Chinese in their wisdom have two characters for that word. The first character is ‘danger.’ Not surprisingly, crises involve danger. But the second word is going to surprise you a bit, and that is ‘opportunity.’ You see, the Chinese in their wisdom have told us that a crisis involves danger and opportunity. That was profoundly true for me three months ago, and it is even more true now.

“Now there are many things in my report, and my oral report to you has changed form in the last few days. That is not to say that what is written there is unimportant. It’s just only a small piece of a bigger story. In the days and weeks and months and years ahead as we meet together, I want the Office of the Secretary to be the oil in the engine of the ELCA, a metaphor you will hear me use again and again. We are already developing a list of things that we can help the Office of the Presiding Bishop with as well as the units in this building, as well as the synods, congregations, and individuals. Now there are some things that you might be expecting to hear from me today that you won’t. We are not going to talk about the site for 2011 Churchwide Assembly. Mary Beth Nowak is still working on evaluating the sites, which include Houston, San Antonio, Phoenix, Columbus, and others. I am blessed as an individual, the Office of the Secretary is blessed, and this entire church is blessed to have Mary Beth doing that work, and we thank her. I want you also to know that we are blessed for having two other colleagues on my executive staff, and it is going to be my practice that you hear from them from time to time because right now they know a lot more than I do, and that probably will be true six years from now as well. Paul Schreck will talk to you about some information that is derived from parochial reports, important information for you to have. Pastor Ruth Hamilton will address following up on Churchwide Assembly actions, something that I think is very important and I think needs to be on our radar screen. I had planned to talk to you about scintillating topics like fiduciary responsibilities, fulfilling corporate purposes, obedience, diligence, loyalty, and confidentiality, and I am not. That does not mean that those are not important. But at the end of Paul’s and Ruth’s presentations, I want to loop back and bookend their presentations and make some concluding comments.”

The Rev. Paul A. Schreck, executive assistant to the secretary, using a PowerPoint presentation, reviewed data provided in Exhibit A, Part 3, Appendix 2, which was a trend report for the past seven years based on information collected in parochial reports. Pr. Schreck stated that the greatest importance of the parochial reports was their cumulative statistics. He highlighted particular trends and showed how the data suggested reasons for them. Pr. Schreck emphasized the significance of congregations’ filing parochial reports each year; they had an enormous impact on ministry decisions for this entire church. When congregations did not file, decisions were made based on incomplete or inaccurate information.

The Rev. Ruth E. Hamilton, executive assistant to the secretary, summarized the routes by which actions reach the Churchwide Assembly and then are referred from the assembly, with particular attention to the role of the Church Council. Using Exhibit A, Part 3, Appendix 1, and Exhibit B, Part 3, she highlighted those actions that had been referred particularly to the Church Council and its Executive Committee. Pr. Hamilton noted that the Office of the Secretary would continue to assist the council in undertaking its responsibilities and asked for suggestions on how it could do so better.

Secretary Swartling stated, “Let me just provide a bookend to these comments. This will set a way that we will approach making our reports to you periodically, providing you information, hopefully asking provocative questions. With respect to Paul’s report, take a look at the charts that begin at page 27. I had intended to talk with you about the planned-giving opportunities that are reflected in that quantitative data. I will reserve the right to do that at a later time. With respect to memorials and resolutions, I specifically asked that you be given those extra pages so that you can keep them and have them on your radar screen because I think the actions of the Churchwide Assembly have to be continually

monitored, as Ruth said. In the course of this meeting I have also tried to keep our collective ears open in the Office of the Secretary so that we can catch your comments and your wisdom and evaluate them in collaboration with the Office of the Presiding Bishop and the appropriate churchwide units. So we have jotted down issues related to Church Council size and the role of youth representation, issues with respect to working collaboratively with Synodical Relations to assist bishops' elections processes. We also have a carryover item; the one item from the Churchwide Assembly that is applicable to the Office of the Secretary refers to green assemblies. I can tell you that we will have a greener assembly in Minneapolis in 2009. We are already looking at issues, such as the use of preliminary minutes and the way we send those out and evaluating whether we can provide them electronically to people. I look forward to engaging you all in conversation in April about ways that we can fulfill our responsibility as the Office of the Secretary and collectively as the Church Council to help fulfill that, and I am particularly interested in having those of you with computers let us know how that operates. As Ruth said, the Office of the Secretary is about service, service to individuals, congregations, synods, and you. We want to help you serve better. One of the ways we want to do that is to solicit your feedback. We will distribute to you all a feedback form. It asks what we are doing well as the Office of the Secretary and what we are not doing so well and what we can improve on. Similarly, if there are things regarding the conduct of this meeting that you would like to note, just fill out that form, and we will process it after the meeting. That suggestion form is really important to me and to our office.

"So let me end a little bit by the way we began. In listening to Bishop Hanson yesterday talk about navigating and agitating, that resonated with me, partly because of my Navy experience and partly because of the way it is really profound. I went up to him afterwards and commented that it is really important to realize that rivers and where you navigate aren't always in the same direction and aren't always on straight courses. What you need are 'navaids,' we used to call them, navigational aids, lights and buoys. This morning I was moved by Bishop Bolick's "Dwelling in the Word." His family Bible was open to John 3. This is the Bible I gave to my mom and dad when their eyesight began to fail. It's a large-print Bible. So at noontime, I opened to John chapter three, and it is underlined, not just John 3:16, but John 3:17: 'For God sent his Son into the world not to condemn the world but that the world through him might be saved.' Well, if my dad were here, he would talk about crisis and danger and opportunity, and he would tell us not to get bogged down in the shoals because we have a navaid. My mother and father were a 'Book of Faith' family. Every time that I greeted my father for the last year or two of his life, at some point in the conversation and usually right at the beginning, he would say, 'Rejoice in the Lord; I say, rejoice!' His favorite Bible verse was Philippians 4:4. So I opened Philippians 4:4, and that's not the only verse that he underlined. So, Dad, wherever you are, this is for you: 'Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice. Let your gentleness be evident to all.' And it was. 'The Lord is near.' And he is. 'Do not be anxious about anything, but in everything by prayer and petition with thanksgiving present your requests to God. And the peace of God, which passes all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus.' Thank you again for your prayers and support."

## **RECESS**

The third plenary session recessed at 3:54 P.M. and resumed at 4:15 P.M.

## **NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND ELECTIONS** (Agenda III.A.)

### *Church Council Action:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called upon Secretary David D. Swartling to report on elections. He reported elections to the Executive Committee of the Church Council and to the churchwide Committee of Hearing Officers.

### **VOTED:**

**CC07.11.76**

**To declare elected the following:**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CHURCH COUNCIL**

Lay Female

**Ms. Norma J. Hirsch - 21**

Ms. Judith Tutt-Starr - 15

Lay Male

**Mr. Gary Wipperman - 21**

Mr. Mark S. Helmke - 15

**CHURCHWIDE COMMITTEE OF HEARING OFFICERS**

Clergy [2013] *Vacancy due to the resignation of Pr. Leslie G. Svendsen, Sioux Falls, S.D. (3C)*

1. a. Pr. Tor K. Berg, Pullman, Wash. (1D) - 16

b. **Pr. Charles H. Maahs, Olathe, Kans. (4B) - 20**

**REPORT OF THE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**(Agenda II.E.3.)**

Mr. William R. Lloyd Jr., chair, presented the report of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee. Mr. Lloyd indicated that all the proposed actions coming from his committee were in the *en bloc* resolution, located on pages 22-26 in the agenda.

Secretary David D. Swartling reported that there had been no requests to remove any items from the *en bloc* action.

**DWELLING IN THE WORD**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called on Ms. Lynette M. Reitz to reflect on dwelling in the Word. Ms. Reitz said, "I don't know why I have been struggling with figuring out what to say to you about this, but I have. So here's what I have decided to talk about. I am the daughter of a pastor, and my father was a pastor for 45 years before he died. He happened to be retired for about 18 months before he passed way, very unexpectedly, which happened about two years ago. Growing up, dwelling in the Word was what happened in my house all the time. In fact, as the daughter of a pastor, it was really difficult to get away from dwelling in the Word. In fact, both my parents were very active Lutherans. My mother actually served as the secretary to the president of Waterloo Seminary, and that's how she met my father, who was a student at Waterloo Seminary at the time. So suffice it to say my mother was the stereotypical pastor's wife who should have really been called the co-pastor because she truly did everything that my father didn't do in the church.

"So that meant that my brother and I were subjected to dinners where all we heard was talk about Lutheran doctrine, in my words, which made me not want to be involved in Lutheran doctrine, which led me to tell my parents at one point that I would never, absolutely never, date or marry a Lutheran pastor. So I dated and married the son of a Lutheran pastor. So, as you see, throughout my life I experienced being surrounded through my family and my extended family with being Lutheran and reading the Bible and being involved in Bible school, and I worked at church camp, and all those great things that come along with being the daughter of a pastor.

"I also recall the period of time in my life when I was rebelling against the Word. That happened for a little while when I went away to college and decided that I could do things on my own now, and I did not have to be surrounded by my parents, who forced me, of course, to go to all the church events and be a part of the church family. So I did that, and I realized that now that I have my own children and my own family, things have come full circle. Being elected to be on this council was truly ironic, given the fact that I had rebelled against the Word for a while and did not see myself as being part of the Lutheran church or wanting to be part of the Lutheran church the way my parents were.

"I now have a daughter who is in confirmation, and she is a very critical thinker at the age of 13. In fact, she has caused me now to dwell in the Word because she asked me all these questions that I am not sure I can answer about the Bible and what the Bible means. Her last lesson I had to help her interpret the Ten Commandments, especially the commandment about 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' Her pastor asked her to start to think about what kind of a mate

would she want in life, and some of those tough questions. So my daughter now reminds me how important it is to look back on my heritage and not be upset that I wasn't part of a 'normal' family. I need to realize that I actually had a really good grounding from what I experienced in my family, and I don't think that I would know how to be a part of a 'normal' family because my normal family is a family where we have a faith and we carry out that faith. My daughter reports to everyone that we read the Bible at home, and, in fact, one of her friends in confirmation, his mother approached me and said, 'Jordan says that you all sit down and read the Bible together at home. . . . I must be a really bad mother because I don't do that.' I said, 'I am not sure when we did that.' Jordan thinks we've done that, but actually I have sat down with Jordan, and she and I have read together to try to figure out the answers to some of her questions, which have been really challenging and really difficult. In closing, my dwelling in the Word is the journey that I experienced through my life. It has been nice to come back. . . . I knew all the stories growing up, but now I am in an adult Sunday school class where we are critically looking at the Bible too. That has been a good benefit to me, and something that has really helped me."

**Plenary Session IV  
Saturday, November 10, 2007**

**REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF BISHOPS  
(Agenda II.B.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit A, Part 5)**

The Rev. Marie C. Jerge, bishop of the Upstate New York Synod and vice chair of the Conference of Bishops, presented the report in song. To the tune of St. Anne, she referred the council to the appropriate exhibit and offered to answer questions about the report that had been prepared by the Rev. Allan C. Bjornberg, chair of the Conference of Bishops.

Mr. Richard L. Wahl inquired about the process and time line for the Conference of Bishops' response to the 2007 Churchwide Assembly's resolution on bishops' accountability. Bp. Jerge replied that the process would begin with the bishops' relational agreement, which deals in part with accountability. She reported that the bishops had discussed the agreement extensively in October and likely would do so again at the March 2008 meeting, when work on the response would begin.

**DWELLING IN THE WORD**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called on Mr. William R. Lloyd Jr. to share his reflection on dwelling in the Word. Mr. Lloyd stated: "Myrna said that we could sing, and for anyone who has heard me, thankfully you will know that I am not going to. I also am a little bit concerned that the last several presentations have been somewhat light, and what I have to say isn't very light, but maybe my committee report will have bought me your good graces.

"In the second chapter of Genesis the seventh verse it is written, 'and the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.' 'Remember that you are dust and to dust you shall return.' At age 14, I was called, not, as many of the people in this room, to the ministry but to public service. I wanted to, I had to make a difference. In my arrogance I sacrificed my personal life, married my career, and outside of my family restricted my social network almost entirely to people who had some political connection to me. I had the confidence, based on that arrogance, that somehow if I just worked hard enough, just did what was right, that I was going to win some special favor with God. That I was going to succeed where other people, equally talented, did not. Judged objectively, I did find success. For 18 years I was a Democrat, representing a majority Republican district in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. I was a prolific sponsor of new laws, a *de facto* leader in the House, a committee chairman. If there ever was a job made for me, I had it.

"But it was never enough. In 1998 I won the Democratic primary for the U.S. Senate. As expected, I lost in November. Unfortunately, I lost without getting the hoped-for 'bounce' that would have set me up for some future race. And so, at age 51, my career was over, and I was alone. Intellectually, I meant what I said in my farewell speech in the House: that most of us are not going to be in the history books, that the best that we can hope to do is to leave our Commonwealth and our districts a little better than we found them. I knew that to be true, but for more than eight years, I struggled emotionally to accept that fact. I wanted vindication. I couldn't begin to tell you the number of times I ran through in my mind how I could get the money to try a comeback.

"Finally, we got a Democratic governor, and there were lots of jobs for deserving Democrats, and I got back into state government. I was so anxious that I took the bird in the hand rather than wait for the promised one in the bush, which was better. But I like my job and I am enjoying it, and I think I am making a difference—not the one I wanted to make—but I think I am making a difference. Throughout that struggle of eight years I had to convince myself that we really are as individuals just like a grain of sand in the hourglass of time. That despite our arrogance, none of us is likely to do something that sets the world on fire. I came to accept that earlier this year, and while I still struggle with many things daily, in that part of my life I finally accepted where things were. Throughout that struggle one of the most comforting things to me and something that gave me perspective was to remind myself of the Ash Wednesday incantation: 'Remember that you are dust, and to dust you shall return.'

"When I got here on Friday, I thought that's where this 'Dwelling in the Word' was going to end. Kind of downbeat,

but I am playing out the string. I am 60 years old; I am going to have a governor of my party for three more years. If I mind my p's and q's, I will have a job until I am 63. Maybe not after that, but that's okay. That's okay. And who knows? Maybe I can hold over. Maybe we will get lucky and we will break the cycle. Then I got to the hotel Friday and I had a message, a call. This was a telephone call, but it also turned into another kind of call. When I saw it, I knew it was not a call I wanted to take. I have been offered something or asked to do something which would probably turn my life upside down. It's something I am going to have to decide. I have agreed to meet with some people on Monday. I have agreed to meet with one of the governor's aides on Monday, and it is something that—I cannot really get into the details—but suffice it to say that it's a job I am not sure anybody can do. It is an effort to try to help clean up a mess which imperils in at least short-term the success of the Democratic party in Pennsylvania. For a lot of ego reasons it would be very hard for me to do this job, and if you knew the people involved, you would understand that. It's a job where my reputation could be solid, and it's still an uphill fight all the way. It also removes me from the comfort zone, and I thought about that as I listened to the Bible study today and I looked at the questions for personal reflection. I don't know, and I was told last night, 'If you get to 95 percent, we will get a meeting with the governor,' and I said, 'I am not even to the 50-yard line yet and I don't know that I will be.'

“But what I do know is that when I got up this morning, there was a hymn running around in my mind, and I could not remember how it started. Finally, I corralled Michael Burk, and he found it for me. Here is the refrain; I won't sing it: 'Here am I, Lord. Is it I, Lord? I have heard you calling in the night. I will go, Lord, if you lead me. I will hold your people in my heart.'”

Vice President Peña thanked all of those who had shared their amazing stories of faith in the “dwelling in the Word” reflections.

## **REPORT OF THE PROGRAM AND SERVICES COMMITTEE** (Agenda II.E.5.)

### **SOCIAL POLICY RESOLUTION ON THE SPONSORSHIP OF LEGAL GAMING BY AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBES** (Agenda III.G.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit K, Part 2)

#### *Background:*

The Church in Society unit, in accordance with “Policies and Procedures of the ELCA for Addressing Social Concerns,” requested that a social policy resolution be developed to clarify the position of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America related to legal gaming sponsored by American Indian tribes. Social policy resolutions refer to actions, other than social statements, of the Churchwide Assembly or Church Council on matters of social concern.

The introduction to the document indicates, “ELCA social policy documents express serious concerns about all forms of gambling,<sup>1</sup> and call for “opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored gambling”<sup>2</sup> as exploitative, wasteful, and detrimental.<sup>3</sup> This church also explicitly affirms the sovereignty of American Indian tribes and supports the aspirations of Native Americans for self-determination, self-sufficiency, and cultural identity.<sup>4</sup> Many American Indians

---

<sup>1</sup>The ALC social statement on gambling offers the following definition: “Gambling has been described as involving three elements: (a) *a valuable consideration*, mutually risked in the hope of (b) winning *a significant prize*, which is awarded (c) not primarily for skill or ability but largely by the *caprice of chance*” “Gambling and the Public Good: A Statement of the American Lutheran Church” (page 2).

<sup>2</sup>1999 ELCA social statement on economic life, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” (page 12).

<sup>3</sup>“Gambling and the Public Good...”.

<sup>4</sup> “1992: Year of Remembrance, Repentance and Renewal,” a resolution adopted by the 1991 ELCA Churchwide Assembly.

and others—including persons in this church—testify that opposition to tribal gaming adopted under these sovereign powers threatens both these powers and this viable means to advance tribal economic and social development. ELCA documents do not address the specific issue of legal gaming sponsored by American Indian nations. There is need, therefore, to clarify the ELCA public policy position on tribal gaming.”

The proposed social policy resolution was prepared by the Church in Society unit in consultation with the Office of the Presiding Bishop, other appropriate units, the Church in Society program committee, and the Program and Services Committee of the Church Council.

*Church Council Action:*

The Rev. Steven P. Loy, chair of the Program and Services Committee, introduced the proposed action.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña opened the floor to discussion.

Mr. Mark W. Myers called attention to the changes made in committee.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson inquired whether the four resolutions within the policy document were included in the proposed action. The response was affirmative.

Pr. Loy read the revisions made in committee. By consensus, the council agreed that the revisions were part of the document.

Mr. Richard L. Wahl asked what the brief resource would contain, expressing concern that a simple précis of the document could be misleading. The Rev. Roger A. Willer, director for studies in the Church in Society unit, envisioned the resource as providing an introduction to the issues facing American Indians, including gaming. It would not be focused on understanding the resolution but on the impetus for the resolution and the concerns and issues surrounding it.

Mr. Wahl suggested that the resource item be separated from the resolution. Pr. Willer responded that since its purpose was further education, the brief resource was in keeping with the items that fall under part 4 of the resolution.

Mr. Wahl asked if there were precedent for such a resource. Pr. Willer answered affirmatively.

Pr. Loy noted that this church has different levels of social policy documents, including social statements, which needed to be adopted by Churchwide Assemblies; social policy resolutions; and social messages.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.77 To approve the social policy document on legal gaming sponsored by American Indian tribes as follows:**

**INTRODUCTION**

ELCA social policy documents express serious concerns about all forms of gambling,<sup>5</sup> and call for “opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored gambling.”<sup>6</sup> This church also explicitly affirms the sovereignty of American Indian tribes and supports the aspirations of American Indians and Alaska Natives for self-determination, self-sufficiency, and cultural identity.<sup>7</sup> Many American Indians and others—including persons in this church—testify that opposition to the sponsorship of tribal gaming

---

<sup>5</sup> Waste, exploitation, broken homes, and poor stewardship are among the concerns indicated in “Gambling and the Public Good: A Statement of the American Lutheran Church” (1984). It also provides the following definition accepted here: “Gambling has been described as involving three elements: (a) *a valuable consideration*, mutually risked in the hope of (b) winning *a significant prize*, which is awarded (c) not primarily for skill or ability but largely by the *caprice of chance*” (p. 2).

<sup>6</sup> 1999 ELCA social statement on economic life, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” p. 12.

<sup>7</sup> “1992: Year of Remembrance, Repentance and Renewal,” a resolution adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, *1991 Reports and Records: Minutes* [CA91.5.28], pp. 472-473.

adopted under these sovereign powers threatens both these powers and this viable means to advance tribal economic and social development. ELCA documents do not address the specific issue of legal gaming sponsored by American Indian nations. There is need, therefore, to clarify the ELCA public policy position on sponsorship of legal gaming by American Indian tribes. This document addresses that specific matter and does not address personal decisions about gambling, which are considered by this church in other documents.<sup>8</sup>

### HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND CONTEMPORARY SITUATION

Prior to contact by European explorers, Indian tribes exercised full sovereignty over their political, economic, and spiritual affairs. Explorers, colonizers, and early settlers sometimes recognized native tribes as distinct nations, entering into treaties to claim the land and resources. The native population often was seen as part of the untamed landscape, to be “civilized” and subjugated under the principle of manifest destiny. As the U.S. emerged as a nation, its official policy toward Indian peoples evolved from one of defeat and destruction, to forced segregation on reservations, to assimilation into the dominant culture. Current federal policy recognizes, if imperfectly, a trust responsibility founded on the recognition of tribes as distinct nations whose historic sovereignty should be preserved and protected.

It is widely acknowledged that American Indians have suffered from the practices of the dominant European-American society in a history of considerable violence, injustice, and exclusion,<sup>9</sup> which has left a legacy of economic, social, and cultural marginalization. Since the 1970s, U.S. federal government policies have sought to strengthen tribal governments, reduce dependence upon federal government services, and encourage tribal self-sufficiency through economic development.<sup>10</sup> American Indians and Alaska Native peoples are active partners in addressing these circumstances, yet many continue to lag far behind the rest of the U.S. population on most measures of well-being, such as employment, income, education, housing, and health.<sup>11</sup>

Many tribes have embarked upon Indian gaming as an instrument of political and cultural self-determination in order to provide revenue for infrastructure, jobs, essential services, and a better standard of living. Some of these efforts have been successful while others have not, and not all tribes are able or desire to use gaming as an option for their economic development.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See, for instance, “Gambling and the Public Good.”

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, Alvin M. Josephy Jr., *500 Nations: An Illustrated History of North American Indians*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994; Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West*, Toronto, ON: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. and Bantam Books, 1971; George E. Tinker, *Spirit and Resistance: Political Theology and American Indian Liberation*, Minneapolis, MN.: Fortress Press, 2004.

<sup>10</sup> Steven Andrew Light and Kathryn R. L. Rand, *Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty: The Casino Compromise*, Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2005, pp. 33-34.

<sup>11</sup> Jonathan B. Taylor and Joseph P. Kalt, *American Indians on Reservations: A Databook of Socioeconomic Change between the 1990 and 2000 Census*, Cambridge, MA: The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, 2005.

<sup>12</sup> “A Vision of Partnership and Unity,” a resource published jointly by the ELCA, Presbyterian Church (USA), and the United Church of Christ, relates the perspectives of some American Indian Christian leaders and church staff, including this comment on Indian gaming: “It is a topic that is often controversial and much misunderstood. It has been treated, we believe, sensationally and unfairly in a number of prominent media articles. For factual information and Indian perspective one can turn to the National Indian Gaming Association (NIGA). The fact is that only a small number of tribes—near urban or tourist areas and with

### **Importance of Tribal Sovereignty**

Historic treaties, the U.S. Constitution,<sup>13</sup> federal legislation, and numerous court decisions recognize and define tribal sovereignty.<sup>14</sup> The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) explains sovereignty in this way:<sup>15</sup>

American Indians and Alaska Natives are members of sovereign tribal nations that have a unique legal and political relationship with the federal government. This relationship has a strong historical foundation, with roots in the treaty-based relationship between tribes and arriving European settlers, who recognized the inherent sovereignty of the tribes. This relationship has been recognized and reinforced by the United States Constitution, nation-to-nation treaties, federal statutes, case law, executive orders, and other administrative policies.

Just as the United States deals with states as governments, it also deals with Indian tribes as governments, not as special interest groups, racial minorities, individuals, or other non-governmental entities. Many state governments also have explicitly recognized the governmental status of Indian tribes through various state recognition processes and agreements.

The essence of tribal sovereignty is the ability to govern and to protect the health, safety, and welfare of tribal citizens within tribal territory. Tribal governments exercise these inherent rights just as any governmental entity would, determining citizenship, establishing civil and criminal laws for their reservation areas, taxing, licensing, regulating, and delivering services. Tribal governments, like state and local governments, are responsible for a broad range of governmental activities on tribal lands, including education, law enforcement, environmental protection, and the development and maintenance of basic infrastructure such as roads, bridges, sewers, public buildings, and solid waste treatment and disposal.

. . . Self-government is essential for tribal communities to continue to protect their unique cultures and identities, and in turn tribal cultures and traditions provide the foundation upon which Indian communities are governed.

### **About Sponsorship of Gaming by American Indian Tribes**

The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), passed by the U.S. Congress in 1988, provides a framework for tribal gaming. "IGRA grew out of a federally mandated political compromise between state and non-Indian gaming interests to control the spread of gambling, on the one hand, and tribal

---

good management—have prospered. Casinos and related enterprises are not an option for most tribes and are risky endeavors for many others. Some of the successful gaming operations have provided money for the development of their own communities. . . . Regardless of one's own views on gambling, we can appreciate Indian gaming as one tool for economic development. Used wisely and responsibly, it can provide a way and some models for meeting the economic needs of particular tribes and for serving the needs of the broader Indian and non-Indian communities" (pp. 34-35). This resource is available from Augsburg Fortress, Publishers: [www.augsburgfortress.org](http://www.augsburgfortress.org).

<sup>13</sup> In the "Indian Commerce Clause," Article I, Section 8, the U.S. Constitution delegates to the Congress the power "to regulate commerce . . . with the Indian Tribes" (Light and Rand, 2005, p. 27).

<sup>14</sup> An excellent discussion on tribal sovereignty is provided by David E. Wilkins and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*, Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> National Congress of American Indians, *An Introduction to Indian Nations in the United States*, Washington, D.C., 2004, p. 9.

and federal interests in promoting reservation economic development on the other.”<sup>16</sup> The IGRA legislates that gaming operations are regulated under the jurisdiction of a tribal government or gaming commission, as well as the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC) and several federal agencies.

The act differentiates three types of gaming.<sup>17</sup> Class II and III operations are subject to regulation by the NIGC, including the approval of management contracts. For Class III gaming, tribes must negotiate an agreement (or “compact”) with the state government. Casinos and other Class II and Class III gaming may be operated by tribes if not specifically prohibited in the state. The IGRA requires that all revenues from Indian gaming be designated for the benefit of the tribes.<sup>18</sup> Just like the revenues of federal and state governments, the revenues of tribal governments are not subject to taxation.<sup>19</sup>

Like a wide variety of legal forms of gambling, from commercial casinos to charitable bingo to state lotteries, tribal gaming has expanded markedly in recent years. Gambling of various types is now permitted in 48 states. Fully two-thirds of the tribes in 32 states in the contiguous U.S. operate some form of gaming. There is a wide diversity in the scope and earnings of these operations. About 6% of the 380 tribal gaming operations generate over 45% of the total revenues from Indian gaming.<sup>20</sup> Revenues from Indian gaming represent slightly more than one quarter of the total revenues from all gambling operations in the U.S., including commercial, state, and charitable gaming.<sup>21</sup>

While acknowledging this legal framework and rapid expansion of gambling within the U.S., it is essential to note that tribal gaming differs from other government-sponsored gaming in certain respects that are relevant to this issue. State governments have at their disposal a wide range of means for raising public revenue and tend to use gaming income to reduce general taxation. American Indian tribes, on the other hand, have far more limited sources of public funds.<sup>22</sup> The differences also include structural factors, such as the strictures placed on Indian reservation lands and resources held in trust by the federal government, and political factors, such as the lack of express representation in

---

<sup>16</sup> Light and Rand, 2005, p. 6.

<sup>17</sup> Class I: traditional and ceremonial games; Class II: bingo-type games; and Class III: slot machines and casinos.

<sup>18</sup> Regulations also permit the *per capita* distribution of profits to individual tribal members if all obligations have been fulfilled. Such general distribution requires the consent of the Secretary of the Interior of the U.S. government.

<sup>19</sup> Many tribes operating casinos share revenues with states in lieu of taxes. Employees of Indian casinos pay federal income taxes, and Indians living off reservations and non-Indian employees pay state taxes.

<sup>20</sup> About 2.5 million U.S. citizens claim American Indian or Alaska Native status. There are 560 federally recognized tribes, of which 335 are located in the lower American states. Around 230 of these tribes operate about 390 Class II or Class III gambling facilities. Prior to 1989 revenues from Indian gaming were about \$400,000. In 2006 revenues exceeded \$22 billion (National Indian Gaming Commission reports, [www.nigc.gov](http://www.nigc.gov)).

<sup>21</sup> The American Gaming Association Web site reports gross revenues from all types of gambling in 2005: card rooms \$1.12 billion; commercial casinos \$31.85 billion; lotteries \$22.89 billions; Indian casinos \$22.62 billion; legal bookmaking \$130.5 million; pari-mutual wagering \$3.68 billion; charitable games and bingo \$2.33 billion for a total of \$84.65 billion (figures rounded) [www.americangaming.org](http://www.americangaming.org).

<sup>22</sup> Current reports indicate that federal funding for the needs of American Indian people falls far short of essential support. See, for example, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, “A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country,” 2003.

Congress.<sup>23</sup> These limiting conditions have been heightened by the history of brutal oppression, enforced dependence, and broken promises that have undercut tribal culture and the normal means of economic development open to other forms of government.

#### **Concerns Surrounding Sponsorship of Gaming as a Form of Gambling<sup>24</sup>**

The rapid growth of Indian gaming operations since 1988 has been accompanied by controversies over the administration, economic benefits, and social impact of Indian gaming. Debate about the merits and effects of gambling occurs within tribes; between tribes; between tribes and local, state, and federal governments; and with public interest groups, such as community-based organizations and churches. Some of the concerns surrounding American Indian gaming include:

- The impact on tribal communities: these include the influence of gambling management companies on tribal self-governance, the fear that gaming enterprises will disrupt traditional Indian values and tribal community life, and the division caused when tribal members differ markedly in their views on gaming.
- The impact on local communities: concerns here include the effect of Indian gaming operations on the surrounding communities, such as increased traffic, congestion, and crime, and the competition of tribal enterprises with local community businesses.<sup>25</sup>
- The impact on the larger society: these include concerns about the economic and social costs of casinos of any kind<sup>26</sup> and the particular impact of gaming operations on those who suffer with problem or pathological gambling.<sup>27</sup> There is also the question of whether the burdens of gaming fall disproportionately on those with fewer financial resources.

While the non-economic effects of Indian gaming may be difficult to measure adequately, recent studies provide some information about the economic consequences of the activity. First, data offered by the National Indian Gaming Association (NIGA) point to the significant contributions of gaming

---

<sup>23</sup> Additional political differences are helpfully delineated in Light and Rand, 2005. Some of these include the fact that states have direct representation in Congress and explicit constitutional protection, while tribes are subject to the plenary power of Congress. Further, Indian tribes must negotiate with the states in which they reside and are thus limited by a state's policy, which can rule gaming illegal. The authors conclude: "In view of these advantages (of the states) . . . we believe that the only fair and level playing field, and the necessary foundation for government-to-government relations, is one that recognizes and respects tribal sovereignty" (p. 155).

<sup>24</sup> All the studies and reports mentioned throughout this section are subject to questions about methodological assumptions and the difficulty of measuring economic and social impact accurately.

<sup>25</sup> These effects are especially important where casinos are located close to neighboring communities or urban areas.

<sup>26</sup> Many studies seek to assess the social impact of gambling. Some studies are cited in the ELCA discussion resource, "Gambling: A Study for Congregations," Division for Church in Society, 1998. More recent estimates are also available. For instance, a University of Georgia study reports that casinos in general drain an average of at least \$97 per resident per year (reported by Mark Whitehouse in the *Wall Street Journal*, June 11, 2007). In his book, *Gambling American: Costs and Benefits* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004) economist Earl Grinols argues that there is a \$289 social cost for every \$46 of economic benefit from casinos.

<sup>27</sup> The National Council on Problem Gambling comments that "Problem gambling is an emotional problem that has financial consequences." Pathological gambling is "an uncontrollable obsession with gambling." "When gambling behavior interferes with finances, relationships and the workplace, a serious problem already exists." They report that two million persons, about one percent of the U.S. population, are pathological gamblers and an additional four to eight million or two to three percent are problem gamblers.

revenues to reservation infrastructure, employment, housing, schools, educational scholarships, health and recreational services, and environmental protection and conservation services. The NIGA also observes that the economic benefits derived from gaming enhance tribal self-government and strengthen the voice of American Indians in the public arena.<sup>28</sup>

Second, some independent research findings<sup>29</sup> conclude that the balance of economic impacts for tribes does seem favorable. One of these studies observes:

Overall, Indian gaming has provided the means to fulfill the various dimensions of tribal self-determination via effective self-governance, economic self-sufficiency, and cultural and spiritual vitality [and] represents a reversal of the negative effects of historically flawed federal Indian policy.<sup>30</sup>

Finally, there is some evidence,<sup>31</sup> though insufficient as a basis for policy, that sponsorship of gaming by Indian tribes provides economic benefits to surrounding communities.<sup>32</sup>

## MORAL AND ETHICAL REFLECTION

### ELCA Policy Precedents

A social policy resolution draws upon precedents of social statements and resolutions. A number of these are relevant to the question of Indian gaming.

- 1) The 1991 social statement “The Church in Society: A Lutheran Perspective” asserts that God works through the imperfect orders of society to promote justice in a broken world:

---

<sup>28</sup> National Indian Gaming Association, *The Economic Impact of Indian Gaming in 2006*. Washington, DC, [www.indiangaming.org](http://www.indiangaming.org). This report indicates \$25.7 billion gross revenues from Indian gaming and \$3.2 billion from related hospitality and entertainment services in 2005; 670,000 direct and indirect jobs were created; \$8.6 billion was paid in federal taxes and revenue savings; and \$2.4 billion in state taxes and revenue sharing; and more than \$100,000 million to local governments.

<sup>29</sup> An extensive Harvard study found that in the period from 1990 to 2000 the economic situation of American Indian tribes had improved at a more rapid rate than the general American population and that the greatest increase tended to be among tribes with gaming operations. Jonathan B. Taylor and Joseph P. Kalt, *American Indians on Reservations: A Databook of Socioeconomic Change between the 1990 and 2000 Census*, Cambridge, MA: The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, 2005.

<sup>30</sup> Kathryn R.L. Rand and Steven Andrew Light, *Indian Gaming Law and Policy*, Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 2006, p. 143.

<sup>31</sup> Jonathan B. Taylor, Matthew B. Krepps, and Patrick Wang, “The National Evidence on the Socioeconomic Impacts of American Indian Gaming on Non-Indian Communities,” Cambridge, MA: The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, 2000. This study included some measures of broad social impact (e.g., crime rates, bankruptcies).

<sup>32</sup> Conclusions about tribal gaming, both pro and con, are often inferred from studies of gambling in general or from localized studies in separate communities or states. Often standard measures are not used in these studies, nor are there controls for situational factors, which make comparisons between studies difficult or ambiguous. In 1996 the federal government commissioned a comprehensive study to examine gambling in general (National Gaming Impact Study Commission [NGISC], *Final Report*, 1999). Some researchers suggest that a similar comprehensive study, commissioned by the federal government and conducted by an independent, impartial body would provide clearer empirical evidence regarding the political, economic, social, and cultural benefits and the costs of Indian gaming for the tribes and for the general American society, research that could contribute to social policy development (Rand and Light, 2006, p. 153).

God works through the family, education, the economy, the state, and other structures necessary for life in the present age. God institutes governing authorities, for example, to serve the good of society. The church respects the God-given integrity and tasks of governing authorities and other worldly structures, while holding them accountable to God.

It also commits this church to:

. . . work with and on behalf of the poor, the powerless, and those who suffer, using its power and influence with political and economic decision-making bodies to develop and advocate policies that seek to advance justice, peace and the care of creation; mediate to achieve just and peaceful solutions to social conflicts.<sup>33</sup>

- 2) A resolution titled “1992: Year of Remembrance, Repentance and Renewal,” adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, speaks directly to tribal sovereignty:

To affirm the commitment of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to support the sovereignty of American Indian tribes, to speak out for just treatment of American Indians, and to promote harmony, reconciliation and mutual understanding within and among our communities.<sup>34</sup>

- 3) The 1993 social statement “Freed in Christ: Race, Ethnicity, and Culture” voices this church’s commitment to seek justice for all, to fight racism, and to advocate for policies that “seek to eliminate racial or ethnic discrimination.”<sup>35</sup> The statement also affirms:

The Church that pursues justice will face and address difficult social, political, and economic problems such as: how racism must be confronted in order to build a society where diversity is truly valued. . . . In its pursuit of justice, this church must question responses that are quick, easy, and, therefore, probably inadequate.<sup>36</sup>

- 4) The American Lutheran Church’s 1984 social statement “Gambling and the Public Good” articulates the ELCA’s underlying approach to gambling. While this document finds no biblical or theological grounds “for any absolute prohibition of gambling,” it articulates “serious questions and concerns” with respect to legalized gambling as a revenue source for states to reduce taxation. It is particularly concerned when legalized gambling functions as a regressive tax that is disproportionately carried by people living in poverty. It also raises concerns about the negative social and economic impact of gambling on individuals and communities, stating, “All of the factors pertaining to the well-being of individuals and the community should be carefully weighed in making responsible decisions.” It further counsels, “All people involved in gambling should carefully examine their own motivation for engaging in such activities and judge the quality of their stewardship as it applies to their use of their resources in gambling.” It stresses, further, that questions of personal and congregational stewardship are involved in decisions to participate in

---

<sup>33</sup> “The Church in Society: A Lutheran Perspective,” adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly [CA91.02.04], *1991 Reports and Records: Minutes*, pp. 3 and 7.

<sup>34</sup> “1992: Year of Remembrance, Repentance and Renewal,” a resolution adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly [CA91.5.28], *1991 Reports and Records: Minutes*, pp. 472-473.

<sup>35</sup> ELCA social statement “Freed in Christ: Race, Ethnicity, and Culture” (1993), pp. 2-3.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

- gambling activities.<sup>37</sup>
- 5) The ELCA's 1998 study "Gambling: A Study for Congregations" devotes a chapter to "Gambling on American Indian Reservations." The chapter describes the distinctive status of American Indian tribes as sovereign nations, their rights of self-determination, and their rights to conduct gaming operations that are not prohibited by state law.<sup>38</sup> The study sets forth the issue to be addressed: "On the one hand, American Indian gambling raises concerns that are no different from non-Indian gambling. . . . On the other hand, if any groups are justified in using gambling for economic development, it would be the Indian nations."<sup>39</sup>
  - 6) The 1999 ELCA social statement on economic life, "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All," calls for opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored gambling "because of how these regressive means of raising state revenues adversely affect those who are poor."<sup>40</sup> It also endorses "alternatives to gambling as a means of community economic development."<sup>41</sup> The statement encourages the church to "generously support organizations and community-based efforts that enable low-income people to obtain more sufficient, sustainable livelihoods. . . ."<sup>42</sup>

### Moral Tensions

ELCA policy raises continuing *concerns* about gambling in general, concerns that are directly related to the negative effects of gambling on individuals and communities. It *opposes* gambling operations sponsored by governments because such activity contradicts the responsibility of governing authorities to protect the well-being of their citizens and communities. The ELCA has never contested the legal power of governments to sponsor gambling, including that of tribal governments. For the reasons given above, however, this church has insisted that the negative effects of gambling, particularly on the vulnerable or those living in poverty, be weighed against positive benefits—even when revenue is used for social purposes.

This church believes that the best interests of society are not protected when governments seek to build revenues from activities that impose serious risk of individual and communal harm. These arguments have been founded on evidence showing gambling's regressive economic impact on those living in poverty and concern for overall economic harm to communities, injury to some individuals and their families, as well as the moral impact on the general social fabric.

On the other hand, as set forth above, American Indian tribal gaming is marked by several important characteristics that may distinguish this activity from other types of government-sponsored gambling. These features raise the question whether, given the specific historical, economic, social, and cultural contexts in which it takes place, gaming sponsorship by American Indian tribes may, in fact, contribute to the well-being of their communities. These aspects include:

- American Indian nations have limited powers of taxation and minimal access to economic resources. Gaming, then, may be one of the only viable means for some tribes to advance their

---

<sup>37</sup> "Gambling and the Public Good: A Statement of the American Lutheran Church," (1984), p.3.

<sup>38</sup> "Gambling: A Study for Congregations" (1998), pp. 26-27.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>40</sup> ELCA social statement "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All" (1999), p. 12.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.* p. 17.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

economic and social development. As indicated above, some research evidence suggests that gaming has advanced that development.

- Because of the history of brutal oppression, this church has a special obligation to Indian tribes that includes listening to the voices of American Indians when they claim that outright opposition to gaming at the present time would seriously undermine the responsibility of sovereign American Indian tribes to foster the well-being of their communities.

These conflicting features of Indian gaming present this church with clear tensions. This church has good reason to raise its voice against gambling sponsored by governing authorities and to emphasize its belief that tax reduction or economic development based on gambling has serious implications for *any* governing authority, whether for tribes or other forms of government. Nevertheless, the historical, legal, and economic factors related to the question of the sponsorship of gaming by American Indian tribes lead this church to reflect carefully about explicit opposition to this activity because of its potential possible contribution to tribal economic development and self-government.

Drawing upon these insights, the following four resolutions seek to affirm the historic and ongoing ethical concerns of this church related to gambling and the effects of gambling on individuals and communities while also recognizing the governing authority of American Indian tribes and their essential responsibilities to create viable economic opportunities and institutions for the sustainability and survival of their communities.

#### RESOLUTIONS

1. **This church reaffirms its ongoing moral and ethical concerns about gambling and its opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored gambling, particularly where gambling is targeted toward vulnerable groups and adversely impacts the lives of people, especially those living in poverty; it encourages institutions and individuals engaged in such activities to weigh carefully the consequences of these activities.**
2. **This church reaffirms its respect for the inherent sovereignty of American Indian tribes and Alaska Native peoples and its commitment to support American Indian self-determination, address racism, and promote social justice.**
3. **With regard to the sponsorship of legal gaming by American Indian tribes, and within the context of this church's continuing moral and ethical concerns about gambling, this church strongly encourages the exercise of social responsibility by all parties involved.**

These responsibilities include but are not limited to the following:

- a. That the federal government:
  - 1) Respect treaty obligations with Native Americans and in particular provide adequate resources to ensure the health, education, housing, employment, and other social needs of Indians;
  - 2) Strengthen actions to honor its trust responsibility to tribes and interact with tribes on a mutually respectful and appropriate government-to-government basis; and, furthermore,
  - 3) Allocate revenues from trust lands and investments to strengthen tribal self-determination, self-sufficiency, and cultural vitality.
- b. That states negotiate fair agreements in good faith with tribal governments regarding gaming operations, respect tribal sovereignty, and relate to tribes on an appropriate government-to-government basis.
- c. That this church, while it continues to have serious concerns about all forms of gambling, including Indian gaming, acknowledges the initiatives and achievements of American Indian tribes to promote the well-being of their members and urges those tribes that have decided

to sponsor gaming to:<sup>43</sup>

- 1) Assess the physical and social impacts both on their own communities and the communities adjacent to reservations when sponsoring gaming enterprises and work with these communities to alleviate negative impacts;
  - 2) Utilize revenues from gaming to fund diversified economic development and to explore development opportunities other than gaming;
  - 3) Share revenues from very profitable gaming operations with other tribes and American Indians or Alaska Natives not residing on reservations.
- d. That both state and tribal governments intensify effective preventative measures to reduce or eliminate problem and pathological gambling and provide adequate funding for gambling addiction counseling and treatment services.
  - e. That federal, state, and tribal governments exercise full disclosure, transparency, and accountability to their respective constituencies in their management of Indian gaming revenues.
4. **This church in all its expressions reaffirms the importance of building positive and supportive relationships with North American Indians and Alaska Natives and recommits itself to promoting dialogue and moral deliberation regarding Indian gaming and other American Indian concerns, and to intensifying advocacy with, and on behalf of, tribes.**

Toward that end this church:

- a. Reaffirms the resolution “1992: Year of Remembrance, Repentance and Renewal,” adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, and will ensure its public availability and use for social policy and advocacy.
- b. Will contribute tangibly to the health and welfare of American Indian and Alaska Native communities by promoting tribal self-sustainability and supporting the diversification of economic development approaches.
- c. Will foster understanding and reconciliation between Indian reservations and local communities and develop resources for congregations bordering reservations to be agents of dialogue and reconciliation.
- d. Will encourage synods to nurture positive relationships among American Indian tribes, state authorities, and congregations around issues of tribal gaming and other matters to strengthen American Indian communities.
- e. Will encourage the continuing study of American Indian concerns and urge respective churchwide units to promote wider use of the document “A Vision of Partnership and Unity: A Guide to Ministry with American Indian and Alaska Native People”<sup>44</sup> and the resource “Gambling: A Study for Congregations.”<sup>45</sup> Further, to request that the program unit for Multicultural Ministries, in consultation with the program unit for Church in Society, develop a brief resource that assists synods and congregations to understand the issues facing American Indian and Alaska Native people, including attention to the matter of gaming.
- f. Will encourage Lutheran social ministry organizations, congregations, and other institutions of this church to work with American Indian tribes to establish and strengthen gambling addiction counseling and treatment programs.

---

<sup>43</sup> It is recognized that many tribes that have sponsored gaming have adopted one or more of these measures. The intent of these recommendations is to encourage both new and continued measures of social responsibility that might enhance mutual accountability and beneficial outcomes.

<sup>44</sup> An ecumenical resource available from the Multicultural Ministries unit and available through Augsburg Fortress, Publishers.

<sup>45</sup> Produced by the Church in Society unit and available from Augsburg Fortress, Publishers.

- g. Will encourage those engaged in advocacy, such as this church's Washington Office and state public policy offices, to work with tribes to address issues that impact the lives of American Indian and Alaska Native people.

### **LUTHERAN MALARIA INITIATIVE**

(Agenda III.H.1.)

*Background:*

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has a unique opportunity to partner with Lutheran World Relief (LWR) and The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS) as part of the wider global effort to end malaria, a core element in the cycle of global poverty, through a pan-Lutheran effort in a similar timeframe. The ELCA, LCMS, and LWR are working together in an exploratory phase with the United Nations Foundation (UNF) to evaluate their capacities to mobilize the U.S. Lutheran community for this effort. Such an educational and fundraising effort would be funded through the UNF by a major donor with a multi-million dollar five-year grant. The ELCA, LCMS, and LWR are working on a campaign proposal that will be submitted to UNF by the end of November 2007. At this time no specific funding grant amount has been communicated.

In the summer of 2007, an initial feasibility study was conducted by Community Counseling Services (CCS) on behalf of LWR. CCS had recommended a realistic campaign goal of \$75 million over five years. An initial suggested breakdown of this goal was: LWR, \$30 million; ELCA, \$25 million; and LCMS, \$20 million. Money raised in this campaign would be channeled through:

1. Church or church-related entities, specifically LWR, as it builds its capacity to provide malaria-related services in Africa (particularly in West and East Africa); the ELCA, as it engages companion churches in all regions of Africa and within the wider context of the Lutheran World Federation; and LCMS, as it develops projects in eight African countries; and
2. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, a partnership among governments, civil society, the private sector, and affected communities.<sup>46</sup>

For the ELCA, the core case for support needs to articulate the Lutheran Malaria Initiative as a priority among priorities. From the beginning, this church's Lutheran Malaria Initiative efforts would flow out of the World Hunger program and the "Stand with Africa" campaign and integrate with other strategic priorities, including the HIV and AIDS strategy, which was mandated by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly.

The ELCA would engage companion churches in other countries, seeking their leadership and guidance as anti-malaria activities are developed in those countries and as the malaria initiative is interpreted in the United States. This would be done within the context of the ELCA's relationships in the Lutheran World Federation and its bilateral relationships with companion churches. Developing synergy with existing health-related and HIV and AIDS efforts will be a high priority.

At this time, the ELCA has given a "soft" commitment to raise \$20 million for malaria and \$10 million to support the HIV and AIDS strategy in the campaign time period (2009–2013). In addition, in 2008, the ELCA will conduct a feasibility study for a comprehensive churchwide campaign in conjunction with its 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2012. If approved, such a campaign would incorporate the Lutheran Malaria Initiative and the HIV and AIDS strategy into a larger effort. A positive recommendation to move forward with a comprehensive campaign would need approval by the 2009 Churchwide Assembly. With Church Council approval in April 2008, efforts to move forward with Lutheran Malaria Initiative prior to 2009 could be built into the World Hunger Appeal and "Stand with Africa" effort on a somewhat

---

<sup>46</sup> From the Global Fund's Web Site: "The Global Fund's purpose is to attract, manage and disburse resources to fight AIDS, TB and malaria. [The fund] does not implement programs directly, relying instead on the knowledge of local experts. As a financing mechanism, the Global Fund works closely with other multilateral and bilateral organizations involved in health and development issues to ensure that newly funded programs are coordinated with existing ones. In many cases, these partners participate in local Country Coordinating Mechanisms, providing important technical assistance during the development of proposals and implementation of programs."

smaller scale and roll over into the larger campaign at the appropriate time. Ideally, because it would be important to have a good sense of the ELCA's direction in its 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary campaign, the preference would be to delay public Lutheran Malaria Initiative campaigning until the first or second quarter of 2009.

At this time, the proposed timeline is:

December 2007	Decision from UNF
2008	Pre-campaign planning, coordination, leadership recruitment, ramp-up, possible pilots
2009	Introduce campaign, public launch, approval of comprehensive campaign (if recommended) at 2009 Churchwide Assembly
2010	Full campaign roll out

*Church Council Action:*

The Rev. Stephen P. Loy, chair of the Program and Services committee, read the proposed action and explained that it would permit churchwide staff to work on a proposal to the United Nations Fund.

**Moved;**

**Seconded:** 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 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; and

To authorize staff of the Development Services and Global Mission units to include in the World Hunger program's "Stand with Africa" campaign pilot efforts in anti-malaria fundraising, education, and international programing in 2008-2009 as proposals for action by the 2009 Churchwide Assembly on a possible churchwide appeal are developed during that period.

At the request of Vice President Carlos E. Peña, Ms. Cynthia J. Halverson, executive director of Development Services and president of the Foundation of the ELCA, reviewed the background of the proposed action. She explained that it would be a major fundraising effort, larger than any on a single issue attempted previously. She termed "exciting" the possibility of collaboration with Lutheran World Relief and The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod in engaging the U.S. Lutheran community in such a significant project.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson added that the United Nations Foundation had given Lutheran World Relief \$100,000 to do a preliminary feasibility study during the summer of 2007. He expressed confidence that with sufficient cooperation the \$75 million goal could be reached.

The Rev. Rafael Malpica-Padilla, executive director of Global Mission, commended the proposal as a good opportunity for this church to work with the Lutheran World Federation and its companion churches, consulting with and utilizing the response mechanisms of some of the larger ones, such as the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tanzania. If the project moves ahead, he said, the resources available for a few pilot projects would be identified. If those were successful, the African model could be implemented in Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia. In the process,

conversation would take place among the churchwide organization, the Conference of Bishops, Women of the ELCA, and synods about the possibilities for implementation of the project within the companion synod program.

Ms. Kathy J. Magnus, North America regional officer for the Lutheran World Federation, urged very careful consideration of the proposal, noting that this church had just committed at the 2007 Churchwide Assembly to a focus on HIV and AIDS. It would be important to be clear about how much this church can do and where resources will be focused.

Pr. Malpica-Padilla responded, saying that while the proposal from the United Nations Fund initially had been limited to a malaria initiative, it had been expanded to include HIV and AIDS, which also are part of what the global fund supports. This church was mindful, he commented, of its commitment to HIV and AIDS, and it did not desire to have competing initiatives. The point was to try to create synergy between the initiatives and to respond in a larger way than this church could by itself.

The Rev. John C. Richter wondered whether, if the initial action were approved, the council would have the opportunity in April 2008 to consider the project more thoroughly. Presiding Bishop Hanson replied that council members would have materials before the April meeting, including possible actions reflecting the work done between the council meetings. The Church Council, he added, had the right and responsibility to make hard decisions in April 2008, and it would have sufficient information to make those decision, he promised.

Ms. Halverson indicated that it would be helpful for the council to be clear about what kinds of decisions the Executive Committee had the authority to make, especially if the United Nations Foundation provided funds in the interim and desired the program to begin immediately. If final participation is dependent on the April meeting, that stipulation needs to be included in the application, she said.

Presiding Bishop Hanson asked Ms. Halverson to state the desired outcome. She answered that she understood the proposed action would give the Executive Committee the authority to receive money and move ahead with planning. The Church Council would provide final approval of the commitment in April. Ms. Halverson stated that 2008 would be a year of planning, awareness-building, and developing clarity of roles.

The Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger, referring to the first bullet point in the proposed action, asked whether the United Nations Foundation and the Global Fund to Combat AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria were the same entities. Pr. Malpica replied in the negative, explaining that the United Nations Foundation, if the grant proposal were successful, would provide initial funds in order to raise money, which would then be distributed, including a portion to the Global Fund.

Ms. Judith Anne Bunker commented that she did not understand the downside of the project. She wondered if this church would be responsible for paying out \$75 million if the funds were not raised in the time required. Ms. Halverson replied that this church would not be obligated to spend funds it had not raised. The proposed action, she continued, would allow the partner churches to move forward in faith and take the risk of attempting to raise funds. The proposal was for the ELCA to raise \$20–30 million over five years, which it should be able to accomplish, while maintaining its commitment to the World Hunger program. Presiding Bishop Hanson added that one possible problem the grant proposal represented was a conflict with the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding's recommendation that a major churchwide appeal be explored. It was important that this fundraising effort not preempt or undermine that potential appeal, he pointed out, so the proposal was being designed with this concern in mind. Ms. Halverson remarked that Lutheran World Relief had made clear that the ELCA needed to be a part of the proposed project for it to be successful. Should the ELCA decide not to participate, Lutheran World Relief most likely would go ahead with the proposal. That would cause other kinds of challenges to a major ELCA campaign, so her preference was to be a partner in the proposal.

The Rev. David P. Anderson commented that the proposal could energize and excite this church.

The Rev. Jeffrey "Jeff" B. Sorenson stated that if this church did something that was about others, evangelism and leadership would follow. He urged that the proposed project be considered as the major appeal.

Ms. William R. Lloyd Jr. noted that both the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee and the amount of the World Hunger Appeal required the approval of the Churchwide Assembly. He understood from the previous conversation that those who were apprehensive about the project should vote against its approval at the current meeting. He stated that he would be more confident about approval if more information were available, particularly about the need for this project rather than others. He expressed concern about carrying out the commitments of the Churchwide Assembly. Ms. Halverson responded that she did not expect the Church Council to make its final decision at the current

meeting. The proposed action was to give authority to the Executive Committee so that it could act as more information became available, she said. The project represented an opportunity both to receive money for ministry and to build a greater capacity for ministry.

Presiding Bishop Hanson recommended postponement of a vote on the matter until the next day. He desired to respond to Mr. Lloyd's concern more fully, and he wished council members to consider the proposal overnight.

Ms. Halverson indicated that the proposed action would channel the initiative through the "Stand with Africa" campaign initially. If the decision were made to seek a greater commitment, approval from the 2009 Churchwide Assembly would be sought.

Mr. Lloyd moved the following, which was subsequently seconded.

**Moved;**

**Seconded:** To postpone until the following day further consideration of the Lutheran Malaria Initiative proposal.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called for discussion of the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

**Moved;**

**Seconded**

**Carried:** To postpone until the following day further consideration of the Lutheran Malaria Initiative proposal.

Pr. Loy called attention to information about Corporate Social Responsibility, which was available in the exhibits, and a corresponding action that was part of the *en bloc* motion.

**UPDATE ON THE TASK FORCE FOR THE ELCA STUDIES ON SEXUALITY**  
(Agenda VI.G.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit K, Parts 2a–2b)

The Rev. Steven P. Loy, chair of the Program and Services Committee, reviewed key dates on the timeline for the Task Force for the ELCA Studies on Sexuality, particularly those that affected the Church Council.

Ms. Norma J. Hirsch, Church Council advisor to the Task Force for the ELCA Studies on Sexuality, commented that the members of the task force and the churchwide staff continued to be committed to the work. They were amazingly energetic and productive, she said. Some of them have been on the task force since the 2001 Churchwide Assembly, she noted. Ms. Hirsch informed the council that the task force had met with the Conference of Bishops in October 2007. She invited council members to hold the task force members in prayer. Ms. Hirsch emphasized that the task force anticipated developing three items: a social statement on human sexuality, implementing resolutions for the social statement, and a separate statement in response to the request of the 2007 Churchwide Assembly "that the task force specifically address and make recommendations to the 2009 Churchwide Assembly on changes to any policies that preclude practicing homosexual persons from the rosters of this church." Ms. Hirsch encouraged council members not to be anxious about the study and to be ready to discuss the draft of the social statement at its April 2008 meeting.

The Rev. Roger A. Willer, director for studies, highlighted several items from the written report. He reported that the deadline for response to the study was past; the final report concerning the responses would be received by the task force at its January 2008 meeting. A coordinator for hearings on the social statement had been hired; 35 hearings already were scheduled. The youth version of the study had been well received, he added; problems with the Web site were being addressed. Pr. Willer concluded by pointing out that as difficult as the study of sexuality has been, there have been collateral benefits. In particular, it has helped members of this church begin to talk about aspects of their lives and about sexuality in this culture that they had not been able to do previously. He asked for questions.

The Rev. H. Gerard Knoche, bishop of the Delaware–Maryland Synod, expressed concern that the draft of the social statement would be released right before Holy Week. Pr. Willer replied that the concern had been noted, but the timeline was complicated by the dates of Easter and the spring meeting of the Conference of Bishops. A release date after Easter would be too late for the earliest Synod Assemblies. Bishop Knoche proposed that the release come early in the week

after Easter.

The Rev. José Pablo Obregon pointed out that the deadline for youth response was not until December 15, 2007, and he urged council members to encourage youth to respond.

#### **UPDATE ON THE “BOOK OF FAITH” INITIATIVE**

(Agenda VI.G.2.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit O, Part 2)

The Rev. Steven P. Loy, chair of the Program and Services Committee, called attention to the Web site for the “Book of Faith” initiative.

The Rev. Mark N. Wilhelm, director for theology in daily life, summarized how those involved with the “Book of Faith” understood it and its importance. He stated the following:

1. “Book of Faith” is an initiative and not a prepackaged program. The focus is on challenging synods, congregations, and organizations to do their own planning to engage more deeply with Scripture and with Lutheran insights for interpreting Scripture. It also encourages development of a standing churchwide conversation about reading and studying the Bible, identifying and lifting up the efforts and resources in use, sharing ideas that work, and trying to increase dramatically the number of persons who “open Scripture and join the conversation.”
2. Widespread participation is being planned for and is expected. Response has been positive, and a goal of 75 percent of congregations participating has been set. In addition, a goal of training at least 5,000 rostered leaders and 10,000 non-rostered leaders in Bible teaching by 2012 has been established. It also is a goal to expand the circles involved in the development of the initiative.
3. “Book of Faith” is among the core work of the Vocation and Education unit, with regard to priorities and budget. Augsburg Fortress, Publishers, also has committed substantial resources to the project.
4. The initial focus will be promotion of the initiative through communication and marketing.
5. A core practice will be use of the Web.
6. “Book of Faith” is about a hope for renewal of this church. It will be a vehicle for this generation to renew its life and faith. It will make conversation about reading and studying Scripture a renewed hallmark of life together as the ELCA. It also will be an important aspect of the churchwide organization’s increased missional focus as a convener of leaders in this church, modeling engagement of members in ownership, leadership, and engagement in the initiative.

Mr. Richard L. Wahl commended the development of the Lutheran Study Bible, saying that it had been much needed for a long time. Pr. Wilhelm replied that the publishing house had put it on a fast track because of the “Book of Faith” initiative.

#### **UPDATE ON THE TASK FORCE FOR THE ELCA STUDIES ON SEXUALITY (CONTINUED)**

(Agenda VI.G.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit K, Parts 2a–2b)

Mr. Richard L. Wahl desired to re-open discussion about the time table for release of the draft of the social statement on sexuality. He expressed concern about the reassurance the council had received about the matter and announced his attention of offering a motion concerning the timeline.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña responded by asking whether the matter could be revisited on the following day. Mr. Wahl responded in the affirmative.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

At the request of Vice President Carlos E. Peña, Secretary David D. Swartling made a number of housekeeping announcements.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson asked the liaison bishops to contribute to the next day’s discussion about the timing of the release of the draft of the social statement on sexuality.

**CLOSING PRAYER**

Vice President Peña asked the Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger to close the session with prayer.

**RECESS**

The fourth plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council recessed at 5:30 P.M.

**Plenary Session V  
Sunday, November 11, 2007**

Prior to the fifth plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council, a service of Holy Communion was held in the chapel on the first floor of the Lutheran Center. The Rev. Mark S. Hanson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, presided. The Rev. Leonard H. Bolick, bishop of the North Carolina Synod, preached, and Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton, treasurer, served as assisting minister.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called to order the plenary session at 9:19 A.M. and reviewed the day's agenda. He announced that the wine used in the service of Holy Communion had been donated by Don and Vicky Carson in honor of Secretary David D. Swartling.

**REPORT OF THE TREASURER**

(Agenda II.A.4.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit A, Parts 4a–4d)

Ms. Christina Jackson-Skelton, treasurer of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, stated that she would do two things in her report: provide an update on financial results and walk through the summary report so that council members could become more familiar with the format. She explained that the fiscal year ran from February 1 to January 31, and she would be reviewing the report for the first eight months of the 2007 fiscal year.

The written summary, Treasurer Jackson-Skelton indicated, focused on current operating funds of the churchwide organization. For the period, \$51,084,000 had been received, and expenses had totaled \$51,376,000, which resulted in an operating deficit of \$292,000. She pointed out, however, that a seasonal deficit of \$4,735,000 had been anticipated, so the deficit was favorable to budget by \$4,443,000. Total revenue was under that received in the first eight months of 2006 by \$516,000 but was positive to plan by \$342,000. Treasurer Jackson-Skelton noted that expenses had increased by \$1,933,000 over those in 2006, but were still \$4,101,000 under plan.

Turning to the second page of the summary, Treasurer Jackson-Skelton called attention to the fact that mission-support income, which constituted about 80 percent of current operating revenue, had increased over 2006 by nearly \$423,000, or one percent, totaling \$40,847,131. The category was running close to plan, being favorable by \$73,366. She anticipated that mission-support income would be favorable to both the previous year and budget at the close of the fiscal year. As for other categories of income, Treasurer Jackson-Skelton commented that Vision for Mission had decreased by \$70,130 from the previous year and was \$94,888 under plan. Investment income was favorable to budget by \$806,608. The decline from the previous year had been anticipated as, for example, disaster funds were distributed. Bequest and trust income, which was difficult to predict, was down over \$650,000 compared to plan. Mission sponsorship was \$177,478 positive to plan.

Treasurer Jackson-Skelton focused next on expenses. Most units had underspent compared to allocation, she said, resulting in expenses at 92.61 percent of budget. That figure would get closer to 100 percent by the end of the fourth quarter, she stated.

Treasurer Jackson-Skelton reviewed the synodical remittances, pointing out that the last column tallied specific mission-support contributions, such as the World Hunger Appeal and Lutheran Disaster Relief. She highlighted the charts that depicted mission-support contributions by month from 2001–2007.

Treasurer Jackson-Skelton presented an overview of the statements of financial position, which were consolidated with the Foundation of the ELCA. She explained that the negative net assets of \$10,438,715 represented the unfunded post-retirement medical liability. It would be paid out over the next 30–35 years, but it must be reflected in the current statement. The obligation will be fully funded in 15 years and does not impact operations, but it needs to be accounted for, she said.

Finally, Treasurer Jackson-Skelton announced that the World Hunger Appeal was having a strong year. The budget had been set at \$18,750,000, an increase of almost \$2 million over 2006. Income was running positive to plan, much of it due to bequests and trusts.

---

## REPORT OF THE BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

(Agenda II.E.1.)

Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace, chair, presented the report of the Budget and Finance Committee.

### 2008 CURRENT FUND AND WORLD HUNGER SPENDING AUTHORIZATION

(Agenda III.C.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit F, Parts 2a–2b)

#### *Background:*

Current fund income is estimated to increase by \$325,650 to \$81,995,650 from the income proposal approved at the 2007 Churchwide Assembly. The largest budget increase is in mission-support income, with an expected increase of \$500,000 to \$66,600,000. This is an increase of \$300,000 from the revised 2007 fiscal year estimate and equals 98.7 percent of synod mission-support plans for the 64 synods from which plans have been received and 97.5 percent if level support from the outstanding synod is anticipated. Endowment distributions are based on a five-year rolling average of market value. The five years included for the 2008 estimates reflect the addition of a good year in market value and the subtraction of a down year, resulting in an estimated total increase of \$147,635.

Investment income is anticipated to decrease by \$214,000 as a result of lower levels of cash balances. The \$57,985 decrease in rental income is primarily due to adjusting the estimate of space in the Lutheran Center available for leasing. Other income generated by programs has been decreased by \$50,000, reflecting changes in the expectations and focus of those programs.

The proposed 2008 expenditure authorization includes the following major features and revisions to the 2008 budget submitted to the 2007 Churchwide Assembly:

As reported to the 2007 assembly, the expenditure authorization reflects the distribution to units of a compensation increase pool based on an average of three percent increases for approximately 522 full-time, part-time, and term staff, 185 missionary positions, and 170 mission developers supported either on the ELCA payroll or through grants, as well as increases in the cost of benefits, especially health care premiums. The earlier calculation of this expense was \$1,400,000. The final calculation of the expense, based on September 15, 2007, payroll records, is \$1,250,480. Likewise, the earlier calculation of the churchwide organization's 2008 depreciation expense was \$1,690,000. The final calculation, based on lower-than-projected reconfiguration costs, is \$1,650,000.

The 2008 expense proposal incorporates the distribution to units of the \$349,666 set aside in the budget proposal to fund expenses associated with the 2007 Churchwide Assembly-adopted report of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Mission Funding. These allocations include \$33,222 each to Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission, Vocation and Education, and Communication Services for convening groups on stewardship education and mission interpretation; \$150,000 to Research and Evaluation for an additional staff position and related expenses focused on the report's goals; and \$100,000 to Communication Services for staffing expanded mission interpretation.

The combination of lower-than-projected expenses in the compensation and depreciation areas and increased income projections for 2008 created an opportunity for revised allocations to units in several key areas. The revised proposal includes \$132,000 in increased funding to Vocation and Education for the "Book of Faith" initiative; \$360,000 in increased funding to Communication Services for the ELCA ad campaign based on the theme "God's Work. Our Hands"; and \$15,000 to the Office of the Presiding Bishop for a hospitality fund for global and ecumenical guests.

Anticipating an external consultation on ELCA financial services units (Mission Investment Fund, ELCA Foundation, Board of Pensions), \$62,500 is allocated in the General Treasury for one-quarter of the estimated cost of this consultation. The \$72,000 increased allocation to the Office of the Treasurer relates to rent increases in the ELCA's Washington, D.C., office, other Management Services' increases, and maintenance and support of the churchwide organization's new content management system. The remaining allocations in the revised budget are for compensation equity increases.

#### *Church Council Action:*

Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, introduced the changes in the 2008 spending authorization since its approval by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña opened the floor to discussion. There being no discussion, he called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.78 To approve an initial 2008 fiscal year current fund spending authorization of \$81,995,650; and  
To approve an initial 2008 fiscal year World Hunger spending authorization of \$19,250,000.**

**CAMPUS MINISTRY**  
(Agenda III.C.2.)

*Background:*

The 2007 Churchwide Assembly referred a resolution (Motion B) concerning funding for campus ministry to the Church Council for consideration. The resolution read: "RESOLVED, that the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America designate 10 percent or \$100,000, whichever is greater, of any budget surplus at the end of the 2007 fiscal year, to grants for campus ministries." The assembly voted: "To refer this motion to the Church Council for consideration as it deals with a possible budget surplus at the end of the 2007 fiscal year and assesses ministry needs relative to the strategic plan of this church."

This action would be similar to the 2005 distribution of extraordinary grants to ecumenical and institutional partners that totaled \$815,500. Campus ministries received \$94,500 at that time. Other recipients included the Lutheran World Federation, World Council of Churches, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Church World Service, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Lutheran Services in America, colleges and universities, seminary clusters, and a tithe of the total to fund the World Council of Churches Assembly youth stewards and Lutheran World Federation internships. This distribution was available, according to Bishop Hanson's letter that accompanied the grants, primarily due to "a significant reduction in the amount required to subsidize the post-retirement health care premiums for retired church workers with predecessor church body service."

In 2006, expected budget savings were approved for distribution through a process in which units identified unbudgeted funding needs and opportunities that matched the strategic initiatives of the churchwide organization. This process allowed the churchwide organization to react to both evolving ministry needs and its identified strategic goals.

As can be seen by the long list of grant recipients from the 2005 distribution, the ELCA has many partners that can benefit from additional grant support. Since it is the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of campus ministry, a special recognition of that ministry this year would be particularly appropriate.

*Church Council Action:*

Ms. Phyllis L. Wallace introduced the proposed action concerning additional funding for campus ministry. Copies were distributed.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña opened the floor to discussion.

The Rev. Stanley N. Olson, executive director of Vocation and Education, wondered how to interpret the proposed action. Secretary David D. Swartling said that he would not interpret it beyond the wording of the resolution. Ms. Wallace replied that she would not call it a priority but stated that the request needed to be given high regard. Treasurer Christina Jackson-Skelton responded that the request needed to be given intentional consideration among other requests.

Pr. Olson noted that the resolution had been referred to the Church Council without recommendation by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly. He commented that his unit desired additional funds for programs other than campus ministry.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson remarked that decisions about year-end spending had been a collaborative process in the past and would continue to be so.

The Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger indicated that during the Budget and Finance Committee meeting, Treasurer Jackson-Skelton had stated that campus ministry in past years had been a recipient of funds when positive variances had occurred. The action, therefore, had the weight of precedent behind it.

Presiding Bishop Hanson explained that it was important, when a positive balance for distribution occurred, not to fund recurring expenses, whether personnel or program, that would encumber future budgets. Campus ministry fit that profile.

Mr. Mark W. Myers inquired whether figures in the original resolution were binding. He received a negative response.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.79**        **To recommend to the Office of the Presiding Bishop that if in the review of potential 2007 current fund financial results, income is anticipated to exceed expenses, grants to ELCA campus ministries should receive particular consideration as a potential recipient of any distribution.**

Ms. Wallace called attention to the items from the Budget and Finance Committee that were included in the *en bloc* action: the recommendations of two persons to serve on the Audit Committee, the report of the Audit Committee, changes to the Audit Committee charter, revisions to the 2007 mission-support plans, and revisions to the 2008 mission-support plans. The committee also received reports on Development Services activities, mission-support consultations, Church Council designated funds, restructuring of the churchwide offices, expansion of the endowment fund pool investment options, the 2007 interim financial report, the 2007 revised income estimates, the 2007 revised unit allocations, post-retirement medical benefits obligations funding, Information Technology, Management Services, and investment and cash balances. The Budget and Finance Committee also had reviewed a draft charter and an accompanying calendar that laid out the responsibilities of the committee.

**REPORT OF THE PROGRAM AND SERVICES COMMITTEE (CONTINUED)**  
(Agenda II.E.5.)

**LUTHERAN MALARIA INITIATIVE (CONTINUED)**  
(Agenda III.H.1.)

The Rev. Steven P. Loy, chair of the Program and Services Committee, announced the a revised action was being distributed and read it.

**Moved;**

**Seconded:**        *To amend by addition, as follows:*

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 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; ~~and~~

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 to include in the World Hunger program's "Stand with Africa" campaign pilot efforts in anti-malaria fundraising, education, and international programming in 2008-2009 as proposals for action by the 2009 Churchwide Assembly on a possible churchwide appeal are developed during that period.

Secretary David D. Swartling explained the background of the amendment.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson stated that it was unusual for an item of this magnitude to be placed on the council agenda so late, but the proposed action was evolving, driven by possible sources of new funds and the conditions that those sources generate. The churchwide organization, particularly Development Services, Church in Society, and Global Mission, had been working hard to collaborate on the project both internally and externally, he said, but it had failed to communicate with Ms. Kathy J. Magnus, North America regional officer of the Lutheran World Federation. Rather, Lutheran World Relief had been conversing with the Lutheran World Federation. In addition, Presiding Bishop Hanson said, none of Lutheran World Federation's proposals for HIV and AIDS had been supported by the Global Fund this year, so a position that coordinated HIV and AIDS work had been lost. It was essential that the Church Council be fully engaged in any decision about the Lutheran Malaria Initiative. The amendment, he indicated, incorporated expressed council concerns and the desire for transparent, collaborative decision-making.

Vice President Carlos E. Peña reminded council members that only the amendment was on the floor and called for discussion.

Mr. William R. Lloyd Jr. commented that he was trying to understand what the Executive Committee would be approving and what the Church Council was supposed to address online. He stated that he expected that there would be a vote at the 2009 Churchwide Assembly on a fundraising appeal. Presiding Bishop Hanson responded that it was important to differentiate between the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Committee concerning a feasibility study about conducting a major appeal and the Lutheran Malaria Initiative, which could become part of that appeal. Ms. Halverson replied that the proposed action would provide authorization to the Executive Committee to receive money and participate in the Lutheran Malaria Initiative in an initial way at some level. What the action did not provide was a definitive response as to what degree this church would participate. Should the 2009 Churchwide Assembly approve a larger campaign, it might be possible to consider a larger commitment.

Mr. Lloyd asked what the council would be asked to decide at its April meeting. Ms. Halverson answered that it was hoped that at that time there would be greater clarity about the amount to be raised, the role this church would play as a partner, and the way the initiative would relate to other programs.

Mr. Lloyd clarified that approval of the recommended action would authorize the Executive Committee to commit the ELCA to do something, with the full extent to be determined later. Presiding Bishop Hanson stated that the proposed action authorized this church to receive funds and make the accompanying implied commitment. The plans for raising funds would be brought to the council. Any action sent to the Executive Committee also would be disseminated to the Church Council ahead of time for comment.

Ms. Halverson informed the council that this church was working on a plan with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod and Lutheran World Relief for fundraising and programming. The partners would be meeting late in November for further discussion.

Mr. Lloyd queried whether this church would be interested in the initiative if it were not for the money that was being offered. The Rev. Rebecca S. Larson, executive director of Church in Society, replied that this church indeed would be interested because a convergence of energy and effort was developing worldwide around malaria. The private sector, governments, faith-based organizations, and multi-lateral agencies are combining forces to eradicate malaria. Initiatives from various places are coming to faith-based organizations, particularly Methodists and Lutherans, because they have the commitment and international connections to carry out the initiatives. Faith-based organizations, Pr. Larson explained, are 60 percent of the health-care delivery system in developing countries, so a significant response to malaria, HIV, and AIDS cannot occur without the involvement of faith-based organizations. She acknowledged that not enough information was available at present, but expressed concern that April might be too late to accept the United

Nations Foundation's offer.

Ms. Ann C. Niedringhaus pointed out that the enabling structures were the World Hunger Appeal and "Stand with Africa," which was the reason that the initiative could go forward without Churchwide Assembly approval at the moment.

Vice President Peña reminded council members that the amendment was the subject of discussion, not the entire proposed action.

Pr. Loy summarized that input from the Church Council to the Executive Committee was essential.

The Rev. Phillip D. W. Krey, advisory member representing the seminaries, spoke in his capacity as secretary to the Lutheran World Relief board. He judged that the offer from the United Nations Foundation had come to this church and its partners because their excellence in ministry has been recognized and they are being challenged to do even more.

The Rev. John C. Richter pointed out that the amendment to the proposed action would help the Church Council be responsible for and take ownership of the decision.

Mr. Mark E. Johnson inquired whether the name of the foundation behind the United Nations Foundation was confidential. Ms. Halverson explained that it was confidential for the moment.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote on the amendment.

**Moved;**

**Seconded;**

**Carried:**

*To amend by addition, as follows:*

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 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; **and**

**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 to include in the World Hunger program's "Stand with Africa" campaign pilot efforts in anti-malaria fundraising, education, and international programming in 2008-2009 as proposals for action by the 2009 Churchwide Assembly on a possible churchwide appeal are developed during that period.

Vice President Peña opened discussion on the motion as amended.

Secretary David D. Swartling once again informed the Church Council that the use of the term "online meeting" was a misnomer. The Church Council listserv simply was a way of exchanging e-mail, not a meeting of the council.

Presiding Bishop Hanson added that anything said in discussion on the listserv would be publicly shared in Executive Committee meetings. He reiterated this church's commitment to transparency in decision-making.

Mr. Richard L. Wahl asked whether the council was beginning to designate priorities for an appeal that had not yet

been approved. Ms. Halverson answered that, following approval of the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee by the 2007 Churchwide Assembly, proposals from consultants for a feasibility study had been received, and a firm would be chosen in early 2008. The study would test malaria and HIV and AIDS as possible subjects of an appeal, among others. She hoped the study would provide information about how much money for what purposes could be raised.

There being no further discussion, Vice President Peña called for a vote on the motion as amended.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.80**

**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 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 listserve for input to the Executive Committee prior to any decision; and**

**To authorize staff of Development Services and Global Mission to include in the World Hunger program’s “Stand with Africa” campaign pilot efforts in anti-malaria fundraising, education, and international programming in 2008-2009 as proposals for action by the 2009 Churchwide Assembly on a possible churchwide appeal are developed during that period.**

**UPDATE ON THE TASK FORCE FOR ELCA SEXUALITY STUDIES (CONTINUED)**

(Agenda VI.G.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit K, Parts 2a–2b)

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called upon Mr. Richard L. Wahl, who had announced the previous day that he wished to offer a motion with regard to the time table for the release of the draft social statement on human sexuality.

Mr. Wahl indicated that he wished to continue the earlier discussion. He recalled that the presiding bishop had recommended that the council receive input from the liaison bishops on the matter. He also desired to hear from the Rev. Rebecca S. Larson, executive director of Church in Society, on the reason for releasing the draft just prior to Holy Week.

He acknowledged that one reason for the date was to allow sufficient lead time for the draft's consideration by early Synod Assemblies, but the Holy Week release date also presented difficulties.

Pr. Larson explained that the problem in choosing a release date arose from when Easter occurs in relationship to the spring meeting of the Conference of Bishops and to Synod Assemblies. The date had been chosen after considerable deliberation, she noted. An assumption was making leaders were aware of the draft helped them better handle concerns, anxiety, and disagreements. Key among those leaders was the Conference of Bishops, which would be meeting March 6–11, 2008. In addition, the draft would be released 24 hours in advance to rostered leaders and others, including seminary presidents, heads of social ministry organizations, ecumenical partners, and the Church Council. This practice had been followed successfully in 2005, she stated, so sufficient time for leaders to assimilate the document was important. On the other hand, since a number of Synod Assemblies were holding hearings on the document, it was important that synods receive the draft as soon as possible. The earliest 2008 Synod Assembly, she indicated, begins on April 5. Pr. Larson termed this church “very mature” about the process, informing the council that her unit had received only one objection to the timeline. While the task force wanted to be responsive to concerns, varying priorities needed to be balanced. Any change in the release date would have costs, she pointed out. Pr. Larson added that the draft would not contain implementing resolutions or a response to the action of the 2007 Churchwide Assembly. Those would be developed in 2009, after the text of the social statement was finalized.

The Rev. Peter Rogness, bishop of the Saint Paul Area Synod, remarked that conversation on the draft at the fall Conference of Bishops meeting had not identified any particular concerns about the timing of the release. Synodical bishops had been more concerned that they receive the draft as soon as possible so that they could be prepared to address the questions and concerns of others. In general, he reported, the Conference of Bishops was comfortable with the proposed schedule.

The Rev. Marie C. Jerge, bishop of the Upstate New York Synod, stated that she, at least, had not been aware that the release date would be just prior to Holy Week. The date was not an issue for bishops, she said, but parish pastors are so busy that they might see the release date as a hindrance.

The Rev. David P. Anderson called a release date of Monday of Holy Week “very distracting” for parish pastors. The Monday after Easter would be preferable.

Pr. Larson clarified that the draft would be released the Wednesday before Passion Sunday.

The Rev. Jonathan W. Linman commented that the release represented an opportunity to proclaim the Gospel and to say that death and resurrection of Christ, not sexuality, is what this church is about.

The Rev. José Pablo Obregon concurred, saying that Holy Week was a time to remind members that this church is about resurrection and grace and not sex.

Mr. Kai Swanson, chair of the Vocation and Education program committee, spoke against an embargo of the document because it might increase anxiety and decrease expectations of the Holy Spirit.

The Rev. Murray D. Finck, bishop of the Pacifica Synod, asked how Communication Services would be helping the media interpret the document, especially given its release date. Mr. John R. Brooks, director for the ELCA News Service, replied that a considerable amount of time had been spent in 2005 preparing for the release of recommendations of the sexuality task force and planning a communications strategy. He added that a committee has been meeting regularly to prepare for the release of the draft statement. He informed the council that the Communication Services staff had worked with journalists prior to release of the report in 2005, all of whom had cooperated with this church, so there was every reason to believe they would cooperate again.

Ms. Rebecca Jo Brakke remarked that perhaps the news media would have other things to highlight during Holy Week.

Vice President Peña thanked participants for the discussion.

## **REPORT OF THE BOARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Mr. Gary L. Wiperman, chair, presented the report of the Board Development Committee.

### **RACIAL JUSTICE MONITORING PILOT**

(Agenda III.B.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit D, Part 2)

*Background:*

At its April 2007 meeting the Church Council had received a report on anti-racism training. The meeting also included a session on anti-racism led by Ms. Shenandoah Gale, coordinator for anti-racism education, and four members of the Church Council: Ms. Judith Anne Bunker, Ms. Lynette M. Reitz, Ms. Judith Tutt-Starr, and Mr. Allan E. Thomas. One of the recommendations included in the report had concerned racial justice monitoring of council meetings. Following discussion, the Church Council voted [CC07.04.03]:

To assign to the Board Development Committee responsibility for continuing anti-racism training in relation to the Church Council;

To acknowledge that the Board Development Committee may appoint a subcommittee for assistance in addressing issues of anti-racism training; and

To affirm the possibility of engagement of a racial justice monitor or monitors at future meetings of the Church Council to provide observations on the process of deliberations of the council.

The Board Development Committee discussed the report and recommendations related to a racial justice monitoring pilot at its November 2007 meeting and brought a proposal to the Church Council.

*Church Council Action:*

Mr. Gary L. Wiperman introduced the proposed action and reminded council members that the pilot project for monitoring had been discussed previously by a number of groups and had received considerable input. He briefly described the use of process observers and emphasized that the process was only a pilot. Further use would depend on council members' evaluations. Mr. Wiperman stated that any necessary funds for the process would be provided by the Office of the Presiding Bishop.

There being no discussion, Vice President Carlos E. Peña called for the vote.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.81 To approve the "Proposal for Church Council Racial Justice Process Observation"; To delegate to the Board Development Committee the responsibility for implementing the racial justice process observation plan, beginning at the April 2008 meeting of the Church Council; and To request that the Board Development Committee continue to evaluate and report on the process, with a final proposal on the process to be brought to the Church Council no later than the April 2009 meeting.**

### **PRIMERS FOR THE 2007–2009 BIENNIUM**

(Agenda III.B.2.)

*Background:*

The Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America began a series of discussions in April 2002 that led to the appointment in November 2003 of a "board development working group" and a plan for board development, including an orientation manual, a biennial retreat, and primers during Church Council meetings. The series included discussion of Church Council leadership spheres (April 2002); discussion of Church Council responsibilities (November 2002); approval of a plan for board development for the 2003-2005 biennium (April 2004); and discussion of contacts with synods by Church Council members (November 2004).

Primers, which had been an occasional part of Church Council meetings, began as a formal board development activity in April 2004 with a presentation by former presiding bishop H. George Anderson on "Ecclesiology, Polity, and Structure: A Lutheran Perspective" and a primer on budget and financial management by Treasurer Christina Jackson-Skelton and Church Council member Ms. Linda Brown. Additional primers have included:

- April 2005: Church Council roles and responsibilities at the Churchwide Assembly

- November 2005: Orientation for new and continuing members; introduction of board orientation manual developed by the Board Development Task Force
- April 2006: Development of social statements: role and process
- July 2006: Retreat on “Sharing the Mind of Christ”
- November 2006: The role of the Church Council and its advisors
- April 2007:
  1. Church Council roles and responsibilities at the Churchwide Assembly
  2. Anti-racism education
- November 2007:
  1. Anti-racism education
  2. Church Council roles in response to the media

*Church Council Information:*

Mr. Gary L. Wipperman, chair of the Board Development Committee, called attention to the proposed topics for primers in the 2007–2009 biennium, which were the following:

- April 2008: Anti-racism training  
Bible study with anti-sexism focus  
Primer on development of social statements
- July 2008: Retreat with a working focus of “scandalous realities”
- November 2008: Unit updates  
“Book of Faith” Bible study on Acts
- April 2009: “Book of Faith” Bible study on Acts

**UPDATE ON COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY: REDEVELOPMENT OF ELCA.ORG.**  
(Agenda VI.G.3)

At the invitation of Vice President Carlos E. Peña, Ms. Kristi S. Bangert, executive director of Communication Services, presented a brief update on the redevelopment of the ELCA Web site and the advertising initiative “God’s Work. Our Hands.” She directed council members to the Web page [www.elca.org/love](http://www.elca.org/love) for additional information on the project, which had been tested in Denver.

Ms. Bangert explained that the goals of the advertising initiative, which featured the cross and told stories about this church in action, were to help this church talk about its identity and help members understand what it means to be church. In addition, it was hoped that members would begin to own and tell this church’s story, the story of what God is doing in it and through it for the sake of the world. If members can own and tell the story, they can engage in outreach and evangelism, she pointed out.

Ms. Bangert informed the council that, while formal evaluation results were not yet available, anecdotal evidence indicated that the ads had increased awareness of the ELCA and members’ pride in their church body. The next steps involved taking the project to another synod or region, she said, and her unit was working with synods and Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission to decide where to go next. The television component would debut the next week, and a Spanish-language version of the ad initiative would be ready in 2008.

Ms. Karin Lynn Graddy asked about radio ads. Ms. Bangert replied that television ads were being developed first because of the beautiful imagery of the ads and the impact of television. Ms. Graddy inquired whether the ads would be available locally as downloads. Ms. Bangert answered that eventually they would be, but only as part of a coordinated campaign involving congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization.

The Rev. Jeffrey “Jeff” B. Sorenson reported great interest in the initiative in his synod. Ms. Bangert advised him to work through his bishop to bring it to South Dakota.

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson commented that he saw a link between the ad initiative and the “Book of Faith” initiative.

Ms. Bangert emphasized the importance of sustaining the initiative. She turned to describing the redesign of the

ELCA Web site. She promised that it would be highly interactive, beautiful, and easy to navigate. It was being built with users in mind. A button to direct people to the Spanish-language version of the site would be active sometime in 2008.

Mr. Richard L. Wahl commended the redevelopment.

Ms. Bangert concluded by telling the council that the redevelopment had spanned 13 months and that members would receive a special preview of the site.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Secretary David D. Swartling made several routine announcements, and informed the Church Council that the total of the morning's offering was \$2,025.

Mr. Richard L. Wahl asked whether the schedule could be adjusted to allow for earlier elections in case people needed to leave. Vice President Carlos E. Peña responded that Mr. Wahl could move that change if he desired. Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson expressed his hope that no one would leave early because all actions on the agenda were important.

At the request of the chair, Mr. Bradley Dokken closed the plenary session with prayer.

### **RECESS**

The fifth plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council recessed at 10:59 A.M.

**Plenary Session VI**  
**Sunday, November 11, 2007**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña opened the sixth plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council at 11:13 A.M.

**BOARD DEVELOPMENT: ANTI-RACISM EDUCATION**

Ms. Shenandoah Gale, coordinator for anti-racism education, led an anti-racism workshop, “Denial and Resistance to Privilege Awareness and Change,” based on *Privilege, Power, and Difference*, second edition, by Allan G. Johnson.

**RECESS**

The sixth plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council recessed at 12:15 P.M.

**Plenary Session VII**  
**Sunday, November 11, 2007**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña opened the seventh plenary session of the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council at 1:04 P.M.

**EN BLOC APPROVAL OF CERTAIN ITEMS**

(Agenda IV)

*Background:*

The following *en bloc* resolution includes agenda items that were considered on the last day of the Church Council meeting. Inclusion of these items in the *en bloc* action reflects a judgment that these items are relatively non-controversial in nature and may not require plenary discussion and a separate vote. On the first day of the council meeting, the chair provides an opportunity for members to indicate whether they wish to discuss separately any of the items listed in the *en bloc* resolution; any such item would be removed from the *en bloc* resolution and discussed at the appropriate point in the agenda. The chair does not call for a discussion or separate vote on those items that are not removed from the *en bloc* resolution. The items remaining in the *en bloc* resolution normally are considered as the last item of council business.

*Church Council Action:*

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.82**            **To take action *en bloc* on the items listed below, the full texts of which are found in the body of the agenda or in the exhibit as noted:**

- |                   |   |                |
|-------------------|---|----------------|
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.83</b> | Responses to Synodical Resolutions Directed to the Church Council, p. 70;   |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.84</b> | Approval of Amendments to ELCA Pension and Other Benefits Program, p. 79;   |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.85</b> | Audit Committee Membership, p. 80;  |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.86</b> | Audit Committee Report, p. 80;  |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.87</b> | Revision of Audit Committee Charter, p. 81;                                 |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.88</b> | Approval of Revisions to Mission-Support Plans, p. 81;                      |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.89</b> | Approval of Synod Constitutions, p. 82;                                     |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.90</b> | Authorization of Signatories, p. 82;  |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.91</b> | Relationship with Independent Lutheran Organizations, p. 83;                |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.92</b> | Approval of Amendments to Seminary Governing Documents, p. 84;              |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.93</b> | Approval of Resolution Concerning Lutheran Medical Center, p. 84;           |                |
| <b>VOTED:</b>     |   | <i>EN BLOC</i> |
| <b>CC07.11.94</b> | Approval of Resolution Concerning <i>Lutheran Partners</i> Magazine, p. 85; |                |

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.95** Approval of Amendments to Corporate Social Responsibility Issue Papers and Social Criteria Investment Screens, p. 86;

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.96** Nominations, Appointments, and Elections, p. 87;

**1. RESPONSES TO SYNODICAL RESOLUTIONS DIRECTED TO THE CHURCH COUNCIL**  
(Agenda IV.A.1.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit B, Parts 1a–1b)

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.83** **To adopt *en bloc* the following responses to synodical resolutions submitted to the Church Council:**

**A.1. CHAPLAINCY, PASTORAL COUNSELING, AND CLINICAL PASTORAL EDUCATION**  
**Southwestern Washington Synod (1C)**

WHEREAS, the Lutheran church has historically been a pioneer and leader in the delivery of chaplaincy services, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education, dating from at least 1944 through the National Lutheran Council, the college chaplains of the American Protestant Hospital Association, the Lutheran Hospital Association, and the National Council of Churches Commission on Ministry in Institutions of Religion and Health; and

WHEREAS, in 1947 a conference of Lutheran professors of theology recommended that the National Lutheran Council explore possibilities of making adequate provision for the training of Lutheran institutional chaplains, and that it is recommended that each seminary of this church strengthen its own program with special courses and supervised field work; and

WHEREAS, in 1950 the Lutheran Advisory Council on Pastoral Care was formed and, in dialogue with the Lutheran theological professors, became the spokesperson for the Lutheran Church and the integrating agency for Lutheran clinical pastoral training; and

WHEREAS, in 1955 an agreement was reached between the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod relative to chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education; and

WHEREAS, in 1962 Henry Cassler became the secretary to the National Lutheran Council and in 1967 Walter Baepler became an associate director of the National Lutheran Council and in 1977 David Farley was added as an associate director upon the resignation of Henry Cassler; and

WHEREAS, the Commission for a New Lutheran Church at the formation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in 1988 recommended one staff person for the Office of Chaplaincy, Pastoral Counseling, Clinical Pastoral Education; and

WHEREAS, the Division for Ministry reduced this position to two-thirds and one-third candidacy in about 1994; and

WHEREAS, this staff position was further reduced to quarter-time consultant in 2003; and

WHEREAS, since from 1988 to 2005 there has been a reduction of rostered persons in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America serving in the field of chaplaincy, pastoral counseling and clinical pastoral education from 1000 to 690; a reduction of certified pastoral education training supervisors from 148 to 51 active supervisors; and a reduction from 429 rostered, endorsed, and certified persons serving in chaplaincy, pastoral counseling and clinical pastoral education in 1995 to 355 in 2005; and

WHEREAS, the seminaries of the ELCA require a unit (1600) hours of clinical pastoral education of students before graduation from seminary, and the dramatic decline in Lutheran clinical pastoral education supervisors limits opportunities for Lutheran seminary students to serve their clinical pastoral education within a Lutheran context; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Washington Synod Assembly direct the Southwestern Washington Synod Council to forward this resolution to the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for consideration and possible action to correct this departure from the rich historical tradition of Lutheran leadership in the field of chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education, and take action to rectify the dramatic decline of rostered persons called to serve in these missional ministries of the ELCA.

**A.2. CHAPLAINCY, PASTORAL COUNSELING, AND CLINICAL PASTORAL EDUCATION**  
**Southeastern Iowa Synod (5D)**

WHEREAS, the Lutheran Church historically has been a pioneer and leader in the delivery of chaplaincy services, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education, dating from at least 1944 through the National Lutheran Council, the College of Chaplains of the American Protestant Hospital Association, the Lutheran Hospital Association, and the National Council of Churches Commission on Ministry in Institutions of Religion and Health; and

**EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA  
CHURCH COUNCIL  
November 9-11, 2007**

**MINUTES, Page 70**

---

WHEREAS, in 1947 a conference of Lutheran professors of theology recommended that the National Lutheran Council explore possibilities of making adequate provision for the training of Lutheran institutional chaplains and recommended that each seminary of this church strengthen its own program with special courses and supervised field work; and

WHEREAS, in 1950 the Lutheran Advisory Council on Pastoral Care was formed and, in dialogue with the Lutheran theological professors, became the spokesperson for the Lutheran Church and the integrating agency for Lutheran clinical pastoral training; and

WHEREAS, in 1955 an agreement was reached between the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod relative to chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education; and

WHEREAS, in 1962 Henry Cassler became the secretary to the National Lutheran Council; in 1967 Walter Baepler became an associate director of the National Lutheran Council; and in 1977 David Farley was added as an associate director upon the resignation of Henry Cassler; and

WHEREAS, the Commission for a New Lutheran Church at the formation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in 1988 recommended one staff person for the Office of Chaplaincy, Pastoral Counseling, and Clinical Pastoral Education; and

WHEREAS, the Division for Ministry subsequently reduced this position to a two-thirds time position and further reduced it to a quarter-time consultant in 2003; and

WHEREAS, from 1988 to 2005 there has been a reduction of rostered persons in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America serving in the field of chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education from 1000 to 690; a reduction of certified pastoral education training supervisors from 148 to 51 active supervisors; and a reduction from 429 rostered, endorsed, and certified persons serving in chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education in 1995 to 355 in 2005; and

WHEREAS, the seminaries of the ELCA require one unit (400) hours of clinical pastoral education of students before graduation from seminary and 1600 hours of clinical pastoral education for endorsement for ministries in chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical education (formerly called specialized pastoral care), and the dramatic decline in Lutheran clinical pastoral education supervisors limits opportunities for Lutheran seminary students to serve their clinical pastoral education within a Lutheran context; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Iowa Synod request that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America take action to correct the departure from the rich historical tradition of Lutheran leadership in the field of chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education, reverse the neglect of the nurture of Lutheran chaplains, pastoral counselors, and clinical pastoral education supervisors, and take action to rectify the dramatic decline of rostered persons called to serve in these missional ministries of the ELCA; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Iowa 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; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Synod Council request that the Church Council report to the 2007 Southeastern Iowa Synod Assembly the actions taken and the progress made in this matter.

*Background provided to the 2007 Churchwide Assembly Memorials Committee by the Vocation and Education unit*

From 1988 through the reorganization of the churchwide organization in 2005, the former Division for Ministry was responsible for churchwide relationships with ministries of chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education (MCPCE). Since then, these relationships have been overseen through the Vocation and Education unit.

The 2003 Churchwide Assembly adopted the social statement "Caring for Health: Our Shared Endeavor." That statement includes attention to these areas of ministry, and one of the implementing resolutions requested a study of the "current trends and future needs for ministries in health-care chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, spiritual direction, and clinical education," and also a study of the "clinical and academic education needed for the future of these ministries." A report on this study was presented to the Vocation and Education program committee in March 2007. The bulk of the material from that report is incorporated here because it is current and addresses the concerns of the synodical memorials.

The Church Council at its November 2006 meeting considered similar resolutions and took the following action [CC06.11.57]:

To receive the resolutions of the Southwestern Washington Synod, the Southeastern Iowa Synod, and the Southeastern Synod related to chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education; and

To refer the resolution to the Vocation and Education unit with a request that a report and possible recommendations be brought to the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council.

The churchwide organization had engaged previously in careful consideration of this church's needs and

opportunities in MCPCCCE. In 2000 a “Strategic Plan for Specialized Pastoral Care and Clinical Education” was developed by a planning team. That plan restated the importance of health-care chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education in the ELCA and laid out an ambitious set of goals for these ministries and various expressions of this church. Not all goals of the plan were adopted by the unit’s board, nor have all been met. Nevertheless, they have guided the churchwide role into a focus on consultation with synod leadership and implementation of the ecclesiastical endorsement system for the ELCA.

The work of the churchwide organization related to MCPCCCE is overseen through the Vocation and Education unit’s leadership workgroup. MCPCCCE is part of the portfolio of the director for rostered and authorized ministries. A part-time consultant and nine regional consultants—who receive a small honorarium—do the bulk of the organizational and consultative work. It is the responsibility of each regional consultant to work with the synodical bishops so that there will be an active MCPCCCE liaison in each of the 65 synods. A Vocation and Education administrative assistant handles all the paper work for the ecclesiastical endorsement process. Twenty volunteers across this church serve as conveners for the endorsement panels that serve the process. Although Vocation and Education unit staff members and the program committee would be pleased to have more extensive staffing in this arena, they agree that present and projected financial realities make that impossible. More importantly, they agree that the present system is working well and that synods are the primary location for developing and supporting MCPCCCE leadership.

Through the Inter-Lutheran Coordinating Committee for Ministries in Chaplaincy, Pastoral Counseling, and Clinical Education (ILCC), the ELCA participates with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod in a process of ecclesiastical endorsement that determines an individual to be both a recognized (i.e., rostered) minister in good standing and one who has met the appropriate criteria for ecclesiastical endorsement for ministries in MCPCCCE. This endorsement, combined with an individual’s professional certification, helps establish criteria for persons to serve as qualified and certified health-care chaplains and pastoral counselors. There is a similar process for persons endorsed and certified to be clinical education supervisors. A summary of procedures for ecclesial endorsement is included in the ELCA Manual of Policies and Procedures for the Management of the Rosters. The full process is explained in the newly revised ILCC manual, “Ministries in Chaplaincy, Pastoral Counseling, and Clinical Education: Endorsement Standards and Procedures, Call Criteria, Program Guidelines.”

### **Current Trends and Future Needs**

There continues to be an obvious need for qualified persons to serve as health-care chaplains. The emphasis within the health-care industry for higher standards in health-care delivery, including chaplaincy programs, amplifies the importance of the systems that provide for ecclesiastical endorsement and for professional certification. There has been some decline in the number of ELCA ordained or consecrated rostered ministers with ecclesiastical endorsement serving in the ministries of chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical education. In 1995 there were a total of 429 rostered persons with ecclesiastical endorsement and professional certification serving in health-care chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical education; in 2006 the number had declined to 366 persons. Age profiles of those presently serving suggest that the decline in numbers may continue. One area of particular concern is the decline in the number of Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) programs available and the decline in the number of ELCA chaplains certified to lead such programs. On the other hand, in 2006, twenty-six rostered leaders received endorsement for ministries in chaplaincy, pastoral care and clinical education. That is an addition of seven percent to those serving in the prior year, suggesting that there is strong, growing interest in these ministries, despite some declines in prior years.

Demographic trends and changes in health care in this country likely will create a need to increase the number of qualified and professionally trained pastoral care providers, though perhaps in different service configurations and with new skills. The decline in the number of rostered persons in the ELCA who serve in these ministries should be reversed if the ELCA is to continue to have its traditional proportional and leadership representation in the field. Lutheran health and social service institutions are part of one of the largest ministry networks in this country. Many of the available and needed positions are in ELCA institutions, but ELCA ministers also serve in other private and in public institutions.

Seminaries and synods can play important roles in communicating the need for qualified people to serve in those ministries and in facilitating preparation and support. The establishment of the roster of ELCA diaconal ministers in 1995 and the continuation of the ELCA Deaconess Community are areas of potential growth, as these two lay rosters

focus on service ministries, often at the edges of the institutional church. Some associates in ministry also prepare for and serve in these roles. Along with these ministries of Word and Service, there continues to be a need for ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament in MCPCCE roles. Both the Master of Arts degree and the Master of Divinity degree offered by ELCA seminaries can provide the appropriate academic background for people preparing to serve in MCPCCE ministries. The additional requirements for clinical education and supervised fieldwork enable an individual to seek ecclesiastical endorsement and professional certification.

Those exploring or beginning candidacy for ordained or consecrated ministries—as well as those already serving in rostered ministry—can be invited to consider serving in a ministry in health-care chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, or clinical education. Students in ELCA seminaries are eligible for a variety of general financial assistance. It would be useful if additional funding sources were developed to make possible the specialized learning required for many MCPCCE ministries, notably additional training and clinical supervision. The Vocation and Education unit currently provides very limited scholarship assistance for qualified ELCA candidates and also shares in an inter-Lutheran scholarship fund that was established to provide financial assistance to qualified people from both the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod.

#### **MCPCCE and the Vocation and Education program unit**

As indicated above, good structures are in place for supporting, encouraging, and monitoring needs and opportunities for ministry in chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education. Through staff members and the regional and synodical representatives, the Vocation and Education program unit will continue to lift up the importance of having an ample cadre of qualified people both to serve as endorsed and certified health-care chaplains, pastoral counselors, and clinical educators and to facilitate the endorsement and support processes. These ministers provide pastoral care for people at critical life and death junctures and are trained to provide the theological and spiritual dimensions in health care and to demonstrate God's gracious and healing presence in life, as described in the "biblical and theological perspectives" section of "Caring for Health: Our Shared Endeavor."

The Vocation and Education unit has systematized the way in which new bishops and synod staff members are made aware of the ELCA's commitment to and processes for MCPCCE. The unit also is more regularly convening its nine regional MCPCCE representatives for planning to address needs identified in the various studies and reports. The focus is on support to synods, seminaries, and the various networks engaged in this work. This group facilitates and monitors ecclesiastical endorsements by the ELCA. The Vocation and Education unit will continue to cooperate through the Inter-Lutheran Coordinating Committee for these.

With sustained support from the churchwide organization, primary responsibility for ministries in chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education will continue to be in synods. In the synods, staff and other leaders can be more directly aware of those serving or having the potential to serve in these ministries and can actively recruit, offer preparation, and facilitate support. In collaboration with synods and their candidacy committees, and with clinical education programs, seminaries will continue to play a critical role in invitation and preparation.

#### *2007 Churchwide Assembly Action*

The 2007 Churchwide Assembly voted [07.06.33p]:

To receive the memorials of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod, Northwestern Ohio Synod, North Carolina Synod, Minneapolis Area Synod, and Metropolitan Chicago Synod concerning the ministries of chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education (MCPCCE);

To commend and thank those who currently serve in ministries of chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education;

To encourage other rostered leaders and candidates for rostered ministry to consider and to prepare for such ministries;

To thank ELCA synods and seminaries for their facilitation of ministries and ministers in chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education, and to encourage the synods and seminaries of this church to recruit actively and collaboratively for such service and to offer continuing and expanded support and preparation opportunities, including scholarship aid;

To affirm the Vocation and Education unit staff, its consultants, and the regional and synodical MCPCCE representatives for their work in these arenas and for their focused and ongoing planning; to encourage the unit's continued advocacy for chaplaincy, pastoral care, and clinical education ministries;

To acknowledge the action on this subject taken by the Church Council at its November 2006 meeting [CC06.11.57]:

To receive the resolutions of the Southwestern Washington Synod, the Southeastern Iowa Synod, and the Southeastern Synod related to chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and clinical pastoral education; and

To refer the resolution to the Vocation and Education unit with a request that a report and possible recommendations be brought to the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council; and

To refer the memorials to the Vocation and Education unit as additional information as it prepares its report for the November 2007 meeting of the Church Council.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.83a**

**To thank the Southwestern Washington and the Southeastern Iowa Synods for bringing attention to the issue of chaplaincy, pastoral counseling, and pastoral care; and  
To acknowledge the action of the 2007 Churchwide Assembly [CA07.06.33p] as the response of the Church Council to these resolutions; and  
To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.**

**B. CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

**South Dakota Synod (3C)**

WHEREAS, Jesus instructs us that ministry to those in prison is ministry to him (Matthew 25:31-46), and as faithful disciples we desire to model charity and justice toward those who commit crimes, as well as to offer care and support for those who suffer the effects of crime; and

WHEREAS, the United States now incarcerates over 2.2 million of its citizens, giving it the highest *per capita* rate of people in prison of any nation in the world with an incarceration rate of 726 per 100,000\*; and

WHEREAS, funding appropriations for prisons has grown, diverting funds from other state programs such as education and human services; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 2006 South Dakota Synod Assembly encourage its congregations to promote education on prison issues, to pray for ministries to those in prison and for those who work and serve in the prison systems, and to advocate for sufficient funding for alternatives to incarceration, for prevention services for children and families, and for aftercare of inmates; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 2006 South Dakota Synod Assembly ask the Church in Society unit to consider and recommend the best ways for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to promote education on prison issues, to pray for ministries to those in prison and for those who work and serve in the prison systems, and to advocate for sufficient funding for alternatives to incarceration, for prevention services for children and families, and for aftercare of inmates; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 2006 South Dakota Synod Assembly direct the South Dakota Synod Council to forward this resolution to the Executive Committee of the Church Council for proper referral and disposition under the bylaws and continuing resolutions of this church.

*\*Source of information: American Correctional Association*

*Background Information:*

The 2007 Churchwide Assembly received memorials from the Rocky Mountain Synod, South Dakota Synod, and La Crosse Area Synod concerning criminal justice and calling for a social statement on the topic. The assembly voted [CA07.02.09]:

To thank the Rocky Mountain Synod, South Dakota Synod and La Crosse Area Synod for their concern for this important social issue that affects those incarcerated, their families, and the broader society;

To direct the Church in Society unit to develop a social statement on criminal justice, in accordance with "Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns" (2006), for possible consideration at the 2013 Churchwide Assembly.

It is anticipated that the proposed social statement will address the issues raised in the resolution from the South Dakota Synod.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.83b**

**To thank the South Dakota Synod for bringing attention to the issue of criminal justice and urging people to pray for prisoners, prison systems, and for those who work in prison systems;  
To acknowledge the action of the 2007 Churchwide Assembly calling for the Church in Society unit to develop a social statement on criminal justice as the response of the Church Council to this resolution;  
To refer the resolution to the task force for the criminal justice social statement; and  
To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.**

**C. IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PENSION DISABILITY PLAN**

**Northern Great Lakes Synod (5G)**

WHEREAS, congregations of the Northern Great Lakes Synod and congregations of all the synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America make a monthly contribution to the Board of Pensions for the disability benefit program; and

WHEREAS, each congregation with clergy under call expects to receive certain financial benefits for their person(s) under call and for relief of other financial obligations for health insurance benefits and pension benefits when a medical disability would occur; and

WHEREAS, the current language of the plan reads that this benefit shall not apply to any person who has reached the full benefit retirement age as defined by Social Security; and

WHEREAS, the Northern Great Lakes Synod has clergy under call who have exceeded the full retirement age as defined by Social Security and other synods also have clergy under call who have reached this same benchmark in their life passage; indeed, there were 392 pastors under call in this church who, because they have exceeded the Social Security full retirement age, are not under this benefit even as their congregations are paying for it; and

WHEREAS, the clergy shortage within this church will only increase the number of pastors who are over 65 years of age and still serving under call; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Northern Great Lakes Synod meeting in assembly hereby memorializes the 2007 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to require the Board of Pensions to amend the disability benefit program for this church to provide to those workers of this church under call who have passed full benefit retirement age a temporary total disability benefit equal to the current benefit, but not to exceed a predetermined time limit, such as six months from the onset of the disability.

*Response of the ELCA Board of Pensions*

The Northern Great Lakes Synod has brought attention to the need for disability benefits for the increasing number of pastors who are working beyond Social Security's normal retirement age. In addition the synod has pointed out an inconsistency between the ELCA Disability Plan's benefit provisions and the related contributions billed to congregations and other sponsoring employers.

The ELCA Disability Benefits Plan provides for benefits to be paid until "expected retirement ages," or earlier recovery or death. Currently the plan defines "expected retirement age" as the member's Social Security normal retirement age, which ranges from age 66 to 67, depending on the member's year of birth.

The ELCA Board of Pensions has taken action to address the needs identified by the Northern Great Lakes Synod. If approved by the trustees of the ELCA Board of Pensions at its meeting on August 5, 2007, effective January 1, 2008, the ELCA Disability Benefits Plan will no longer exclude those who are working beyond Social Security normal retirement age. Instead it will provide that all sponsored members are eligible for disability benefits regardless of age, subject to the following maximum period of payment:

Age at Disability	Maximum period of payment
Less than 63	To Social Security normal retirement age
63	To Social Security normal retirement age, but not less than 36 months
64	To Social Security normal retirement age, but not less than 30 months
65	24 months
66	21 months
67	18 months
68	15 months
69 and over	12 months

The plan's benefits will remain the same for all who become disabled, regardless of the age at disability. Those benefits include replacement of 2/3 of the member's pre-disability income plus continuation of health, survivor and retirement plan contributions.

With regard to contributions, congregations will continue to be billed for those working beyond Social Security normal retirement age. With the change in benefit provisions, there will no longer be an inconsistency between the plan's benefit provisions and the related contributions.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

CC07.11.83c

**To thank the Northern Great Lakes Synod for raising up the need to revise the ELCA Disability Plan benefit provisions to better meet the needs of pastors who are serving beyond Social Security normal retirement age and the congregations that sponsor those pastors; and To acknowledge and support the benefit changes being implemented by the ELCA Board of Pensions to address those needs; and To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.**

**D. CHANGE THE POLICY OF THE MISSION INVESTMENT FUND**

**Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod (4F)**

*Note: This resolution was conceived as a memorial by the synod. The Memorials Committee requested and the 2007 Churchwide Assembly voted that it be considered by the Executive Committee of the Church Council as a resolution.*

WHEREAS, congregations directly affected by natural or human-made disasters need to minister to the suffering people in their communities without becoming overly preoccupied with their own financial needs and economic viability; and

WHEREAS, some secular financial institutions, such as banks and credit card companies, graciously have deferred, postponed, and even canceled payments for some disaster customers; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Mission Investment Fund of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) be encouraged to work in collaboration with synods to assist ELCA congregations impacted by natural disaster. This assistance could include, but not be limited to, appropriate modifications, such as a moratorium on loan or rental payments or a reduction in an outstanding loan balance; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod, meeting in assembly, direct the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast 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.

The Executive Committee voted [EC07.10.28f]:

To receive the resolution of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Synod requesting a change in the policy of the Mission Investment Fund;

To refer the resolution to the Office of the Presiding Bishop in consultation with the Church in Society unit and ELCA Disaster Response with the request that the report on the consultation on disaster response anticipated at the November 2007 meeting of the ELCA Church Council address the issues raised by the synod; and

To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.

*Response from the Mission Investment Fund*

The Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod has asked that the Mission Investment Fund of the ELCA “be encouraged to work in collaboration with synods to assist ELCA congregations impacted by natural disaster.” The Mission Investment Fund (MIF) both appreciates the importance of partnership of congregations with synods in working to respond to the complex construction and financial issues that often develop as a result of natural disasters and welcomes the opportunity to provide experience and resources where possible to support congregations. When a disaster occurs, the Mission Investment Fund will:

1. Be in contact with the synods and assist as appropriate in assessing damage, advising on property matters, and consulting on financial issues in order to determine some possible steps to assist the congregation.
2. Consult collaboratively with synods in response to any suggestions and requests for special assistance from the MIF.
3. Maintain regular communications throughout the period of recovery, focusing on the best way to be good stewards of the resources entrusted to MIF, while also supporting the mission and ministry of the synod and the ELCA.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.83d**

**To request that the information provided by the Mission Investment Fund of the ELCA be the response of the Church Council to the resolution of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod related to the suspension of transactions; and**

**To request that the secretary of this church inform the synod of this action.**

**E.1. CLERGY FOR DISASTER AREAS**

**Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod (4F)**

*Note: This resolution was conceived as a memorial by the synod. The Memorials Committee requested and the 2007 Churchwide Assembly voted that it be considered by the Executive Committee of the Church Council as a resolution.*

WHEREAS, in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the financial, emotional, and spiritual burdens on congregations afflicted by disaster have increased enormously; and

WHEREAS, a number of congregations in the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod have been unable to call pastoral staff to lead them because of the uncertainty of their circumstances in the wake of the hurricanes; and

WHEREAS, the finances of some disaster-stricken congregations have been so devastated that they are unable to compensate adequately their pastors so that they can continue to live in the communities where they have been called to serve; and

WHEREAS, the pastoral staffs of other congregations have been taxed severely as a result of their responsibility not merely to lead their own congregations but to assist in the support and rebuilding of other congregations destroyed–or placed at risk–by the hurricanes and their aftermath; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for an intentional commitment on the part of this church to provide additional ordained leadership in times of crisis in order to assist those churches in need of pastoral staff and to provide relief to those pastors who have struggled without respite since these disasters; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that:

1. the presiding bishop promptly undertake to identify and create a list of retired rostered clergy and chaplains who are willing to serve in disaster-stricken areas as intentional interim pastoral staff for those congregations that need pastors or to provide respite and relief to existing pastoral staff in disaster-stricken communities and congregations that need additional help; and
2. the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America provide resources sufficient to fund the amounts necessary to pay interim and permanent pastoral staff salaries (if local congregations lack the means to do so) in order to permit

rostered clergy and chaplains to return to the service of this church in disaster-stricken areas; and be it further RESOLVED, that the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod Assembly direct the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod Council to forward this resolution for proper referral and disposition under the bylaws and continuing resolutions of this church.

## **E.2. DISASTER RESPONSE**

### **Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod (4F)**

*Note: This resolution was submitted as a memorial by the synod. The Memorials Committee requested and the 2007 Churchwide Assembly voted that it be considered by the Executive Committee of the Church Council as a resolution.*

WHEREAS, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita taught many valuable lessons to be learned about disaster response; and

WHEREAS, the faith communities of the Gulf Coast areas, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and the world responded with great generosity and love; and

WHEREAS, the presence of local pastors and congregations became beacons of hope and visible signs of Christ; and

WHEREAS, the local congregations and their church facilities should be spiritual centers in the relief response and long-term recovery efforts as well as a public witness to the core values of Lutheran communities; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran Disaster Response does not allocate money for the financial support of pastors and staff, rebuilding of church buildings, or congregational ministries devastated by a disaster; and

WHEREAS, the gap of coverage for churches and their staff impacted by a disaster is one of the lessons from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita as well as after other disasters which have hit this country; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod, meeting in assembly, requests that the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America develop a clear, immediate, and effective response plan to assist local pastors and congregations in disaster areas; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod Assembly direct the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast 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.

## **E.3. CHANGE THE POLICY OF LUTHERAN DISASTER RESPONSE**

### **Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod (4F)**

*Note: This resolution was conceived as a memorial by the synod. The Memorials Committee requested and the 2007 Churchwide Assembly voted that it be considered by the Executive Committee of the Church Council as a resolution.*

WHEREAS, the current policy and practice of Lutheran Disaster Response (LDR) does not allow money contributed to LDR to be used for the rebuilding of churches devastated by disaster; and

WHEREAS, that policy forces local congregations to hustle and scramble in search of alternate financial assistance for their rebuilding; and

WHEREAS, many contributors to LDR naturally assume that their donations also will be used for the rebuilding of Lutheran churches; and

WHEREAS, current policy and practice often lead pastors and congregations to be preoccupied with finding the financial resources to rebuild their structures, diverting time, effort, and money away from the other ministries of the congregations; and

WHEREAS, the current policy and practice has caused bewilderment, outrage, and resentment among members of devastated churches and has caused a public relations blunder for LDR in recently ravaged areas; and

WHEREAS, it is the local congregation that provides hope, compassion, and physical help to its community and therefore needs immediate support following a disaster; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the practice and policy of the Lutheran Disaster Response immediately be changed in order to free up both current and future donations to Lutheran Disaster Response for use in the rebuilding of church facilities affected by disaster; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod Assembly direct the Texas–Louisiana Gulf Coast 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.

**VOTED:**

**CC07.11.83e**

*EN BLOC*

**To acknowledge the report of the ELCA Disaster Response Consultation and the action of**

the Church Council as the response of the Church Council to the resolutions of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod related to clergy for disaster areas, the policy of Lutheran Disaster Response, and this church's disaster response;

To request that the report and the action of the Church Council be transmitted as information to the synod; and

To anticipate additional response by the Church Council at its November 2008 meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS TO THE ELCA PENSION AND OTHER BENEFITS PROGRAM**  
(Agenda IV.B.)

The Board of Trustees of the Board of Pensions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America met August 2-4, 2007, and November 2-4, 2007, in Minneapolis, Minn. The following plan amendments, approved by the Board of Trustees at that time, are recommended to the Church Council for adoption.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.84** To approve *en bloc* the following amendments to the ELCA pension and other benefits plan:

**A. AMENDMENT TO THE ELCA MEDICAL AND DENTAL BENEFITS PLAN: PERSONAL WELLNESS ACCOUNT**  
(Agenda IV.B.1.a.)

Article XX was established as a component of the ELCA Medical and Dental Benefits Plan, and describes the legal nature of the account, as well as terms of eligibility, participation rules, benefit amount, etc.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.84a** To adopt the addition of Article XX to the ELCA Medical and Dental Benefits Plan.

**B. AMENDMENTS TO THE ELCA DISABILITY BENEFITS PLAN: MONTHLY DISABILITY BENEFITS**  
(Agenda IV.B.2.a.)

Section 5.07c. (*Pre-existing Conditions*), Section 7.04 (*Continuation of Disability Coverage for Certain Interim Pastors who are Between Assignments*), and Section 8.05 (*Coverage Continuation Member*) provide for the continuation of disability coverage for interim pastors under call by their Synod Council when they are between assignments. It further recognizes the continued coverage when a new assignment begins and a called interim pastor is once again sponsored in the ELCA Pension and Other Benefits Program.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.84b** To adopt amendments to Section 5.07c of Article V, Section 7.04 of Article VII, and Section 8.05 of Article VIII of the ELCA Disability Benefits Plan.

**C. AMENDMENTS TO THE ELCA DISABILITY BENEFITS PLAN: MONTHLY DISABILITY BENEFITS**  
(Agenda IV.B.2.a.)

Section 5.08 (*Cessation of Disability Benefits*) was amended to provide disability benefits for sponsored members beyond their Social Security full retirement age.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.84c** To adopt amendment to Section 5.08 of Article V of the ELCA Disability Benefits Plan.

**D. AMENDMENT TO THE ELCA SURVIVOR BENEFITS PLAN: ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES**  
(Agenda IV.B.3.)

Section 3.08 (*Pre-existing Conditions*) was amended to provide for consistent treatment of members with continued coverage under the ELCA Disability Benefits Plan and those with continued coverage under the ELCA Medical and Dental Benefits Plan.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.84d**      **To adopt amendment to Section 3.08 of Article III of the ELCA Survivor Benefits Plan.**

**E. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ELCA FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN**  
(Agenda IV.B.4.)

This new plan document creates a plan-wide Flexible Spending Account (FSA), which members can use to pay eligible out-of-pocket medical and dependent care expenses on a pre-tax basis.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.84e**      **To adopt the establishment of the ELCA Flexible Benefits Plan.**

**3. AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**  
(Agenda IV.C.1.a.)

The membership of the Audit Committee is defined by ELCA continuing resolution 14.41.E02. The Audit Committee is composed of six members. A minimum of two members should be members of the Church Council's Budget and Finance Committee. Members are appointed by the Budget and Finance Committee and their names are forwarded to the Church Council for approval. Budget and Finance Committee members are appointed for two-year terms with the possibility of reappointment throughout their Church Council term. Non-Church Council members are appointed for two-year terms, renewable for two additional terms. Terms are staggered to provide for continuity in committee membership from year to year.

Members of the Audit Committee and current term end dates are the following: Pr. John C. Richter (April 2009); Ms. Ann F. Niedringhaus (August 2009); Mr. John F. Timmer (August 2008); and Mr. Timothy L. Stephan (August 2009). Ms. Michele Harbeck Haley had resigned from the committee. A vacancy for an additional Church Council member also existed. Biographical information had been reviewed by the Budget and Finance Committee and was available on the resource table.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.85**      **To elect Mr. Philip W. Bertram to the Audit Committee for a two-year term beginning April 2008; and**  
                    **To elect Ms. Deborah Chenoweth to the Audit Committee for a two-year term beginning April 2008.**

**4. APPROVAL OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT**  
(Agenda IV.C.1.b.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit F, Part 6)

At its June 2007 meeting, the Audit Committee reviewed the audited financial statements for the year ended January 31, 2007.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.86**      **To receive and approve the report of the Church Council Audit Committee describing the review of the audited financial statements, management letter, and response of management for the fiscal year ended January 31, 2007.**

**5. REVISION OF AUDIT COMMITTEE CHARTER**  
(Agenda IV.C.1.c.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit F, Part 7)

The revised charter for the Audit Committee reflects the duty of considering internal audit's fraud risk assessment.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.87**      **To approve the proposed amendments to the Audit Committee Charter.**

**6. RESPONSES TO MISSION-SUPPORT PLANS**  
(Agenda IV.C.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit F, Part 4)

The Church Council has responsibility for reviewing and approving or withholding approval for synods regarding mission support plans. Revisions in synod plans following the April 2007 meeting of the Church Council were forwarded for action to the August 5, 2007, meeting of the Church Council Executive Committee and are recorded in the minutes of that meeting.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.88**      **To approve the following responses to mission-support plans:**

**A. REVISIONS TO 2007 MISSION-SUPPORT PLANS**  
(Agenda IV.C.2.a.)

Since the August 2007 Executive Committee meeting, revisions to 2007 mission-support plans have been received from one synod.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.88a**      **To affirm with sincere appreciation the increase in the percentage for the sharing of 2007 mission support contributions by congregations for synodical and churchwide ministries of the following synod: Pacifica Synod.**

**B. REVISIONS TO 2008 MISSION-SUPPORT PLANS**  
(Agenda IV.C.2.b.)

Since the August 2007 Executive Committee meeting revisions for 2008 mission-support plans have been received from three synods. No mission-support plan has been received from the Upstate New York Synod.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.88b**      **To affirm with sincere appreciation the increases in the percentage for the sharing of 2008 mission-support contributions by congregations for synodical and churchwide ministries of the following synod: Pacifica Synod;**  
                         **To affirm the revised 2008 mission-support dollar estimates for the sharing of mission support contributions by congregations for synodical and churchwide ministries of the following synod: Northwestern Ohio Synod; and**  
                         **To acknowledge the percentage change in mission-support resulting from revised estimates of congregational mission-support for the following synod: Southern Ohio Synod.**

**7. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS TO SYNOD CONSTITUTIONS**  
(Agenda IV.E.1.)

Provision 10.12. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* stipulates: "Each synod shall have a constitution, which shall become effective upon ratification by the Church Council. Amendments thereto shall be subject to like ratification . . ."

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.89**      **To ratify amendments to the constitutions of the following:**

- (1) Grand Canyon Synod (2D), provision S9.04.;
- (2) Eastern North Dakota Synod (3B), provision S9.04.;
- (3) Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod (4D), provision S7.23.;
- (4) South-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5K), provisions S8.24., S9.03., and S11.05.; and
- (5) Upstate New York Synod (7D), provision S7.27.

## 8. AUTHORIZATION OF SIGNATORIES

(Agenda IV.E.2.)

In April 1990, the Church Council adopted a resolution [CC90.4.31] authorizing signatures by assistant vice presidents and assistant secretaries for the execution of documents on behalf of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:

WHEREAS, the Minnesota nonprofit corporation act authorizes the board of directors of a corporation organized thereunder to designate two or more directors to form a committee that shall have authority to act for and on behalf of the board of directors; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that any two of the Bishop (President), Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer are hereby appointed as a committee having the authority of the Church Council in the management of the business or fiscal affairs of this corporation to authorize and approve, on behalf of this corporation, transactions to which it is a party; and be it further

RESOLVED, that any one of the Bishop (President), Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer or in the absence of all of the foregoing, any two of the assistant vice presidents may execute, and the Secretary or any assistant secretary may attest, any document required or desirable in connection with a commercial or fiscal transaction to which this corporation is a party, including but not limited to conveyances, assignments, mortgages, contracts, notes, leases, bills of sale, and financing statements.

Personnel changes necessitated action to update that resolution.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.90**

WHEREAS, in the opinion of legal counsel (Faegre & Benson of Minneapolis), the Minnesota Nonprofit Corporation Act authorizes the Church Council as the board of directors of this corporation to appoint additional officers; and

WHEREAS, this corporation previously has authorized execution of various documents, when necessary, by two assistant vice presidents in the absence of the bishop, vice president, secretary, and treasurer [CC90.4.31]; and

WHEREAS, this corporation previously has appointed various persons to be assistant vice presidents and assistant secretaries of this corporation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the previous appointments of assistant vice presidents and assistant secretaries of this corporation [CC90.4.32, CC92.11.103, CC96.11.61b, CC03.11.85] be and are hereby rescinded; and be it further

RESOLVED, for the sole purpose of executing documents, as specified in CC90.4.31, that the following be and are hereby appointed as assistant vice presidents of this corporation: M. Wyvetta Bullock, Kathie Bender Schwich, and Myrna J. Sheie; and be it further

RESOLVED, for the sole purpose of executing documents, as specified in CC90.4.31, that the following be and are hereby appointed as assistant secretaries of this corporation: Ruth E. Hamilton, Phillip H. Harris, Mary Beth Nowak, Paul A. Schreck, and David A. Ullrich.

## 9. APPROVAL OF RELATIONSHIPS WITH INDEPENDENT LUTHERAN ORGANIZATIONS

(Agenda IV.E.3.)

At its April 2006 meeting, the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America voted [CC06.04.27] to approve a revised "Policy on Relationships of Churchwide Units with Independent Lutheran Organizations." The revision was made necessary by changes in structure, governance, and the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*.

VOTED:

EN BLOC

**CC07.11.91 To approve the following relationships with independent Lutheran organizations:**

### A. LUTHERAN OUTDOOR MINISTRIES

(Agenda IV.E.3.a.)

In accord with the revised policy, the Rev. Stanley N. Olson, executive director of the Vocation and Education unit, recommended the establishment of a relationship with Lutheran Outdoor Ministries.

VOTED:

EN BLOC

**CC07.11.91a To acknowledge, in accord with bylaw 14.21.16. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* and the "Policy on Relationships of Churchwide Units with Independent Lutheran Organizations," Lutheran Outdoor Ministries, which will relate to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through the Vocation and Education unit of the churchwide organization.**

### B. FRIENDS OF MWANGAZA

(Agenda IV.E.3.b.)

In accord with the revised policy, the Rev. Rafael Malpica-Padilla, executive director of the Global Mission unit, recommended the establishment of a relationship with the Friends of Mwangaza.

VOTED:

EN BLOC

**CC07.11.91b To acknowledge, in accord with bylaw 14.21.16. of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* and the "Policy on Relationships of Churchwide Units with Independent Lutheran Organizations," Friends of Mwangaza, which will relate to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through the Global Mission unit of the churchwide organization.**

## 10. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS TO SEMINARY GOVERNING DOCUMENTS

(Agenda IV.E.4.)

Bylaw 8.31.01. provides both for the independent incorporation of ELCA seminaries and for a churchwide role in the approval of their governing documents: "Each seminary shall be a seminary of this church, shall be incorporated, and shall be governed by its board of directors consistent with policies established by the Church Council. Amendments to the governing documents of each seminary and each seminary cluster shall be submitted, upon recommendation of the appropriate unit of the churchwide organization, to the Church Council for approval."

This process of approval is accomplished by the following steps:

1. The appropriate seminary president notifies the director for theological education that the seminary board has taken action to amend its governing documents.
2. The director for theological education consults with the president on the content and intent of the amendment(s).
3. The director for theological education consults with the executive director of Vocation and Education and ELCA legal counsel.

4. The executive director of Vocation and Education and the director for theological education recommend appropriate amendments to the Church Council at its next meeting.
5. The Office of the Secretary notifies the seminary president and the executive director of Vocation and Education of the action taken by the Church Council on the recommendation.
6. The amendment(s) become(s) effective upon approval of the Church Council.

Due to the length of the amended constitution, complete copies of the text with amendments indicated were provided only to members of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee. One complete copy also was available for review by Church Council members at the materials distribution table.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.92 To approve the amended bylaws of Luther Seminary, Saint Paul, Minn.**

## **11. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION CONCERNING LUTHERAN MEDICAL CENTER (Agenda IV.E.5.)**

Lutheran Medical Center is an affiliated social ministry organization incorporated under the New York Not-For-Profit Corporation Law, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is the sole voting member of the corporation. Lutheran Medical Center's (LMC) board is proposing two changes in the composition of the board's membership:

- Article V, Section 1.b.: changing from 51 percent members of Lutheran congregations to "At least 25 percent of the membership of the Board of Trustees shall be members of a congregation of a Lutheran church . . . with the understanding that the nominations committee and the board shall make all reasonable efforts to maintain the Lutheran percentage as close to 50 percent as feasible. . . ."
- Article V, Section 1.b., adding: "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 . . . ."

The first change is explained in the final sentence of Section 1. b.: "recognizing the need to also reflect the diversity of the community on the board . . . ." The service area of LMC is composed of at least five major ethnic communities with an even wider religious diversity, representing a considerable shift from the origins of the institution 124 years ago as a Norwegian Lutheran hospital founded by a Lutheran deaconess to serve a Norwegian Lutheran community. The local and state governmental entities, which reimburse a large share of the costs of health care provided by LMC, require that the governance reflect more completely the communities being served. This change respects the institution's Lutheran ties and commits the board nominating committee to be diligent in continuing to identify members of Lutheran congregations for service on the board. In addition, the provision of a permanent *ex officio* seat for the bishop of the Metropolitan New York Synod adds weight to the Lutheran presence on the board, which up to the present encouraged representation from the bishop's office but did not secure a permanent seat for the bishop.

The action below and the exhibit to which it refers were reviewed by the general counsel of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The exhibit was available for review at the resource table.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.93 WHEREAS, Lutheran Medical Center (LMC), a New York not for profit corporation, is an affiliated social ministry organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA); and**

**WHEREAS, the ELCA is the sole voting member of the LMC corporation and the ELCA has the authority to amend the LMC constitution; and**

**WHEREAS, LMC, by action of its board of trustees, has requested that its constitution be amended as indicated in Exhibit A attached hereto, primarily in order to reduce the percentage of Lutheran board members to no less than 25 per cent; and**

WHEREAS, under its certificate of incorporation, Lutheran Medical Center must obtain authorization of the ELCA for any constitutional amendments; and

WHEREAS, LMC has therefore requested that the ELCA formally adopt amendments to the LMC Constitution as indicated in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, by action of its board of trustees, LMC has adopted additional amendments to its bylaws in order to guarantee and enhance the participation of Lutherans, the ELCA, and of the Metropolitan New York Synod in the governance of LMC as indicated in Exhibit A attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, these amendments to the LMC Constitution allows LMC to remain an affiliated social ministry organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Church Council, on behalf of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, hereby authorizes and adopts the amendments to the constitution of Lutheran Medical Center specified in Exhibit A hereto; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the Church Council, on behalf of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, hereby approves the amendments to the bylaws of Lutheran Medical Center as adopted in Exhibit A hereto.

## **12. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION CONCERNING *LUTHERAN PARTNERS* MAGAZINE** (Agenda IV.E.6.)

In 2007 the U.S. Postal Service increased mailing costs for all mailing classes. In the case of *Lutheran Partners* magazine, mailing costs increased by 36 percent, from approximately \$5,100 to \$7,100 per issue. To reduce these charges, the editor of *Lutheran Partners* has been working with the U.S. Postal Service to apply for rights to use the periodical mailing class, formerly second-class mail. In the past, officials familiar with the postal service did not believe that *Lutheran Partners*, as a non-subscription magazine, could qualify for the periodical mailing class. (Currently *Lutheran Partners* is mailed using standard class, formerly known as third-class mail.) Postal service officials, however, are now recommending that *Lutheran Partners* apply for the periodical class under "Requester" criteria. If the application is accepted on this basis, *Lutheran Partners* will save approximately \$1,000 per issue, or \$6,000 per year. To receive this desired mailing classification, *Lutheran Partners* must demonstrate that it is a magazine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, published for its rostered leaders. A resolution adopted by the Church Council is one way of demonstrating the required relationship.

### **VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.94**

**To acknowledge and affirm that *Lutheran Partners* is a magazine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA); and**

**To acknowledge and affirm that each rostered leader of the ELCA—pastors, associates in ministry, deaconesses, and diaconal ministers—both active and retired, will receive one free copy of *Lutheran Partners* magazine for each published issue by virtue of their rostered status in the ELCA.**

## **13. APPROVAL OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ISSUE PAPERS AND SCREENING CRITERIA** (Agenda IV.G.1.)

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has a long history of working for justice through corporate social responsibility. The Corporate Social Responsibility Program (CSR) of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) is mandated by the ELCA constitution:

**14.21.14.** The Church Council, acting through the designated churchwide unit, shall have responsibility for the corporate social responsibility of this church and shall have the

authority to file shareholder resolutions and cast proxy ballots thereon 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.

- 16.12.D06.** 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. To fulfill these responsibilities, this program unit shall: . . .
- i. give expression to this church's concern for corporate social responsibility, both in its internal affairs and its interaction in the broader society. To do so, this program unit will:
    - 1) exercise, at the direction of the Church Council, the rights of this church as a corporate shareholder on issues of social concern 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 proxy ballots on stocks held by those units;
    - 2) facilitate the formation of an Advisory Committee on Corporate Social Responsibility that will include representatives from the Board of Pensions, the Church Council, and other units of this church and that will give counsel and advice to all appropriate units of this church on corporate social responsibility; and
    - 3) work with national ecumenical groups on issues of corporate responsibility.

At its November 2003 meeting, the Church Council voted [CC03.11.68]:

To approve the revised governance process for Corporate Social Responsibility in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, with the request that:

1. The ELCA Church Council, upon recommendation of the board for the Division for Church in Society:
  - a. review and recommend prioritized focus issues for the attention of this church in Corporate Social Responsibility; and
  - b. recommend a policy framework for each focus issue that will identify and delimit the scope within which resolutions may be filed;
2. The executive director of the Division for Church in Society, within the policy framework, approve individual Corporate Social Responsibility resolutions for filing; and
3. Regular reports be made to the board of the Division for Church in Society, the Conference of Bishops, the ELCA Church Council, and the trustees of the Board of Pensions regarding resolutions that have been filed ; and

To approve the following five issue papers and to anticipate additional issue papers as they are developed:

1. Caring for Creation: Global Warming and Climate Change
2. Caring for Creation: Environmental Topics
3. Caring for Health: International Access to Pharmaceuticals
4. Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All: Sustainability
5. Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All: Domestic Access to Capital.

The Advisory Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility (ACCSR) provided to the Church Council an overview of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Roles and Responsibilities and a report on its activities over the last year. In accordance with the roles and responsibilities, a number of items were provided for Church Council approval.

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.95**      **To approve the following Corporate Social Responsibility matters:**

**A. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ISSUE PAPERS**  
(Agenda IV.G.1.a.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit K, Part 3 and Parts 3a-j)

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.95a**      **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:**

- **Caring for Creation: Environmental Topics**
- **Caring for Creation: Global Warming and Climate Change**
- **Caring for Health: International Access to Pharmaceuticals**
- **Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All: Domestic Access to Capital.**

**B. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY SOCIAL CRITERIA INVESTMENT SCREENS**  
(Agenda IV.G.1.b.)

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.95b**      **To approve the amendments updating the wording of the following Corporate Social Responsibility social criteria investment screens, but to request that the wording of the original investment screens be archived for historical and research purposes:**

- **Alcohol Social Criteria Screen**
- **Environmental Social Criteria Screen**
- **Pornography Social Criteria Screen**
- **Tobacco Social Criteria Screen**
- **Military Weapons Social Criteria Screen.**

**14. NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND ELECTIONS**  
(Agenda IV.1.1)

**VOTED:** *EN BLOC*  
**CC07.11.96**      **To elect the following:**

**A. ELECTIONS TO BOARDS OF ELCA SEMINARIES**  
(Agenda IV.1.1.a.)

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

1. The appropriate seminary president notifies the director for theological education of an upcoming board vacancy and the term of that board position (as specified in the seminary's governing documents).

2. The director for theological education contacts the seminary president in order to consult on filling the vacancy and, with the concurrence of the executive director of Vocation and Education, reaches an agreement on a single nomination.
3. The director for theological education submits that nomination in a letter also signed by the executive director to the secretary of the ELCA for inclusion in the agenda of the Church Council. This letter will include a brief candidate *vita* and a summary of the gifts this person brings to this service.
4. The Church Council is asked to ratify the nomination at its next meeting.
5. The Office of the Secretary notifies the seminary president of the action taken on the nomination, sending a copy to the director for theological education for the unit's records.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.96a**

**To elect Ms. Emma Graeber Porter as an at-large member of the board of directors of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, Pa., to a three-year term expiring in 2011;**  
**To elect Mr. Fred Fritz as an at-large member of the board of directors of Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., to a four-year term expiring in 2011;**  
**To elect Dr. John Marr as an at-large member of the board of directors of the Trinity Lutheran Seminary, Columbus, Ohio, to a four-year term expiring in 2011;**  
**To elect the Rev. Lowell G. Almen as an at-large member of the board of directors of the Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, S.C., to a three-year term expiring in 2011; and**  
**To elect Mr. Dan Yeiser as an at-large member of the board of directors of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Gettysburg, Pa., to a three-year term expiring in 2011.**

**B. SOCIAL MINISTRY ORGANIZATIONS**

(Agenda IV.1.1.b.)

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America serves as a corporate member of certain inter-Lutheran organizations and affiliated social ministry organizations. The role of corporate members includes the responsibility to elect ELCA representatives to the organization's board of directors as prescribed in the organization's governing documents. The relationship of the ELCA to certain inter-Lutheran organizations and affiliated social ministry organizations is expressed through the Church in Society unit. The ELCA serves as a corporate member of Lutheran Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York; the Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society, Sioux Falls, S.D.; Lutheran Services in America, Baltimore, Md.; Mosaic, Inc., Omaha, Neb.; and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Baltimore, Md.

The Church in Society program unit forwarded to the Church Council the following nominations for positions on the boards of these organizations.

**VOTED:**

*EN BLOC*

**CC07.11.96b**

**To elect to the board of directors of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Baltimore, Md.: Mr. J. David Ellwanger, Ms. Betty Boyd, Ms. Judith Diers, and Pr. Rebecca S. Larson to three-year terms beginning January 1, 2008 and expiring December 31, 2010;**  
**To elect Bp. E. Roy Riley to the remainder of a three-year term, ending on December 31, 2008, on the board of directors of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service;**  
**To elect to the board of trustees of Lutheran Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York, Mr. Joseph Lodato as a member-at-large, for a term expiring in 2008;**  
**To elect to the board of trustees of Lutheran Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York as members-at-large: Ms. Maria Carlson, Mr. Dale Christensen, Mr. Frank Comerford, Mr. Thomas Edwards, Ms. Kristine M. Gebbie, Ms. Emma Graeber Porter, Ms. Marilyn Gulin Santomauro, Mr. Gerald Luterman, Pr. Jeanne R. Warfield, and Bp. Stephen P. Bouman for terms expiring in 2010; and**

**To elect to the board of directors of the Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society Mr. David J. Horazdovsky for an unlimited term and Mr. Timothy J. Penny for a term expiring in 2011.**

### **EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ONLINE MATERIALS**

Vice President Carlos E. Peña invited comments about the use of online materials at the Church Council meeting. Mr. Bradley Dokken requested hard copies of documents that would be discussed at committee meetings.

Ms. Karin Lynn Graddy commented that it had been hard to tell which documents had been revised. She proposed that revisions be listed on the top of documents in reverse chronological order.

The Rev. David P. Anderson remarked that he had not brought a laptop, although he had signed up for electronic distribution of materials. He had not received several items and was unaware of some revisions.

Ms. Judith Tutt Starr stated she had printed the material in order to read it more quickly.

Mr. Gary L. Wipperman found the process very helpful, especially the ability to make comments and merge them into the documents.

The Rev. Susan Langhauser concurred, saying the system was very flexible.

Secretary David D. Swartling expressed his gratitude for council members' participation. Since the churchwide organization was committed to the "greening" of the Church Council as well as the Churchwide Assembly, he encouraged others to consider electronic participation.

Ms. Myrna J. Sheie, executive for governance and institutional relations, asked council members to thank Ms. Paula Berger for her work on the project. She anticipated that by the April 2008 meeting the process would be part of the Lutheran Center's content management system, which would enable the development of a more comprehensive, secure site.

### **2007 CHURCHWIDE ASSEMBLY EVALUATION**

(Agenda VI.; Agenda/MINUTES Exhibit R, Part 2)

#### *Background:*

Planning for Churchwide Assemblies is a cooperative endeavor involving the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the Office of the Secretary, churchwide units, the host synod, and many volunteers. The presiding bishop of this church is responsible for the preparation of the agenda for the assembly, as well as the assembly worship and program (ELCA 12.31.04.). The secretary is responsible for the management of the physical arrangements for the assembly, for the preparation and distribution of the *Pre-Assembly Report*, and for the establishment in consultation with the presiding bishop of committees that "may be necessary to facilitate the planning for and operation of the assembly" (ELCA 12.31.03. and 12.31.05.). Churchwide units assist the officers to carry out their responsibilities. A local arrangements committee helps to coordinate the use of volunteers in close cooperation with the host synod. An assembly planning committee helps to plan for and coordinate this complex partnership.

The Church Council plays an important role in the development of agenda items for the Churchwide Assembly since it reviews all recommendations from churchwide units that are to be considered by the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 14.21.03.); the council also proposes a budget for consideration by the assembly, upon recommendation by the presiding bishop. In carrying out its review of unit proposals, the Church Council works closely with the boards, program committees, and advisory committees of churchwide units, which are responsible to the Churchwide Assembly but report to Church Council in the interim. Throughout the biennium, the council and program committees, boards of separately incorporated units, and advisory committees are in regular communication as those actions are being shaped.

At the council's November 2007 meeting, members who attended the assembly had an opportunity to share their perspectives, which will inform those who already are planning for the 2009 Churchwide Assembly, which will be held August 17-23, 2009, in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

*Church Council Discussion:*

Vice President Carlos E. Peña called upon Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep, executive for research and evaluation, to report on the evaluation of the 2007 Churchwide Assembly.

Mr. Inskeep explained that his unit analyzed evaluations of the assemblies over time in order to look for trends and discern differences from assembly to assembly. The surveys were designed, he observed, to see if the organization collapses in any area. Because the organizers are professionals, he noted, that hardly ever was the case, but it was important to keep monitoring. Mr. Inskeep commented that it was a remarkable thing that the Office of the Secretary was able to move into quite different sites and coordinate everything for the Churchwide Assembly.

Mr. Inskeep highlighted a number of significant items in the evaluations.

- Less than 50 percent of voting members said that they reviewed all the materials before the assembly; 41 percent reported reviewing some; 10 person reported reading very few of them.
- The helpfulness of the pre-assembly materials was ranked the same (5.6 on a 7-point scale) in both 2005 and 2007.
- 94 percent of the voting members registered online.
- 57 percent of the voting members stated that they were very prepared (6-7) to fulfill their roles on the first day of the assembly.
- On-site registration was ranked slightly lower in 2007 than in 2005.
- Hotel accommodations also were ranked a bit lower.
- 18 percent did not attend a hearing in 2007, compared to only 4 percent in 2005.
- 25 percent of those who did attend a hearing went to one dealing with sexuality.
- The process of voting for presiding bishop and secretary was deemed very helpful (6.2 and 6.3).
- The facilitation of debate ranked at 5.9, approximately the same as in 2005, leaving some room for improvement.
- 20 percent of respondents spoke at microphone, a fairly typical percentage.
- Use of parliamentary procedure was ranked at 6.2, about the same as 2005.
- The work of the Memorials Committee was ranked 5-6, about the same as 2005.
- The work of the Nominations Committee and election procedures ranked just under 6, up slightly from 2005.
- Worship scored around 6, about the same as 2005.
- The scores for the quality of the space were down in 2007, owing to problems with acoustics and sound equipment.
- 72 percent of voting members indicated previous experience at Churchwide Assemblies, much more than the 40 percent who had done so in 2005.
- Large congregations were over-represented as a proportion of all congregations in this church, but under-represented as a proportion of all ELCA members.

Mr. Inskeep concluded his summary by saying that, overall, the rankings for the 2007 Churchwide Assembly were similar to those of previous assemblies and, generally, they were high.

Vice President Peña asked for comments.

Ms. Judith Anne Bunker asked whether the shuttle buses were evaluated. Ms. Mary Beth Nowak, executive for assemblies, meeting management, and travel, replied that they had not been evaluated by Mr. Inskeep's survey. Anecdotal evidence indicated that most people had been pleased. She added that most people liked the cash cards; preliminary estimates were that \$57,000 had been returned to the assembly budget.

Vice President Peña asked council members to thank Ms. Nowak and her staff for their organization of the assembly and the Church Council meetings.

The Rev. Jonathan W. Linman inquired what happened to remaining cash card funds that had been designated. Ms. Nowak replied that the designations had been given to the Office of the Treasurer and logistics were being developed for transferring funds. Pr. Linman asked for a report at the next council meeting.

In response to an earlier question from Mr. Richard L. Wahl, Ms. Nowak stated that offerings at the 2007 Churchwide Assembly were slightly above those of the 2005 Churchwide Assembly.

The Rev. Jeffrey "Jeff" B. Sorenson observed that leaving repeated open motions on floor from plenary to plenary became confusing. He recommended having only one open motion on the floor at a time. Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson responded that he had compared the ELCA assembly rules with those for conventions of The Lutheran

Church–Missouri Synod. Those rules provided for asking the assembly every 20 minutes whether it was ready to vote on the issue before it. The chair also tested regularly whether the assembly was ready to vote. Presiding Bishop Hanson’s practice was to wait for a voting member to move to close debate. Voting members likely would object if it seemed as if the chair were controlling or pre-empting debate. He expressed concern about the privilege that comes to those who know *Robert’s Rules* and use them to their advantage.

The Rev. Steven P. Loy suggested having some resource people on the floor of the assembly to help people do what they want to do parliamentarily. The Rev. Ruth E. Hamilton, executive for Office of the Secretary administration, replied that the secretary’s deputy filled that role. Additional opportunities for consulting with staff about motions and procedures had been offered but had not been utilized. These services will be further emphasized at the next assembly.

Responding to the proposal that more parliamentary information be part of voting member orientation, Secretary Swartling said that not everyone attended orientation sessions.

Presiding Bishop Hanson commented that assembly organizers struggled with how to invite people into conversation about deeply held convictions without speaking at a microphone. A committee of the whole session helped somewhat, but still required people to speak at microphones. He desired a way for people to engage in conversation with those around them on important matters. Presiding Bishop Hanson also wondered how to help people understand that they do not need to speak again to a point that had already been raised.

Ms. Karin Lynn Graddy expressed gratitude to Pr. Hamilton for assistance during the assembly and noted the problem of voting members conversing while others were in debate.

Mr. John R. Emery remarked that round tables at mealtimes promoted very lively conversations about the topics on the floor. Different points of view were shared in that setting.

The Rev. Keith A. Hunsinger stated a concern that had been raised in the Budget and Finance Committee, namely the Churchwide Assembly’s willingness to recommend uses for positive variances in the budget of the churchwide organization. Because a rule of the assembly mandates balancing a budget increase in one area with a corresponding budget decrease, voting members were trying to sidestep that rule by directing council to do it from reserves or positive variances. Doing so was a dangerous precedent, so he wished to explore how that loophole could be tightened or eliminated. Presiding Bishop Hanson thanked Pr. Hunsinger for his observations. He acknowledged that voting members did not understand cash management policies and the need for reserves. It was difficult, he said, to make clear the boundary between the assembly’s responsibility for the overall budget and its inability to micro-manage line items. Treasurer Christina Jackson-Skelton added that the problem was not new; the churchwide organization frequently worked hard to find ways to fund things the Churchwide Assembly had mandated. Referring such requests to the Church Council through the Budget and Finance Committee provides an opportunity for a wider and more informed discussion of the request.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson informed those present that the name of the person elected as executive director of Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission would be released on Tuesday, November 13, 2007.

Secretary David D. Swartling made a number of routine announcements, including the dates of the next meeting, April 11–13, 2008, and the council retreat, July 26–27, 2008. He asked council members to bring Bibles with them to the next and subsequent meetings.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION: ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF EVANGELICAL OUTREACH AND CONGREGATIONAL MISSION** (Agenda III.A.)

The Church Council entered into executive session at 1:37 P.M. for the purpose of discussing the nominee for executive director of the Evangelical Outreach and Congregational Mission unit. The executive session concluded at 2:10 P.M., after which the plenary session resumed.

**CLOSING PRAYER**

The Rev. Michael L. Burk, executive for worship and liturgical resources and chaplain to the Church Council, closed the meeting with prayer.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The fifty-eighth meeting of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America adjourned at 2:12 P.M.